

## CHAPTER 6

### PAUL'S FIRST SPEECH (Acts 13:16-41/48)

#### 1. THE BROADER CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

The extensive scrutiny and discussion to which the second Petrine speech (Ac 2:14-41) has been subjected has been noted in Ch 4; it has been viewed from many different perspectives, and with different purposes in mind. The same close attention has been applied to this first Pauline speech (Ac 13:16-41),<sup>1</sup> and the trilogy of quotations (VV.33-35) in particular, has exercised the imagination of scholars!

Like the Petrine speeches, this speech is today, fairly generally accepted as the creative and compilatory work of Luke himself.<sup>2</sup> This current stage has not, however, been reached without questions being asked about whether the speech as a whole, or parts of it which were taken from tradition, were formed by Luke.<sup>3</sup> Attention has already been drawn to the similarities between Ac 2:14-41 and 13:16-41. When the focus falls specifically on the explicit quotations in these two speeches, it is interesting to notice that (a) Ps 15(16):10 is found here again, as well as (b) a quotation from the *duodecim prophetae*. The fact that both speeches quote from both the collections of the 12P and of the Pss, is also noteworthy.

Ac 13:14 states explicitly that this speech was delivered by Paul in the Jewish synagogue<sup>4</sup> in Antioch, in the province of Pisidia. This occurred on the sabbath, after the readings from the Law and the Prophets had taken place (13:15).<sup>5</sup> Paul is seen here as a rhetor, but in contrast to the Jewish tradition of sitting in the

<sup>1</sup>. Compare, for instance, the works of E. LÖVESTAM (1961), M.F.-J. BUSS (1980) and B.J. KOET (1989).

<sup>2</sup>. So also A. WEISER (*Apg II*, 328-329) who has argued convincingly in this direction, and C. BREYTENBACH, *Mit Paulus und Barnabas in Galatien. Studien zu Apostelgeschichte 13f.; 16, 16, 18, 23 und Gal 1, 2 und 3, 1*, (yet unpublished) 1993/4, 27. On the basis of Ac 13:15f which forms the scenic narrative frame of the speech, and Ac 13:42f which describes the reaction to the speech, BREYTENBACH says that "Diese beiden Textteile können kaum unabhängig von der Rede existiert haben. Daher wird man annehmen müssen, daß zumindest Apg 13, 14c-42 in dieser Form von Lukas komponiert wurde" (*Paulus und Barnabas*, 27).

<sup>3</sup>. Cf. U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 55; and W.H. BATES, *Note*, 8.

<sup>4</sup>. According to A. WEISER, this is Paul's only speech addressed to Jews (*Apg II*, 323).

<sup>5</sup>. Compare J.W. DOEVE, *Jewish Hermeneutics*; J.W. BOWKER, *Speeches*, 96-111; D. GOLDSMITH, *Peshar*, 321-324; E.E. ELLIS, *Midraschartige Züge*, 94-104; M. DUMAIS, *Le langage de l'évangélisation. L'annonce missionnaire en milieu juif (Actes 13, 16-41)*, Tournai/Montréal 1976; and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 241. The above scholars work from the basis of the quotations, and compare the form of the speech to be on a par with that of a Jewish synagogue homily, especially a Proemium homily based on peshar-midrash. They use 4QFlor 1, 1-16 as a comparative example. The reading from the Torah (*Seder*) would have come then from Dt 4:25-46 and the reading from the Prophets (*Haphtarah*) from 2 Ki(Sm) 7:6-16 (so A. WEISER, *Apg II*, 323).

synagogue,<sup>6</sup> he stood up and began his speech like the Greek orators did.<sup>7</sup>

## 2. OVERVIEW OF THE TEXT OF THE SPEECH<sup>8</sup>

16 ἀναστὰς δὲ Παῦλος καὶ κατασεΐσας τῇ χειρὶ εἶπεν·

**Section I: Summary of the salvation history of the clected Israel and emphasis on God's promise to them (13:16-25)**

\* Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, ἀκούσατε.

- 17 ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραὴλ ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν,  
καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὕψωσεν ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου,  
καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς,  
18 καὶ ὡς τεσσαρεκονταετῆ χρόνου ἐτροποφόρησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,  
19 καὶ καθελῶν ἔθνη ἐπὶ τὰ ἐν γῇ Χανάν κατακληρονόμησεν τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν  
20 ὡς ἔτεσιν τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα  
καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκεν κριτὰς ἕως Σαμουὴλ (τοῦ) προφήτου.  
21 κάκειθεν ἠτήσαντο βασιλέα, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς τὸν Σαοὺλ υἱὸν  
Κίς, ἄνδρα ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμὴν, ἔτη τεσσαεράκοντα.  
22 καὶ μεταστῆσας αὐτὸν ἠγειρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα,  
ὃς καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας,  
Εὗρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου,  
ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελημάτά μου.  
23 τούτου ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ἤγαγεν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ  
σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν,  
24 προκηρῦζαντος Ἰωάννου πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ  
βάπτισμα μετανοίας παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραὴλ.  
25 ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρου Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον, ἔλεγεν·  
Τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι: οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ· ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετ'  
ἐμὲ οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι.

**Section II: Interpretation of the life of Jesus until his resurrection**  
(Jesus-kerygma), i.e. the message of salvation (ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας) (13:26-31)

- 26 \* Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί,  
υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῶν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν,

<sup>6</sup>. See also Lk 4:20. Cf. H. CONZELMANN, *Arg*, 83; and B.M. NEWMANN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 252.

<sup>7</sup>. With regard to κατασεΐσας τῇ χειρὶ, cf. also Ac 12:17; 19:33 and 21:40; Polybius I 78,3; *JosAnt* IV 323; VIII 275 (G. SCHNEIDER, *Arg II*, 131). Also H. CONZELMANN who refers to Philo Spec Leg II 62 (*Arg*, 83). With regard to "standing", cf. also Ac 1:15; 2:14; 5:34; 15:7; 17:22; 21:40.

<sup>8</sup>See J.J. KILGALLEN for an overview of different alternative divisions of this speech (Acts 13,38-39: Culmination of Paul's Speech in Pisidia, in: *Bib* 69 (1988), 480-506, here 485-486).

- ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη.
- 27 οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν  
τοῦτου ἀγνοήσαυτες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον  
ἀναγινωσκόμενας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν,
- 28 καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὐρόντες  
ἠτήσαντο Πιλάτου ἀναβεθῆναι αὐτόν·
- 29 ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα,  
καθελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημεῖον.
- 30 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν·
- 31 ὃς ὥφθη ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναναβῶσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας  
εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, οἵτινες (ὡς) εἰσιν μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν.

**Section III: Contents of the message (gospel) and three quoted texts  
(13:32-37)**

- 32 καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν  
γενομένην,
- 33 ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν τοῖς τέκνοις [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν  
ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν,  
ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ,  
Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.
- 34 ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς  
διαφθοράν, οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι  
Δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.
- 35 διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει  
Οὐ δώσεις τὸν θρόνον σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.
- 36 Δαυὶδ μὲν γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ ἐκοιμήθη  
καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶδεν διαφθοράν,
- 37 ὃν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἤγειρεν, οὐκ εἶδεν διαφθοράν.

**Section IV: Interpretation of the contents of the message and admonition  
(13:38-41)**

- 38 γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί,  
ὅτι διὰ τούτου ὑμῖν ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν καταγγέλλεται,  
{καὶ} ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως δικαιοθῆναι,
- 39 ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιούται.
- 40 βλέπετε οὖν μὴ ἐπέλθῃ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις·
- 41 ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ θαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε,  
ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν,  
ἔργον ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐὰν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν.

**Section V: Reaction of the hearers (13:42-45)**

- 42 Ἐξίσταντο δὲ αὐτῶν παρεκάλουν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον

- λαληθῆναι αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα.
- 43 λυθείσης δὲ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἠκολούθησαν πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων  
καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσκλύτων τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρναβᾷ,  
οἵτινες προσλαλοῦντες αὐτοῖς ἔπειθον αὐτοὺς προσμένειν  
τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ.
- 44 Τῷ δὲ ἐρχομένῳ σαββάτῳ σχεδὸν πᾶσα ἡ πόλις συνήχθη  
ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου.
- 45 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τοὺς ὄχλους ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου  
καὶ ἀντέλεγον τοῖς ὑπὸ Παύλου λαλουμένοις βλασφημοῦντες.

**Section VI: The message is not only for the Jews, but also for the  
"gentiles" (non-Jews).(13:46-48)**

- 46 παρησιασάμενοι τε ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρναβᾶς εἶπαν·
- Ἵμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ·  
ἐπειδὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς  
τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, ἰδοὺ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη.
- 47 οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος·  
Τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί  
σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.
- 48 Ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαIRON καὶ ἐδόξαζON τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου,  
καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον·

**2.1 Division of the speech**

The main speech, or first part of the speech, stretches between VV.16-41. The reaction of the hearers (VV.42-45) divide this first speech with the second part, a follow-up speech, which stretches between VV.46-48.

This speech consists of all the constitutive elements that are to be found in the missionary speeches to the Jews:<sup>9</sup> *Section I: Ac 13:16-25*: Summary of the salvation history of Israel and emphasis on God's promise to them; *Section II: Ac 13:26-31*: Interpretation on the life of Jesus until his resurrection, i.e. the message of salvation; *Section III: Ac 13:32-37*: Contents of the message (gospel) and three quoted texts; *Section IV: Ac 13:38-41*: Interpretation of the contents of the message and admonition; *Section V: Ac 13:42-45*: Reaction of the hearers; *Section VI: Ac 13:46-48*: The message is not only for the Jews, but also for the "Gentiles" (non-Jews).

<sup>9</sup> These speeches are Ac 2:38-40; 3:19 and 3:26. U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 54; G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq II*, 129, and A. WEISER, *Apq II*, 322-323, also divide the speech roughly within the same structure. The debate on the structure can also be followed in G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq II*, 129-130; U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 54; R.P. GORDON, Targumic Parallels to Acts XIII 18 and Didache XIV 3, in: *NT 16* (1974), 285-289; and O.H. STECK, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten* (WMANT 23), Neukirchen 1967, 263-289.

With regard to the form, or structure, of the speech itself,<sup>10</sup> during the last decade some scholars have indicated that this speech (and other early Christian "sermons") show remarkable resemblances with the form of (*hellenistic-*) *Jewish sermons*.<sup>11</sup> Although this may be a possibility, the problems remain that there is insufficient comparative material available to prove this hypothesis.<sup>12</sup> Others, on the other hand, have found it to be nearer to that of *Graeco-Roman speeches*.<sup>13</sup> According to the latter, Ac 13:16b could be regarded as the *exordium*, VV.17-26 could be seen as the *narratio*, VV.27-37 as the proposition (*propositio*), the proof (*probatio*),<sup>14</sup> and VV.38-41 as the *epilogue*.

### 3. SECTION I: ACTS 13:16-25

Summary of the salvation history of Israel and emphasis on God's promise to them.

This Pauline speech starts with the same structural elements as did the Petrine speeches: (a) *The gesture of the speaker*: "Paul stood up and motioned with his hand" (ἀναστὰς δὲ Παῦλος καὶ κατασεΐσας τῇ χειρὶ... = V.16);<sup>15</sup> (b) *A verb of saying introducing the direct speech*: "he said" (εἶπεν, V.16); (c) *Naming of the hearers at the beginning of the speech*: "Brothers Israelites and Godfearers" (ἀδελφοὶ Ἰσραηλίται<sup>16</sup> καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν<sup>17</sup>... = V.16).

In addition, the explicit appeal to the hearers to "listen" follows the naming of the hearers: ἀκούσατε (V.16).<sup>18</sup> This probably resembles the element of the *Schéma* in the synagogue service.<sup>19</sup> Compare Dt 6:4: "Ἀκουε Ἰσραηλ... However, here in

<sup>10</sup> For a more comprehensive discussion on this, cf. M.F.-J. BUSS (*Missionspredigt*, 19-31; and A. WEISER, *Apg II*, 322-324).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. for instance, D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 241-242; L. WILLS, The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity, in: *HTHR* 77 (1984), 277-299.

<sup>12</sup> So argued also by M.F.-J. BUSS (*Missionspredigt*, 23), and A. WEISER (*Apg II*, 324): "Aber der Hypothese, daß das formale Gerüst ganz einer Proömien-Homilie entspreche, stehen doch die Schwierigkeiten entgegen, daß die genauen Formen und Gesetzmäßigkeiten jüdischer Synagogenpredigten aus so früher Zeit nicht genügend bekannt sind..., daß die Form des Christuskerymas nicht dem vorausgesetzten Schema entspricht und daß der Schlußteil mit der Paränese bereits im V 38 beginnt."

<sup>13</sup> C.C. BLACK II, The Rhetorical Form of the Hellenistic Jewish and Early Christian Sermon: A Response to Lawrence Wills, in: *HTHR* 81 (1988), 1-18.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 8-10. Ac 13:17-25 probably shows several of the characteristics of a *narratio* as recommended by Quintilian, while Ac 13:27-37 resembles all four types of "certainties" (*a priori*) which were conceptualized by Quintilian.

<sup>15</sup> Compare also Ac 1:15; 2:14; 12:17; 15:7; 17:22; 21:40; 26:1. This was not Jewish custom, as rabbis have sat in the synagogue.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. also Ac 2:22 and 3:12.

<sup>17</sup> See also V.26. Cf. STR-BILL, *Kommentar II*, 715-723 for an extensive discussion on this phrase. It refers to a "Proselytenklasse." The old Synagogue has had two categories of proselytes: complete and half proselytes. According to B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, "They may have been either full converts to Judaism or Gentiles who sympathized with the Jewish faith and desired to worship the God of the Jews" (*Translator's Handbook*, 253).

<sup>18</sup> Compare also Ac 2:22; 7:2; 15:13; 22:1.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the Mishnah (ca. 200 AD) Megilla IV:3-6 which indicated that the synagogue service consisted of 5 elements: Sche'mah (confession), Tefila (prayer), Torah (law), Ha-Nabim (prophets) and Targum (explanation).

Ac 13:15, this element follows *after* the reading of the Law and the Prophets, and not before it, as in the order described in the Mishnah.

V.17 starts with God as the Subject, the God of this people of Israel (ὁ θεὸς τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου Ἰσραήλ).<sup>20</sup> It resembles the beginning of Peter's third speech, also starts with God as the Subject, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Ac 3:13). The covenantal God is thus at stake here. The motif of the election of their forefathers (probably the patriarchs) is then introduced, with Paul including himself within the circle of his hearers by using a first person plural pronoun (ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν, V.17). This election motif introduces a summary of the salvation history of Israel which involves God as its Subject:<sup>21</sup> VV.17b-23. Its peak or climax is to be found in V.23 with the coming of the Saviour Jesus, as was promised by God. The function of the material in VV.17b-23 is thus probably to lead, in a salvation-historical manner, to the Jesus-kerygma.<sup>22</sup>

VV.17b-23 provides a brief summary to help the listeners recall God's activity in their history,<sup>23</sup> from the Exodus to the rise of David.<sup>24</sup> The following eight elements in God's salvation history with his elected people are described: (a) the prospering of his people during their stay in Egypt (καὶ τὸν λαὸν ὑψώσεν<sup>25</sup> ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτου, V.17b); (b) their exodus out of that country, being led out with his mighty power<sup>26</sup> (καὶ μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ αὐτῆς, V.17c); (c) his endurance of their conduct for about forty years in the desert (καὶ ὡς τεσσαρακονταετῆ χρόνον ἐτροποφόρησεν<sup>27</sup> αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, V.18); (d) his overthrowing of seven nations in Canaan and his gift of their land to his people as their inheritance,<sup>28</sup> a process taking about 450 years (καὶ καθελῶν ἔθνη ἑπτὰ ἐν γῆ Χανάαν κατεκληρονόμησεν τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν ὡς ἔτεσιν τετρακοσίοις καὶ πεντήκοντα, VV.19-20a); (e) God then gave them judges<sup>29</sup> until the time of Samuel "the prophet" (καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκεν κριτὰς ἕως Σαμουὴλ [τοῦ]

<sup>20</sup>. The expression ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραήλ is to be found frequently in the LXX. Cf. G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq II*, 131, n.36.

<sup>21</sup>. Cf. also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq II*, 131.

<sup>22</sup>. So U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 51-52.

<sup>23</sup>. Behind this "heilsgeschichtlich-summarischen Durchblick durch die Geschichte Israels," lies "eine uralte israelitisch-jüdische Tradition" according to U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 50, and A. WEISER, *Apq II*, 325, but — as the latter points out — there are elements which point to this version as the composition of the author of Ac! So also F.F. BRUCE, following G.E. WRIGHT (*God Who Acts*, London 1952, 70-81), reckons that it "summarizes the Old Testament *kerygma*, Israel's salvation-history as it was recited in the national worship" (*Davidic Messiah*, 11).

<sup>24</sup>. So also F.F. BRUCE, *Davidic Messiah*, 11.

<sup>25</sup>. C. SMITS saw a parallel with the selection and exaltation of Israel, and Is 1:2 where the same word is used, although in a different context (*Citaten II*, 193). So also H. CONZELMANN, *Apq*, 83.

<sup>26</sup>. Cf. to Dt 4:34; 5:15; 9:26,29; Ex 6:1,6; and 12:42. See also C.A.J. PILLAI, who calls it a "simple major citation" of Dt 5:15 (*Early Missionary Preaching*, 40).

<sup>27</sup>. According to C. SMITS it is only Dt 1:31 which knows the word ἐτροποφόρησεν (*Citaten II*, 194). See also NA26; B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 253; and C.A.J. PILLAI, *Early Missionary Preaching*, 40, the latter who indexed this whole phrase as a "simple major citation".

<sup>28</sup>. Cf. Dt 7:1. See also NA26 and C.A.J. PILLAI, *Early Missionary Preaching*, 40.

<sup>29</sup>. According to C.A.J. PILLAI, this phrase is a "minor citation" of Jdg 2:16 (*Early Missionary Preaching*, 40). C. SMITS has pointed to 1 Ki(Sm) 8:5 and 10:21-24: "De figuur van David is enigszins op de voorgrond geschoven door expliciete citaten, maar het gebeurt wederom alleen om een overgang te maken naar de persoon van Jesus" (C. SMITS, *Citaten II*, 194).



προφήτου, V.20b); (f) the people then asked for a king<sup>30</sup> and God gave them Saul, the son of Kish, of the tribe of Benjamin, who ruled fourty years (κακειθεν ητήσαυτο βασιλέα, και ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς τὸν Σαοὺλ υἱὸν Κίς, ἀνδρα ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμείν, ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα, V.21); (g) after removing Saul, he made David their king (καὶ μεταστήσας αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς βασιλέα ᾧ, V.22a);<sup>31</sup> (h) this was the man from whose descendants God brought to Israel the saviour Jesus — as he has promised (τούτου ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ἤγαγεν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα<sup>32</sup> Ἰησοῦν, V.23).<sup>33</sup>

All these phrases are combined with a καί, with the exception of the latter. It is interesting that a direct leap is made from David (the climax of the "OT *kerigma*") to Jesus (the climax of the "NT *kerigma*"),<sup>34</sup> probably to point out some typological meaning in the context of the traditional proof from Scripture.<sup>35</sup> Also important is the fact that God remains the Subject throughout their history. When looking back into their history, it is clear that this God has never let them down and has fulfilled all his promises.

The reference in V.22b was probably meant as an explicit quotation.<sup>36</sup> Not only is it introduced by an introductory formula (καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας), but also the words directly following are in the first person singular, so as to be understood as God's direct speech: Εὗρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἀνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου. The quotation itself is, however, not drawn from a single quoted text. It consists of a conflation of Scriptural textual phrases,<sup>37</sup> mainly from Ps 88:21(89:20),<sup>38</sup> 1 Ki(Sm) 13:14 and Is 44:28.<sup>39</sup>

<sup>30</sup>. Although C.A.J. PILLAI calls this a "minor citation" of 1 Ki(Sm) 8:5, it refers simply to the history as contained in 1 Ki(Sm) 8:5 and 10:24 (*Early Missionary Preaching*, 40).

<sup>31</sup>. For the history behind VV.21-22a, see 1 Ki(Sm) 8:50; 10:21-24; 16:13.

<sup>32</sup>. Cf. Lk 2:11 and Ac 5:31.

<sup>33</sup>. G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg II*, 133, and A. WEISER find in V.23 a reference to the Davidic promise of 2 Ki(Sm) 7:12-14 (*Apg II*, 325).

<sup>34</sup>. So also A. WEISER, *Apg II*, 325. The comparison of the two terms, OT and NT *kerigma*, is used by F.F. BRUCE, *Davidic Messiah*, 12-13.

<sup>35</sup>. See also U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 50,n.3.

<sup>36</sup>. So C. SMITS, who calls this a "gekombineerde citaat" (*Citaten II*, 194). Also E. HAENCHEN, *Schriftzitate*, 166; E. RICHARD, *OT in Acts*, 331 (especially 331-332); C.A.J. PILLAI, *Early Missionary Preaching*, 41; F.F. BRUCE, Paul's Use of the Old Testament in Acts, in: G.F. HAWTHORNE & O. BETZ (eds), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament. Essays in Honor of E. Earle Ellis for his 60th birthday*, Tübingen 1987, 71-79, here 71-72.

<sup>37</sup>. So also E. HAENCHEN, *Apg*, 331; H. CONZELMANN, *Apg*, 83; E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 45; B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 256; G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg II*, 133,n.56; F.F. BRUCE, *Paul's Use*, 72; D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 242-243; and C.A.J. PILLAI who calls it a "composite citation...introduced by a formula of quotation, but combining texts from different books" (*Early Missionary Preaching*, 41). Some consider this to be probably the result of a "testimony book", cf. for instance, H. CONZELMANN, *Apg*, 83; (somewhat reserved) G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg II*, 133; and E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 45.

<sup>38</sup>. Cf. here to D.A. HAGNER for a comparison between Ac 13:22 and Clement of Rome on the use of this text (*The Use of the Old and New Testaments in Clement of Rome* (S.NT 34), Leiden 1973, 259-261). HAGNER admits that the similarities between the two might "...indicate that the source of the citation in Acts is to be found in a collection of Davidic or Messianic passages." This remains a possibility, but the simpler conclusion of dependence upon Acts is to be preferred in the present instance" (260-261). Differently, G. SCHNEIDER: "Trotzdem ist 1Clem hier kaum von der Apg abhängig (*Apg II*, 133,n.56). So also D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 243.

<sup>39</sup>. F.F. BRUCE points to the fact that the phrase, "who will do all my will", is found as a paraphrase of "after his own heart" in the Targum Jonathan. On the basis of the literal rendering and the paraphrase

IV.24-25 deals with the motif of the preparatory work of John the Baptist before the coming of Jesus. He preached repentance and baptism to all the people of Israel. He himself revealed his true identity: he is not ("the one"), and he is not worthy to untie the sandals of that one (Jesus) who is coming after him (John).<sup>40</sup>

#### 4. SECTION II: ACTS 13:26-31

Interpretation of the life of Jesus until his resurrection (Jesus-kerygma), i.e. the message of salvation (ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας)

The second major section of this speech starts again with the typical ἄνδρες (ἀδελφοί), V.26a, calling the hearers sons of the generation of Abraham (υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ). The addition of the phrase "God-fearers" (καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν) implies a wider audience than just Jews, and suggests that this is a "mixed audience".<sup>41</sup> It is to them that this word of salvation is sent (ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη,<sup>42</sup> V.26b).<sup>43</sup>

After mentioning David (V.22), a change is made directly to Jesus, i.e. to the Jesus-kerygma. He is the Saviour (V.23).<sup>44</sup> The life of this Jesus until his resurrection is now briefly summarized in IV.27-31. The following seven elements are focused on: (a) the people of Jerusalem and their rulers did not recognise Jesus (οἱ γὰρ κατοικοῦντες ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες αὐτῶν τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες, V.27a);<sup>45</sup> (b) but by condemning him they fulfilled the words of the prophets that are read every sabbath (καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας κρίναντες ἐπλήρωσαν, V.27b);<sup>46</sup> (c) though they found no proper grounds for a death sentence, they asked Pilate to have him executed (καὶ μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὑρόντες ἤτήσαντο Πιλάτον ἀναφρεθῆναι αὐτόν, V.28); (d) when they had carried out all that was written about him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb<sup>47</sup> (ὡς δὲ ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ

---

being found together there, he thinks that they were probably joined "in the testimony tradition used by the Lukan Paul and by Clement of Rome (1 Clm 18:1)" (*Paul's Use*, 72). Evidence for such a "testimony tradition" is, however, too vague.

<sup>40</sup> U. WILCKENS has pointed out that John has here the function of a prophet (*Missionsreden*, 51). So also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq II*, 134.

<sup>41</sup> See V.16. Cf. also F.J. MATERA, *Responsibility*, 85; and in the same direction A. WEISER, *Apq II*, 333.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. A. WEISER, who shows that this *passivum divinum* points to the fact that this mission is meant to be initiated by God (*Apq II*, 333).

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Ps 107(106):20. C.A.J. PILLAI calls this a "minor citation" (*Early Missionary Preaching*, 40).

<sup>44</sup> The promise is to be found in Is 11:1, although the terminology is to be found in 2 Ki(Sm) 7:13 (C. SMITS, *Citaten II*, 194).

<sup>45</sup> See F.J. MATERA, *Responsibility*, 77-93. Responsibility for the death of Jesus is placed on the shoulders of the Jerusalemites (Ac 2:23,36; 3:13-14) and their leaders (Ac 4:10-11; 5:3) (*Responsibility*, 85).

<sup>46</sup> They read thus these Scriptures, but do not understand them. Cf. also Ac 8, as well as Ac 28 with its combination of *ἰσχυρία τοῦ θεοῦ*.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. to F.J. MATERA who draws attention to this "new element, seemingly in tension with the Lukan passion account". In Lk 23:50-53 it is Joseph of Arimathea who undertook the burial of Jesus. Here in Ac 13:29, it seems to be the Jerusalemites and their leaders (*Responsibility*, 86). According to B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, however, a distinction should be made between the first "they" (being the Jewish people and their Jewish leaders) and the second "they" (being Joseph and Nicodemus specifically) (*Translator's Handbook*, 260).



περὶ αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένα,<sup>48</sup> καθελόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου<sup>49</sup> ἔθηκαν εἰς μνημεῖον, V.29); (e) but God raised him from the dead (ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, V.30); (f) for many days he was seen by those who had travelled with him from Galilee to Jerusalem<sup>50</sup> (ὅς ᾤφθη ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, V.31a); (g) they are now his witnesses to their people (οἵτινες [νῦν] εἰσὶν μάρτυρες<sup>51</sup> αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν.V.31b).<sup>52</sup> The call for repentance is omitted here, as the Jerusalemites and their leaders were responsible for the death of Jesus, and not the diaspora Jews and the God-fearers of Antioch in Pisidia.<sup>53</sup> The elements described in numbers a-d have as subjects the Jews of Jerusalem and their leaders. The resemblances between these elements of the Jesus-kerygma and those in the third Petrine speech (Ac 3:13-18) are striking:<sup>54</sup> the guilt of the Jews, and their ignorance of who Jesus was (Ac 3:13,17 and 13:27); the guiltlessness of Jesus (Ac 3:14 and 13:28); that these things happened in order that the Scriptures might be fulfilled (Ac 3:18 and 13:27b); the resurrection of Christ by God (Ac 3:15b and 13:30); the apostles' witness to this resurrection (Ac 3:15c and 13:31).

### 5. SECTION III: ACTS 13:32-37

Contents of the message (gospel) and three quoted texts

#### 5.1 Composition of the section

The section of the speech which consists of VV.32-37 forms such a cohesive unit that it would be almost impossible to discuss each of the three quoted texts in it completely separately.<sup>55</sup> Luke's interpretation of each quoted text flows over into the others. One cannot be understood without the other being directly linked with it. This trilogy of quoted texts forms part of the same argument and reflects a striking interwovenness.

Luke's intention here, is to summarize the message, the "good news" (gospel). This is presented through the mouths of Paul and Barnabas to those Jews and God-fearers in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia: καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα, V.32a. The content of the message itself is threefold: (a) God has fulfilled, to those of the present generation, the promise he made to their fathers, to them their children (τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην, ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς

<sup>48</sup>. Here, thus *Scriptural* witness.

<sup>49</sup>. Cf. also Ac 5:30 (10:39). This might be an allusion to Dt 21:22-23. See M. WILCOX, "Upon the Tree" — Deut. 21:22-23 in the New Testament, in: *JBL* 96 (1977), 85-99.

<sup>50</sup>. The Lukan Paul had not himself seen this resurrected Jesus. Cf. also G. SCHNEIDER, *App II*, 136.

<sup>51</sup>. Here, thus *oral* witness.

<sup>52</sup>. U. WILCKENS has pointed out that also now is nothing else preached than the fulfillment of the scriptural promises which were given to their fathers (*Missionsreden*, 53).

<sup>53</sup>. So also F.J. MATERA, *Responsibility*, 86; A. WEISER, *App II*, 333-334.

<sup>54</sup>. Cf. also U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 51; and W.H. BATES, *Note*, 9-10. The latter found the similarities between Ac 3 and 13 to be even broader.

<sup>55</sup>. Cf. W.K.L. CLARKE who talks about "a remarkable combination...(which) make a composite quotation" (*Use of the Septuagint*, 94).

ἐκπεπλήρωκεν τοῖς τέκνοις [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν, VV.32b-33a); God has done this by (b) raising Jesus (ἀναστήσας<sup>56</sup> Ἰησοῦν, V.33b), substantiated with a quotation from Ps 2:7: υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε, V.33c); and (c) Jesus, being raised from death, would therefore never decay (ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, V.34), substantiated with quotations from Is 55:3 (δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὄσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά, V.34) and Ps 15(16):10 (οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὄσων σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν, V.35).<sup>57</sup> Basically the very same thing is said in both of the last two quotations. The one from Is 55:3 only in a positive statement, and the other from Ps 15(16):10 in a negative statement.

The people are thus first informed of Jesus' raising as referred to in the second Ps (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ, V.33), that he (Jesus) is God's son and God has given him life. The fact of Jesus' raising is repeated again after the quotation, referring now explicitly to his resurrection as a fact which has taken place: God has resurrected Jesus from death and he would thus never decay. Having established this, Luke can now come back to the first part of the argument, or the first element of the apostles' message: that God has thus indeed fulfilled his promises, as was foretold in Is 55:3 (οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι, V.34), that the blessings promised to David<sup>58</sup> would be bestowed, and, elsewhere (διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, V.35), that he would never decay. Attention is then given to this aspect by way of the third quoted text, from Ps 15(16):10. It is at this point that Luke explicitly states that these words could not have referred to David himself<sup>59</sup> (V.36), but are to be understood in terms of Jesus (V.37). For when David had served God's purpose in his own generation, he fell asleep, was buried with his fathers,<sup>60</sup> and his body decayed (Δαυὶδ μὲν γὰρ ἰδίᾳ γενεᾷ ὑπηρετήσας τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ βουλῇ ἐκομήθη καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶδεν διαφθοράν, V.36).

<sup>56</sup>. Compare Ac 3:22-23 where this *crux interpretum* was encountered. Cf. to M. RESE, *Motive*, 82-86 and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 244-245 for a summary of the debate and the arguments *pro* and *contra*.

<sup>57</sup>. Similarly also E. HAENCHEN: "Lukas trägt also hier 3 Gedanken vor: 1. Jesus ist auferstanden; 2. damit ist die Verheißung an die Väter erfüllt; 3. das verkünden wir" (*Apg*, 353).

<sup>58</sup>. G. SCHNEIDER points to the fact that (τὰ ὄσια was seen by Plato (*Politicus* 301d), Xenophon (*Hell* IV 1,33) and others as the "göttlichen Verfügungen im Gegensatz zu den δίκαια, den menschlichen Satzungen". He says also that it could mean here "die dem David (oder durch David) gegebenen göttlichen Verheißungen bzw. verheißenen Heilsgaben." Cf. also Wisd 6:10 and Jos (*Ant* VIII, 115) (*Apg II*, 137).

<sup>59</sup>. Because the Psalmist (David) is speaking here in the first person (cf. also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg II*, 138). See also the discussion on Ps 15(16):8-11 in the second speech of Peter, especially under 4.2.5 (Section IV).

<sup>60</sup>. Cf. 3 Ki(1Ki) 2:10, also labelled a "minor citation" by C.A.J. PILLAI, *Early Missionary Preaching*,

5.2 The three quoted texts: (Ac 13:33-35)  
Ps 2:7 - Is 55:3 - Ps 15(16):10

5.2.1 *God has fulfilled his promise: The raising of Jesus and the quoted text  
from Ps 2:7 in Ac 13:34*

(a) *Pre-Lukan occurrences of the quotation*

Within the context of later Judaism, Ps 2 was probably already connected with the "messiah," especially with regard to the occurrence of משיח in Ps 2:2.<sup>61</sup> In 4QFlor, for example, is to be found a quotation from Ps 2:1, where it is linked to 2 Ki(Sm) 7:10b-14.<sup>62</sup> Ps 2:7, in turn, was already linked with 2 Ki(Sm) 7:12-16 in PsSol 17:23-24.<sup>63</sup>

Although not quoting from the same verse, it is also interesting to note that Ps 2:1-2 is quoted in Ac 4:25-26.

Here in Ac 13:33 is found a quotation which identically resembles a part of Ps 2:7.<sup>64</sup> The same quotation is found again in both Heb 1:5 and 5:5,<sup>65</sup> where, in each case, the quotation serves to strengthen the idea of the exaltation of Jesus, and is therefore linked with the christology.<sup>66</sup> In Heb 5:5 this quotation from Ps 2:7 is followed directly by another Ps quotation, from Ps 109(110):4. It became clear from these occurrences that both Ps 2(7) and Ps 109(110) were already linked with the christology, and then especially with Jesus' exaltation.

(b) *The introductory formula (Ac 13:33)*

The introductory formula is formed by the words: ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ.<sup>67</sup> Although there are a lot of textcritical alternatives to be found in this unit, none of them seems convincing enough to alter the reconstructed text of NA26.

Very interesting then is the explicit reference that the quotation which is to follow, comes from *the second Ps*.<sup>68</sup> One has to weigh a few probabilities here:<sup>69</sup> Was it (a) either "more likely that Luke was acquainted with the tradition that

<sup>61</sup>. So according to D.L. BOCK, who points out that Ps 2 is used "messianically" in 4QFlor (*Proclamation*, 246).

<sup>62</sup>. See the work of D. GOLDSMITH in this regard (*Pesher*, 321-324). Also D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 246.

<sup>63</sup>. So pointed out by E. SCHWEIZER, *Davidic 'Son of God'*, 190.

<sup>64</sup>. VV. 1-2 of the same Ps was already quoted in Ac 4:25-26.

<sup>65</sup>. T. HOLTZ mentions only Heb 1:5 (*Untersuchungen*, 56).

<sup>66</sup>. "In der Hebr 1,5 und 5,5 vorliegenden alten Tradition wird Ps 2,7 eindeutig auf die himmlische Inthronisation Christi in der Erhöhung bezogen. Damit soll gesagt werden: Durch die Erhöhung hat Gott Jesus zu seinem Sohn gemacht (vgl. Röm 1,4; Kol 1,18; Offb 1,5)" (J. ROLOFF, *Apq*, 207). See also E. LÖVESTAMM, *Son and Saviour*, 13-14.

<sup>67</sup>. Cf. C.K. BARRETT: "Not only a book but a division of the book is given" (*Luke/Acts*, 239).

<sup>68</sup>. This reading is supported by P<sup>74</sup> N A B C Ψ 33.81.945.1739 *al*. Codex D reads here οὕτως γὰρ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται — as it is indeed to be found in the MT. This exact pinpointing of the precise place from which the quotation came, is an individual case and unique in the whole NT (so also M. RESE, *Motive*, 81; J. ROLOFF, *Apq*, 206).

<sup>69</sup>. So proposed by B.M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 412-414.

counted the first two Pss as one,<sup>70</sup> and later editors or transcribers altered his πρώτῳ to δευτέρῳ to conform what became the usual enumeration", or (b) "was πρώτῳ substituted by someone who was acquainted with the rabbinical practice of combining them"? Another possibility to reckon with is whether (c) the reading of P<sup>45</sup> (τοις ψαλμοις) is "to be preferred, not only because it is the oldest, but for transcriptional reasons as well"? In favour of the last is the fact that "the variety of positions at which the numeral (whether πρώτῳ or δευτέρῳ) is introduced makes both numerals suspect".<sup>71</sup> One of the consequences of choosing the last alternative, is that one would then have to be cautious of using this introductory formula as part of the evidence that Luke might have had a broader knowledge of Ps 2.<sup>72</sup>

(c) *Determining and explaining the textual differences*

NT (NA26) Ac 13:33	NT (NA26) Heb 1:5	NT (NA26) Heb 5:5	LXX Ps 2:7	MT Ps 2:7
υἱός μου	υἱός μου	υἱός μου	υἱός μου	יְהוָה
εἶ σύ,	εἶ σύ,	εἶ σύ,	εἶ σύ,	יְהוָה
ἐγώ	ἐγώ	ἐγώ	ἐγώ	יְהוָה
σήμερον	σήμερον	σήμερον	σήμερον	דו יְהוָה
γεγέννηκά	γεγέννηκά	γεγέννηκά	γεγέννηκά	:יְהוָה יְהוָה
σε.	σε.	σε.	σε.	

The Greek translation of the LXX is a complete, identical and true translation of the Hebrew,<sup>73</sup> and the quotation in Ac 13 (as well as in Heb 1 and 5) agrees exactly with the text of the LXX.<sup>74</sup> In codex D, the quotation is extended to the next verse (V.8) of Ps 2. Also this addition agrees with the LXX version.<sup>75</sup>

(d) *Method of quotation*

After presenting a summary of the salvation history of Israel, the place of Jesus within this history is explained. It is made clear that he was the fulfillment of God's

<sup>70</sup> See also STR-BILL, indicating that also the Talmud has often taken the first and second Pss to be one (*Kommentar II*, 725).

<sup>71</sup> Cf. also G.D. KILPATRICK in connection with Tertullian (*Adv.Marc* IV.xxii.8) who quoted Ps 2:7 as "the first Ps" (Acts xiii.33 and Tertullian, *Adv.Marc*. IV.xxii.8, in: *JThS* 11 (1960), 53).

<sup>72</sup> So done, for instance, by W.J.C. WEREN: "This introductory formula shows that Luke not has v.7b in mind but also that the verse quoted functions as a *pars pro toto*" (Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: an Intertextual Study, in: S. DRAISMA (ed), *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings. Essays in honour of Bas van Iersel*, Kampen 1989, 189-203, here 198).

<sup>73</sup> So also D.L. BOCK: "This agreement extends even down to the word order of the text" (*Proclamation*, 245-246).

<sup>74</sup> W.K.L CLARKE (*Use of the Septuagint*, 85.87); M. RESE (*Motive*, 81); H. RINGGREN (*Luke's Use*, 234) and D.L. BOCK (*Proclamation*, 245), among others, agree that Ps 2:7 is quoted here according to the LXX.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. C. SMITS, *Citaten II*, 195: "De aanvulling voegt geen nieuwe gedachte aan de vorige toe. Zij doet alleen sterker het universalisme van het heil uitkomen." Also W.J.C. WEREN, *Psalms* 2, 198.

promise which was made to their forefathers. The Davidic promise plays a prominent role here. The summary account of the salvation history of Israel breaks off at this point, and the connection with Jesus is made immediately thereafter (VV.22-23). The quotation of Ps 2:7 is then probably also to be understood within this context. Both the motif of the "raising" of David and Jesus, as well as that of the "promise" made to David (fulfilled in their raising/coming of Christ), serve the purpose of strengthening the links between what happened with David and Jesus. This technique of quoting within the context of the speech compares with that established in Peter's first speech.

(e) *Interpretation of the quotation by Luke*

Luke himself used this quotation to support his statement "that God has fulfilled this" (ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν)<sup>76</sup> "to us, to their children" (τοῖς τέκνοις [αὐτῶν] ἡμῶν)<sup>77</sup> "by raising Jesus" (ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν).<sup>78</sup> It was no problem to quote from the Pss in this manner, because the Pss have functioned also as prophecy.<sup>79</sup> The quotation itself is encircled by the whole issue of Jesus' resurrection. It was stated in V.30 that God has raised Jesus from the dead. Then, just after the quotation, Luke again repeats it: ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν (V.34). The motif of Jesus' resurrection thus forms an *inclusio* here. But that does not necessarily mean that this quotation refers here to the resurrection and/or exaltation process!<sup>80</sup> Scholarship seems to be deeply divided on this issue, and the following major viewpoints are represented with regard to the interpretation of this quotation: The first two viewpoints are concerned with the issue if the quotation should (a) refer to God's presentation of Jesus to humankind, i.e. *Jesus' appearance*, human birth and ministry, or (b) if it is to be linked with *Jesus' resurrection*. The debate has developed on the basis of the double meaning of ἀνιστάται in Ac 13:33 — which could mean either "to appear" ("auftreten lassen"), as it is used in Ac

<sup>76</sup> ἐκπεπλήρω is a *hapax legomenon*.

<sup>77</sup> The ἡμῶν of this phrase, of which the reading is supported by only a few witnesses (C<sup>3</sup> E MT sy), has triggered some debate in the past. It was read during the time of E. HAENCHEN (*App*, 353) as ἡμῶν in some printed NT text editions, based on the overwhelming support of textual witnesses (P<sup>74</sup> NA B C<sup>\*</sup> D (ψ pc) lat) — on which HAENCHEN's response was that it is an "uralter Fehler". Although some have adopted the ἡμῶν-reading (cf. G.D. KILPATRICK, *Eclectic Study*, 74), the majority of textcritics have concluded that "there is a serious degree of doubt regarding the original reading of the text at this point" (B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 261). After F.J.A. HORT (Notes on Select Readings, in: B.F. WESTCOTT & F.J.A. HORT, *The New Testament in the Original Greek, Vol II: Introduction and Appendix*, Cambridge/London 1896, 95) has made this choice in favour of ἡμῶν, it became the popular mode to see it in this way by which it became possible to explain all the variants (J.H. ROPES, *Detached Note*, 124; E. HAENCHEN, *App* (1968), 353; M. RESE, *Motive*, 82; B.M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 411).

<sup>78</sup> Having chosen the resurrection alternative, W.J.C. WEREN reckoned that the three quotations in Ac 13:33-35 "...are used to emphasise that God's promise to send Israel a saviour from the descendants of David is fulfilled in the resurrection of Jesus" (*Psalms 2*, 198).

<sup>79</sup> So G. SCHNEIDER who refers here to Ac 1:16, 2:25 and 4:25 (*App II*, 137).

<sup>80</sup> Against E. SCHWEIZER who used the theme of Jesus death in this section as substantiation for his argument that also this quotation deals with Jesus' resurrection (The Concept of the Davidic 'Son of God' in Acts and Its Old Testament Background, in: L.E. KECK & J.L. MARTYN (eds), *Studies in Luke-Acts; Festschrift for Paul Schubert*, Nashville 1968, 186-193, here 186).

3:22,26 and 7:37 in the sense of the first appearance of a prophet<sup>81</sup>, or it could mean "to be resurrected" ("auferwecken").<sup>82</sup> The saying could thus refer to either the physical birth of Jesus in the meaning of the first instance, or to his new life which has started with his resurrection when the second alternative is chosen, an event which has taken place on easter day. Within this second alternative, some go to great lengths to link the quotation with the resurrection by means of birth imagery, where Jesus is seen "to be 'begotten' at the resurrection".<sup>83</sup> This viewpoint was recently rejected on the basis that such imagery does not exist in the NT.<sup>84</sup> The arguments of both alternatives were already extensively discussed in detail several times in the past.<sup>85</sup>

Members of a third viewpoint agree that this quotation in Ac 13:33 refers to Jesus' *exaltation*, but differ about whether it refers exclusively to the exaltation, or whether it can be linked also with the resurrection.<sup>86</sup> Most of them saw it in terms of a finer distinction which was implemented here by Luke, which is an important new point within his tradition: He saw the resurrection and the exaltation as two different events which followed one after the other.<sup>87</sup> After the distinction is made, emphasis is then laid on Jesus' exaltation. When bearing in mind that the letter to the Heb probably predates Ac, it is a relatively safe assumption that Luke was familiar with the tradition<sup>88</sup> linking the quotation with Jesus' exaltation. It is clear from the way in which Heb 1:5 and 5:5 interpret this quotation, that the exalted status of the Son at the right hand of the Father is a God given honour. Ps 2:7 is thus used within the context of Jesus' exaltation. Being involved in the christology himself, and in discussing Jesus' resurrection, he also included the known quotations that were already previously linked with the exalted Christ, i.e. Ps 2:7<sup>89</sup> here in Ac

<sup>81</sup> So, for example, supported by M. RESE, *Motive*, 86. Cf. also F.F. BRUCE: "...not, probably, to his being raised from the dead but to his being raised up as Israel's deliverer (just as, earlier in the address, God is said to have 'raised up David to be their king'" (*Davidic Messiah*, 12). Cf. also *idem.*, *Paul's Use*, 72. Although E. SCHWEIZER did not support this option, he said that this would indeed be the sense of the same Greek word in the OT prophecy of 2 Ki(Sm) 7:12. He also refers to PsSol 17:21 and Sir 47:12 (*Davidic 'Son of God'*, 186).

<sup>82</sup> So seen by the second corrector of codex A and some Bible translations (e.g. NAB). Also followed by J. WEISS, *Das Urchristentum*, Göttingen 1914, 25; J. GEWISS, *Urapostolische Heilsvkündigung*, 30, n.73; L. CERFAUX, *Citations*, 44; E. HAENCHEN, *App.*, 353; J. DUPONT, *Filius meus*, 530; E. LÖVESTAMM, *Son and Saviour*, 10; H. CONZELMANN, *App.*, 85; D. GOLDSMITH, *Pesher*, 322; E. SCHWEIZER, *Davidic 'Son of God'*, 186; B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 262; W.J.C. WEREN, *Psalms* 2, 198; and U. WILCKENS, the latter who has pointed out that the proof from Scripture is attached here to the resurrection-kerygma, which is introduced by a repetition of the salvation historical motif (*Missionsreden*, 51). Also G. SCHNEIDER thought that it is to be understood as "auferwecken", and substantiates it that "das auf die Auferweckung Jesu bezogene transitive αὐτοῦ τεύχει bezeugt im NT nur die App: 2,24.32; 13,33.34; 17,31" (*App II*, 137). Also the TEV and NEB.

<sup>83</sup> So E. LÖVESTAMM, *Son and Saviour*, 20. For an evaluation of the arguments of E. LÖVESTAMM, see D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 246-248.

<sup>84</sup> So D.L. BOCK (*Proclamation*, 248).

<sup>85</sup> See J. DUPONT, *L'interpretation*, 528-535; E. LÖVESTAMM, *Son and Saviour*, 8-11; M. RESE, *Motive*, 83-86; E. SCHWEIZER, *Davidic 'Son of God'*, 186-193.

<sup>86</sup> See for instance D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 246.

<sup>87</sup> So also J. ROLOFF, *App.*, 207.

<sup>88</sup> Reference to this Ps could therefore be due to the tradition (so also G. SCHNEIDER, *App II*, 137).

<sup>89</sup> According to A. WEISER, "Ps 2,7 ist bereits vorpaulinisch (Röm 1,3f.) herangezogen worden, um die in der Auferweckung geschehene Einsetzung des Davidsohnes Jesus in seine göttliche Sohnschaft auszudrücken" (*App II*, 327). Also in the same direction: H.J. HOLTZMANN, *Die Apostelgeschichte (ACNT 1/2)*, Tübingen/Leipzig<sup>3</sup> 1901, 90; A. LOISY, *Les Actes*, 533f; O. BAUERNFEIND, *App.*, 176;



13:33 and Ps 109(110):1 in Ac 2:34-35.<sup>90</sup> The quotation probably belongs then to some of the oldest "Schriftbeweisen der Urgemeinde"<sup>91</sup> and was often used in early Christianity with reference to the exaltation of Christ. This christological use of Ps 2:7 could even be so old, that it might have been used in pre-Pauline times.<sup>92</sup>

When looking once again at this quotation within its context, the connection between VV.22-23 and VV.32-33 seems to be important, something which was sometimes overlooked by scholars.<sup>93</sup> V.22 states that God has "raised up" David as the king of Israel (ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ); V.23 goes on to say that it is "of this man's posterity that God has brought to Israel a Saviour, Jesus, as he promised" (κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν). God promised David that a messiah would come; for Luke, the coming of Jesus is the fulfillment of that Davidic promise. But there is another aspect from the Davidic tradition which is standing out prominently at the beginning of Luke's gospel, i.e. the angel's (*God's messenger's*) promise which was made to Mary during the announcement that she will become pregnant with Jesus: "...and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David" (καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, Lk 1:32). That promise was referred to again in Ac 2:30, "that he will sit on the throne of David" (καθίσει ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ). The same motif is also retrospectively mentioned here in Ac 13:22-23, and again referred to in VV.32-33: the good news is that what God promised to their fathers (τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν), is fulfilled for these people in the raising of Jesus (ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν).<sup>94</sup> The intention is probably, that he is now sitting on that promised throne! The connection between VV.22-23 and VV.32-33 is established on the one hand by linking the explicit reference to *David* (V.22) with the quotation from the *Pss* (V.33), already accepted by Luke as the work of David,<sup>95</sup> and on the other hand by taking two motifs from the Davidic tradition and applying them to Jesus: the "raising" (ἤγειρεν, V.22; ἀναστήσας, V.33) and the "promise" (ἐπαγγελίαν, V.23; ἐπαγγελίαν, V.32). By using this first quotation (Ps 2:7) in the trilogy of quotations, Luke probably intended to refer to the fact of Jesus' exaltation. The final piece of evidence which substantiates this interpretation, is the content of

and E. HAENCHEN, *Apq.* 353.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. also E. LÖVESTAMM on this (*Son and Saviour*, 36. According to J. ROLOFF, Ps 2 was (after Ps 109(110)) the most quoted OT text in connection with the christology (*Apq.* 206).

<sup>91</sup> Cf. T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 56.

<sup>92</sup> According to A. WEISER, "...um die in der Auferweckung geschehene Einsetzung des Davidsohnes Jesus in seine göttliche Sohnschaft auszudrücken" (*Apq II*, 327). He refers to Rm 1:3f at this point. So also E. SCHWEIZER, *Davidic 'Son of God'*, 186-187.

<sup>93</sup> Some, however, have noticed this. Cf. C. SMITS who said: "Door de voorafgaande vermelding van de belofte aan de vaderen (13.23,32) moet hier naar onze mening wel sprake zijn van de verschijning van de Zoon van God in de tijd" (*Citaten II*, 195). Also D.L. BOCK: "Ps. 2.7 is used as part of the chain of texts to point to the fulfillment of the Davidic promise in Jesus (vv. 22-23) as that fulfillment is demonstrated through his resurrection. Ps. 2.7 serves to designate Jesus as God's son. The decisive demonstration of his sonship is revealed in the fact that he is raised from the dead incorruptible" (*Proclamation*, 248,253).

<sup>94</sup> C. SMITS has already pointed to the fact that the terms ἐγείρω and ἀνιστάμαι are used interchangeably in biblical literature for the appearance of kings and prophets (*Citaten II*, 195). So also F.F. BRUCE, *Paul's Use*, 79.n.6.

<sup>95</sup> With regard to Ps 2 being the work of David, see Ac 4:25-26.

the quotation itself: ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε — God has "begotten" Jesus! This quotation contains thus the *contents* of the promise made to David, as a third motif from the Davidic tradition. The implied knowledge of 2 Ki(Sm) 7:12-16 cannot be denied here.<sup>96</sup> The "promise" of V.32f refers probably to 2 Ki(Sm) 7. Ac 13:33 could then be based on 2 Ki(Sm) 7:12 (LXX) and the quotation from Ps 2:7 seen as a fulfillment of 2 Ki(Sm) 7:14. The prophecy which Nathan gives to David there, is that his "seed" shall be "raised up", he shall be God's "son", and his "throne", "house", and "kingdom" shall last "in all eternity".<sup>97</sup> Except for the same verb being used for "raising", all these elements of the Davidic promise were probably at the background of Luke's mind. Without really wanting to distinguish the coming, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus here as separate events, he probably understood them inclusively and all being part of one process. The importance of the "eternal throne" which was promised by God himself to David, is to be seen in Palestinian Judaism with references such as 1Mac 2:57, and in Hellenistic Judaism with references such as Sir 47:11.<sup>98</sup> It should be noted that there were two main streams of interpretation of the Davidic prophecies: the one emphasized "a Messianic figure, God's Son of Davidic descent, who rules over Israel in the latter days", and the other has emphasized "the divine sonship of the eschatological Israel and leads to the apocalyptic or Qumranian passages of the NT".<sup>99</sup> The interpretation of Ps 2 here in Ac 13 takes place within the framework of the former stream.<sup>100</sup>

It is also interesting to note the similarity of the first part of the quotation from Ps 2:7 with the words spoken by the voice from heaven at Jesus' baptism: "You are my beloved son" (Mk 1:11; Lk 3:22; Mt 3:17)<sup>101</sup> as well as at the transfiguration of Jesus: "This is my Son, my beloved" (Lk 9:35; Jn 12:28-30).<sup>102</sup>

With the first quotation referring to the resurrected Jesus being raised (exalted) as God's Son<sup>103</sup> at his right hand, the following two quotations will focus exclusively on the fact of his resurrection<sup>104</sup> within this whole process of exaltation.

<sup>96</sup> See also Heb 1:5 where the quotation from Ps 2:7 is followed immediately by a quotation from 2 Ki(Sm) 7:14. So also D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 375,n.109. Compare also D. GOLDSMITH: "There seems to be sufficient connection between the ideas and wording of 11 Sam 7:11-16 and Acts 13 to suggest the possibility of an early Christian *pesher* tradition related to the Nathan oracle" (*Pesher*, 322).

<sup>97</sup> So effectively pointed out by E. SCHWEIZER, who has indicated that the key words of this prophecy "...turn up time and again whenever the Son of David is expected". Compare especially for this his table (*Davidic 'Son of God'*, 187-188).

<sup>98</sup> So E. SCHWEIZER, *Davidic 'Son of God'*, 190.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>100</sup> On the Davidic sonship of Jesus, cf. *Lk 1:27* (Joseph belongs to the "house of David"); *1:32* (Jesus will inherit the "throne of David"); *2:4* (they went to Bethlehem, the "city of David"); *3:23,31* (the genealogy of Jesus... "the son of David"); *18:38* (the blind man at Jericho knew him as "Jesus, son of David"); *20:41* (Jesus himself poses the problem of the Messiah (Christ) who will be the "son of David", using Ps 109(110):1 as quotation); *Ac 2:30* (the issue of the promise made to David that he will sit on the throne of God and the link with Ps 109(110):1 is taken up again). See also *Rm 1:3* ("concerning his Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh").

<sup>101</sup> So also B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 262. F.F. BRUCE suggests that the wording of Ps 2:7 "...may well have been the precise wording of the heavenly voice" and points to the fact that it is so read in the so-called "Western text" (*Davidic Messiah*, 12).

<sup>102</sup> Cf. also E. LÖVESTAMM, *Son and Saviour*, 26,n.7.

<sup>103</sup> So also the conclusion of D. GOLDSMITH: "The recent major treatments of Ps 2:7 in Acts 13:33 agree that the reference is to the elevation to sonship of the resurrected Jesus" (*Pesher*, 322).

<sup>104</sup> So also F.F. BRUCE, *Paul's Use*, 72.

*(f) Possible broader knowledge of Ps 2 (LXX) in the rest of the section  
(Language, Style and OT-motifs)*

That Luke had some broader knowledge of Ps 2 in mind when quoting V.7 here, seems to be accepted by some scholars.<sup>105</sup> The question must be asked, however: if Luke adopted the Ps 2:7 quotation (which seems likely, bearing in mind the occurrences in Heb 1:5 and 5:5), were the interpretative links applying the quotation to Jesus of Nazareth already present in the tradition? But that Ps 2 has played a significant role for Luke's evidence in his argumentation in Ac, is clear from the fact that it is also used in Ac 4.

Other possible indications of Luke's knowledge of Ps 2:7 can be found in Lk 3:22; Ac 11:15; 17:18 and 19:19.

*5.2.2 God has resurrected Jesus from death and the quoted text from Is 55:3 (LXX) in Ac 13:34*

Although the next two quotations are extremely closely linked with each other, scholars found it difficult in determining the role of Is 55:3 in this speech.<sup>106</sup>

*(a) Pre-Lukan occurrences of the quotation*

This quotation seems to be familiar in early Judaism as becomes clear from the evidence found in the scrolls from the Judean desert (Qumran). It occurs in 1QS 4:22; 5:5f; 1QSB 1:2f and 2:25.

Although this quotation is not found as an explicit citation anywhere else in the NT, there may be an implied reference to Is 55:3 in Heb 13:20 — but then only with regard to those words which are omitted here in Ac 13:34! Its occurrence here in Ac 13:34 is thus the only place where it is to be found in the NT. The question arises then, that if this was part of a so-called "testimony book",<sup>107</sup> would one not expect to find other references to it in the NT writings? Especially bearing in mind the close relationship between this quotation and that from Ps 15(16):10 which follows hereafter in Ac 13.

On the basis of a lack of evidence proving the existence of the trilogy of quotations as found here in Ac 13, it should be presumed that the selection and adaptation of this quoted text is the creative work of Luke himself.

*(b) The introductory formula (Ac 13:34)*

Scholars seem to have accepted without question that V.34b is an explicit citation. This assumption needs to be re-examined. If an explicit citation is typified as a conscious quotation that is always clearly introduced by an introductory formula, then it is doubtful that V.34b qualifies as an explicit quotation. In contrast to the

<sup>105</sup> Cf. M.F.-J. BUSS, *Missionspredigt*, 98; and W.J.C. WEREN, *Psalms* 2, 198.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. for instance D. GOLDSMITH, *Pesher*, 323.

<sup>107</sup> Cf. for example, F.F. BRUCE, *Davidic Messiah*, 11-13.

ὡς...γέγραπται of the previous quotation, which clearly indicates that the words which follow should be read as direct speech, V.34b is prefaced by an ὅτι-construction. On the surface, this is a possible indication that the phrase *should* be read as indirect speech, though this is not necessarily the case. It seems important, then, to try to determine whether this is an explicit quotation, introduced by an introductory formula, or whether it should be seen simply as a reference to the OT.

There is one important indicator here that could throw some light on this question. The words which follow directly after this second ὅτι are presented in the first person, and not in the third.<sup>108</sup> The words directly after ὅτι were thus meant by the writer to be seen as a direct quotation<sup>109</sup> — with δώσω included as part of it!<sup>110</sup> When δώσω is taken as part of the quotation it also links better with the next quotation.<sup>111</sup> Seen from this perspective, the words οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι thus function here as introductory formula.<sup>112</sup>

(c) *Determining and explaining the textual differences*

NT (NA26)	LXX	MT
Ac 13:34	Is 55:3	Is 55:3
οὕτως εἶρηκεν	καὶ	וַיְהַרְוֶהָ
ὅτι δώσω	διαθήσομαι	
ὑμῶν	ὑμῶν	לְכֶם
	διαθήκη	כְּרִית
	αἰώνιον,	עוֹלָם
τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ	τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ	נְנִי נְנִי
τὰ πιστά.	τὰ πιστά.	:סִגְוֶהָנִי

<sup>108</sup>. This is due to δώσω (= fut/ind/act/1st pers/sing) which would otherwise have been δώσει (= fut/ind/act/3rd pers/sing).

<sup>109</sup>. ὅτι then must be interpreted here as a *hoti recitativum*. "Ὅτι is usually followed not only by the indicative instead of the optative (a tendency also in classical), but also by an exact representation of direct discourse, so that ὅτι serves here the function of our quotation marks" (BL-DBR § 470, 246). Compare also Mk 7:6; 11:17; Lk 2:23; 4:4,[10]; [Jn 8:17]; Rm 3:10; 4:17; 8:36; 1 Cor 14:21; Gl 3:10 and 1 Pt 1:16 where the same tendency is to be found.

<sup>110</sup>. In the printed edition of NA26 this can cause some confusion, because only the words that correlate directly with the reading from the known LXX texts are printed in *cursive*. Discussions on this quotation often also omit δώσω as part of the contents of the quotation itself (cf. for example C. SMITS, *Citaten II*, 195-6; B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 263; G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq II*, 137). The printing format of the Greek UBS (third) edition, is more clear on this. Δώσω is printed with a capital and starting on a new line, as is the case with other quotations.

<sup>111</sup>. The combination δώσω...τὰ ὅσια (V.34) would then be found again in the δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν of the next quotation (V.35). This is in agreement with E. HAENCHEN, following CERFAUX, by saying that for "διαθήσομαι διαθήκην αἰώνιον tritt unter dem Einfluß des folgenden Zitats...δώσω ein" (*Schnftzitate*, 163). So also H. CONZELMANN, *Apq*, 85.

<sup>112</sup>. See also C.K. BARRETT: "It is integrated into the argument with οὕτως εἶρηκεν (the subject must be God) ὅτι..." (*Luke/Acts*, 239).

*Textual differences between MT and LXX*

The only major difference between the readings here is that the ἴδιον of the MT was translated with ὅσα by the translators of the LXX<sup>113</sup> (and so adopted here in Ac). It was thus changed to the plural.<sup>114</sup> The fact that the LXX translated ἴδιον with ὅσα in Is 55:3, with the same Hebrew letters as to be found in 2 Ki(Sm) 7:15, might point to an earlier linkage between Ps 2 and Is 55. Did Luke know of this?

*Textual differences between LXX and Ac*

There are two major differences to be found here in Ac 13:34: (i) the addition of δῶσω, and (ii) the omission of διαθήσομαι...διαθήκην αἰώνιον.

*(i) Addition: δῶσω*

None of the NT witnesses offers any textual evidence to cast doubt on the occurrence here of δῶσω. On the other hand, the LXX witnesses show no evidence of the word being included at some stage in the LXX textual history. This evidence make it clear that the addition of δῶσω in V.34 should probably be ascribed to the hand of Luke himself. There seems to be an intended connection implied between the δῶσω...τὰ ὅσα of this quotation in V.34 (Is 55:3) and the δῶσεις τὸν ὄσιον of the next quotation in V.35 (Ps 15(16):10).

This addition might be an implicit replacement for the phrase διαθήσομαι...διαθήκην αἰώνιον which is omitted later on in the quotation.

*(ii) Omission: διαθήσομαι...διαθήκην αἰώνιον*

Both the textual witnesses of the NT and the LXX readings agree that the readings, as reconstructed in the modern editions, are beyond question. There is thus no doubt, on the one hand, that these words are part of the reading in Is 55:3,<sup>115</sup> and on the other hand, that they are not part of the reading of Ac 13:34.

By omitting this phrase here in Ac, a different emphasis is given to the quotation. The explicit reference to the eternal covenant is left out. The focus which was on the covenant tradition itself, shifts to the promise made to David, with emphasis on the person David, and therefore the David tradition itself. The *promise* which was made to David, and which was fulfilled in Jesus, replaces thus the idea of the *covenant* which God has entered into with Israel. This change of focus has already taken place implicitly with the reference to the fulfillment of God's promise

<sup>113</sup> H. RINGGREN says that this translation makes it "easy to carry the argumentation by means of word play (V 35)" (*Luke's Use*, 234).

<sup>114</sup> So also D.L. BOCK: "Thus τὰ ὅσα Δαυὶδ is deliberately plural and includes two key elements. They are (1) the provision for an everlasting rule [specifically, in resurrection of the Davidic son] and (2) the opportunity of deliverance through the Davidic son [specifically, in justification and forgiveness of sin]" (*Proclamation*, 254). Interesting here is that it has exactly the same Hebrew letters as τὰ ὅσα in 2 Ki(Sm) 7:15, as pointed out by E. SCHWEIZER, *Davidic 'Son of God'*, 192,n.10.

<sup>115</sup> Only the minuscule 88 (10th cent AD) disagrees with the LXX textual witness tradition (cf. J. ZIESLER, *Isaiah* (Vol XIV), Göttingen 1967, 327).

(V.32-33). The concept of the διαθήκην αἰώνιον (Is 55:3) is therefore probably implicitly replaced by the concept of the ἐπαγγελίαν...ἐκπεπλήρωκεν (V.32-33), and the concept of διαθήσονται (Is 55:3) with the addition of δώσω at the beginning of the quotation (V.34).

(d) *Method of quotation*

On the surface it seems that the sense of Luke's line of argumentation would have lost nothing if he had gone directly from Ps 2:7 at διαφθοράν at the end of V.34a, to the beginning of V.35 (i.e. omitting V.34b). The quotation from Is 55:3 (with its introductory formula) contributes to the argument by providing authoritative Scriptural evidence<sup>116</sup> of the promise to David that the resurrection from death would take place and that he would not "see decay". It may have been used here in order to make it clear that Ps 15(16):10 could not, at this point, have been referring to David.<sup>117</sup> For some scholars, this is evidence of a pre-Lukan link between Ps 15(16):10 and Is 55:3.<sup>118</sup>

Did Luke himself insert Is 55:3 at this point,<sup>119</sup> or did he derive it (in combination with either, or both, of the quotations<sup>120</sup> from the pre-Lukan tradition? There has been speculation in the past that the trilogy of quotations may be due to

<sup>116</sup> Cf. B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA: "As a testimony to the reality of the resurrection, an appeal is made not only to the authority of the eyewitnesses but also to the testimony of Scripture" (*Translator's Handbook*, 262). Also A. WEISER: "In der Auferweckung Jesu zu unvergänglichem Leben und ewiger Herrschaft hat sich die göttliche Zusage verwirklicht, und zwar so, daß sie nun den Zuhörern und Paulus selbst (VV 33.34) als Heil zugute kommt" (*Apq II*, 335).

<sup>117</sup> So G. SCHNEIDER: "Das den Gedankenfortschritt von V 34a zu V 35 unterbrechende Jesaja-Zitat hat offensichtlich die Funktion, zu zeigen, daß Ps 15,10 LXX sich nicht auf David selbst beziehen kann, sondern sich an einer späteren Generation — nämlich in Jesus — erfüllen sollte" (*Apq II*, 137). Also H. RINGGREN: "Since David has died and been buried (V 36, an allusion to 1 Kgs 2:10), this promise must refer to someone else, namely Jesus Christ" (*Luke's Use*, 234).

<sup>118</sup> So J.W. DOEVE (*Jewish Hymenics*, 168-176), followed by B.F.M. VAN IERSEL (*'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten*, Leiden 1964, 78-83), J.W. BOWKER (*Speeches*, 101-104), T. HOLTZ (*Untersuchungen*, 140-145), U. WILCKENS (*Missionsreden*, 232), and B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA (*Translator's Handbook*, 263). Cf. also A. WEISER: "...denn die erst von Lukas geschaffene Überleitung V 34a zielt ganz auf die Unverweslichkeitsaussage von Ps 16 hin, so daß *jetzt* Jes 55,3 retardierend dazwischen steht. Hätte erstmals Lukas beide Zitate oder auch nur eines von beiden selbstständig aus der LXX herangezogen, dann wäre die vorliegende Textanordnung befremdlich. Als vorluk messianologische Katene ist sie zusammen mit Ps 2,7 jedoch gut denkbar" (*Apq II*, 327). See also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq II*, 138, for a summary of this hypothesis.

<sup>119</sup> In the same direction, M.F.-J. BUSS, who thought Ps 15(16):10 to be an insertion and Is 55:3 a reworking (*Missionspredigt*, 108).

<sup>120</sup> Cf. T. HOLTZ (*Untersuchungen*, 140-145); U. WILCKENS (*Missionsreden*, 232); and A. WEISER (*Apq II*, 327). The latter said: "Der in den VV 33b-37 mit Hilfe von drei Zitaten dargebotene Beweis, daß sich in Jesu Auferweckung die atl. Verheißungen und Heilshoffnungen erfüllt haben, wird nicht erstmalig von Lukas zusammengestellt worden sein." F.F. BRUCE, among others, accepts the existence of a group of *testimonia*, to which he attributes these quotations (*Davidic Messiah*, 11-13). So also L. CERFAUX (48), who believed that Is 55:3 and Ps 15(16):10 were already combined in a "testimony book" before Luke's time, as R. HARRIS formerly proposed. E. HAENCHEN too, did not deny this (*Schriftzitate*, 163-164). However, the existence of such a "testimony book" could not yet sufficiently be proved. So also G. SCHNEIDER: "Dennoch ist...nicht bewiesen, daß eine Katene oder (vor-lukanische) Testimonien-Sammlung zugrunde liegt. Die Anfügung von Jes 55,3 und Ps 15,10 LXX an das traditionelle Testimonium Ps 2,7 könnte auch von Lukas stammen" (*Apq II*, 138).



some kind of "testimony",<sup>121</sup> but the difficulty of substantiating this has been clearly pointed out.<sup>122</sup>

There might be some similarity here with one of the rules of Hillel, i.e. the principle of "equal category".<sup>123</sup>

(e) *Interpretation of the quotation by Luke*

Taken at face value, Luke's purpose in using the quotation seems vague.<sup>124</sup> However, its function and contribution within its new context in Ac is to be seen in relation with Ps 15(16):10.<sup>125</sup> With the conscious connection of δώσω...τὰ ὄσια<sup>126</sup> (Is 55:3) and δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν (Ps 15(16):10),<sup>127</sup> there can be no doubt that Luke intended to parallelize the two quotations and to use the one as a substantiation of the other.<sup>128</sup>

Emphasis is laid on the promises made to David which will be given by God. The link with David was already established in V.22 where it was said that God raised David as their king, and testified that he was a man after God's heart who will do all his will. Then in V.23 it was said that it was of his posterity that God brought to Israel the Saviour, Jesus, as he has promised. In V.32 the promises to the forefathers were taken up again and linked with the first Ps-quotation, associated with David. The issue of the promises made to David, are once again repeated in V.34 by quoting now Is 55:3. The emphasis on the David-tradition is complemented by the omission of διαθήσομαι...διαθήκην αἰώνιον, which helps to move the focus to the promises made to David, rather than to the "eternal covenant". The fulfillment of that promise made to David, is then interpreted by Luke to have happened with

<sup>121</sup> So for instance, R. HARRIS, who thought it came from an existing collection of texts, concentrating on the promises to David (*Testimonies*). Also G. LÜDEMANN thinks in this direction with regard to the last two in this trilogy (*Christentum*, 164). More recently, for instance, B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 263.

<sup>122</sup> See C. SMITS, *Citaten II*, 196. He thought that Ps 88(89):48f could also be responsible for this connection. Although no direct word similarities are to be found, the contents are similar. He said: "Ofschoon in de griekse tekst de door Paulus aangehaalde woorden niet gevonden worden, staan daar dezelfde gedachten uitgedrukt en zijn ze verbonden met ideeën over het ziele van het bederf."

<sup>123</sup> So F.F. BRUCE: "In the Hebrew text *hasid* ('holy one') in Ps 16:10 is cognate with *hasde* ('covenant mercies') in Is 55:3; in the Septuagint the same adjective *hosios* is used in both places (in the masculine singular in the former and in the neuter plural in the latter)." "If Jesus, the son of David, was the 'holy one' of God who was saved from undergoing corruption, his resurrection was the means by which God kept his undertaking to fulfill for his people the covenant mercies promised to David and his dynasty" (*Davidic Messiah*, 12).

<sup>124</sup> So C. SMITS who reckons that "De woorden van Isaias zijn op zich genomen niet erg duidelijk" (*Citaten II*, 195). Also G. LÜDEMANN says that this quotation is so "...fragmentarisch, daß es unverständlich ist" (*Christentum*, 164). See also D. GOLDSMITH, *Pesher*, 323. H. CONZELMANN suggests that Is 55:3 "ist so fragmentarisch angeführt, daß das Zitat für sich unverständlich bleibt" (*Apg*, 85). Is this vagueness perhaps the result of working with Ac 13:33-35 as being part of poem homily, testimony or early Christian catena?

<sup>125</sup> So also E. LÖVESTAMM, *Son and Saviour*, 49-84.

<sup>126</sup> See D.L. BOCK for the possibilities of what τὰ ὄσια might refer to (*Proclamation*, 252-253).

<sup>127</sup> D. GOLDSMITH has seen a connection between the two only in terms of the ὄσια (*Pesher*, 323).

<sup>128</sup> D. GOLDSMITH points out that this dependence upon each other is taken by some as Ps 15(16):10 being dependent upon Is 55:3, while others consider Is 55:3 to be dependent upon Ps 15(16):10 (*Pesher*, 323).

the events which had taken place around Jesus, especially with regard to his bodily resurrection.<sup>129</sup>

### 5.2.3 *Jesus' body would never decay and the quotation from Ps 15(16):10 in Ac 13:35*

#### (a) *Other NT occurrences of the quotation*

The lengthy quotation of Ps 15(16):8-11 in Ac 2:25-28 was discussed in Ch 4 of this study. At this point it is sufficient simply to refer to its use in the second Petrine speech, and to note that the quotation is found nowhere else in the NT than in the second speech of Peter, and in this first Pauline speech.

#### (b) *The introductory formula (Ac 13:35)*

The words, διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει, form the introductory formula to this quotation.<sup>130</sup> It includes Ps 15(16):10 here, "as another decisive element in the chain"<sup>131</sup> of quoted texts.

#### (c) *Determining and explaining the textual differences*

NT (NA26)	LXX	MT
Ac 13:35	Ps 15:10	Ps 16:10
οὐ δώσεις τὸν ἔσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.	οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ἔσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.	לֹא־תִתֵּן לְעֵינָיו לִרְאוֹת שִׁחָה

#### *Textual differences between Ac and LXX*

Except for the stylistic difference between οὐδὲ (Ps 15(16):10) and οὐ in Ac 13:35, there are no differences to be found between the two versions. NT textual witnesses support the reading as it stands in Ac 13, without any indication of possible changes or alternative readings in the textual tradition. The NT reading, as it stands, is thus beyond dispute.

The same applies to the LXX. There is no existing textual evidence that the οὐδὲ reading should be in doubt; it can be accepted as it is.

It is also interesting to note the difference between the quotation here in Ac 13:35 (which reads οὐ), and the longer version in Ac 2:27 (which reads οὐδὲ). The latter agrees identically with the LXX reading, and makes grammatical sense, as it

<sup>129</sup> D. GOLDSMITH, however, finds here not a proof for the resurrection, but for Jesus being the Christ (*Pesher*, 323).

<sup>130</sup> Cf. C.K. BARRETT who has said: "With ἐτέρῳ we must presumably supply ψαλμῶ; the subject of λέγει is probably God, though comparison with Chap.2 suggests David" (*Luke/Acts*, 239).

<sup>131</sup> So D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 255.

stands in a kind of "neither...nor" construction, expressed by way of the οὐκ...οὐδέ relation in V.27.<sup>132</sup> The former, however, has been taken out of its original syntactical context. In the new context the use of οὐδέ would be confusing, as it indicates the contrary of a parallel argument of which the first half is not to be found in the new context. All this makes it clear that Luke's knowledge of the context from which it is taken allows him to make also stylistic changes<sup>133</sup> in the adaptation of his quotations to their new context.

(d) *Method of quotation*

With the words of this quoted text still fresh in the minds of his reader(s), Luke does not need to quote extensively again from this Ps. Only the relevant phrase for his argumentation is quoted here. But it is done as a *pars pro toto*, and the immediate context of the Ps is also implied, not only from its OT context, but here especially from its context in the second Petrine speech, which includes Luke's interpretation of it at that point.

The importance of this Ps (and then especially this specific verse) for Luke's interpretation of the Jesus-kerygma in terms of the resurrection,<sup>134</sup> is clear, and is emphasized by the fact that it is placed in the mouths of both Peter (Ac 2) and Paul (Ac 13).

That the trilogy of quotations was taken from a so-called testimony book, is doubtful. Three things are pointing against it: (a) Both Is 55:3 and Ps 15(16):10 are only to be found by Luke and nowhere else in the NT corpus, (b) the combination of all three is only to be found once, and that is here in Ac 13, and (c) the similarities and strong connection between Is 55:3 and Ps 15(16):10 should then also be reflected somewhere else, which is not the case.

Luke has rather found Ps 2:7 from the tradition, and has probably added the other two himself. The first deals then with the exalted Son (at the right hand of his Father), while the other two deal with his resurrection from death. These three are now used as textual "witnesses" to the fact that God has fulfilled his promises to David, with 2 Ki(Sm) 7:11-16 probably used as the *locus classicus*. It makes more sense to understand the combination of these three quotations not only as a compilatory act of Luke himself,<sup>135</sup> but also as an important piece of evidence about Luke's interpretation of Scripture. Ps 2:7 is quoted as the first piece of evidence, taken from the tradition, to interpret the υἱός as the exalted Jesus of Nazareth. Is 55:3 and Ps 15(16):10 are quoted as the second and third pieces of evidence, which

<sup>132</sup> Cf. also the following in Lk-Ac: Lk 6:43; 8:17; 11:33; 12:24,27,33; 16:31; 17:20-21; 18:4,13; 20:36; Ac 4:12; 7:5; 8:21; 9:9; 16:21; 17:24-25; 24:13; 24:18.

<sup>133</sup> D.L. BOCK also takes it as a stylistic variation here in Ac 13:35, "since the text is no longer set with its parallel partner of Ps 16.10a" (*Proclamation*, 255).

<sup>134</sup> According to A. WEISER, Luke, under the influence of hellenistic anthropology, has understood the resurrection of Jesus as the "Wiedervereinigung der Seele mit dem der Verwesung nicht verfallenen Fleisch Jesu" (*App II*, 336).

<sup>135</sup> With D. GOLDSMITH: "...not a random selection, but one carefully conceived on linguistic and theological grounds to show the Jews how God fulfilled his promise to David in II Sam 7 — namely, by raising Jesus from the dead" (*Pesher*, 324).

were added by Luke himself, to interpret the resurrection of Jesus from death. The Davidic tradition plays then a prominent role by linking all three quotations to one single unit in Paul's (Luke's) argument.

(e) *Interpretation of the quotation by Luke*

If ἐτέρω in the introductory formula is understood here to mean "another Ps", then it implies that the previous Ps was understood in terms of Davidic authorship.<sup>136</sup> The speaker has changed between the two quotations. In both the one from Ps 2:7 and that from Is 55:3, it was taken to be God. But with the introductory formula of this quotation from Ps 15(16):10 the speaker is interpreted as to be David. His name was thus picked up from within the last quotation. Also immediately after quoting from Ps 15(16), the quotation is explained in terms of what has happened with David.

The prominence of διαφθοράν<sup>137</sup> in VV.34-36 must be noticed. The word itself is found in the NT only in Ac (six times). It was used two times in the second speech of Peter,<sup>138</sup> and appears here four times in this first speech of Paul. One of these four usages is again part of the same quotation (V.35), while the two occurrences directly following (VV.36-37) are also to be linked directly with the interpretation of the quotation. The other occurrence in the preceding V.34<sup>139</sup> also connects to this quotation, although indirectly. Its importance, as stressed through this quotation, is probably to be found in its message that Jesus was given victory over death by God (VV.32,34) and that he would never decay (V.34).<sup>140</sup> The idea of incorruptibility is thus the point, or function, of this quoted text.<sup>141</sup>

In combination with the immediate preceding quotation from Is 55:3, these two texts are interpreted by Luke "...in the sense that Jesus' resurrection fulfills the promises made to David and guarantees the perpetuity of his throne."<sup>142</sup> The context of Ac 2:25-32, where Ps 15(16):8-11 was quoted and interpreted already before by Luke in Peter's second speech, should not be forgotten here. The connection with Jesus' resurrection was very carefully pointed out there by Luke. It

<sup>136</sup> So taken by the RSV, for instance.

<sup>137</sup> Categorized in the semantic dictionary of J.P. LOUW & E.A. NIDA under the domain of "Physiological Processes and States" (248), and under the subdomain: "Rot, Decay" (277). It is described as "to rot or decay, in reference to organic matter" (*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains, Vol 1: Introduction and Domains*, New York 1988).

<sup>138</sup> It is found in both instances in Peter's speech as part of the quotation from Ps 15(16):10.

<sup>139</sup> μὴκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφω εἰς διαφθοράν...

<sup>140</sup> E. FREISTEDT has found a possible connection here with the Jewish conception that the decay of the corpse begin after the third day. Jesus would then be resurrected just before this could begin (E. FREISTEDT, *Altchristliche Totengedächtnistage und ihre Beziehung zum Jenseitsglauben und Totenkultus der Antike*, 1928, 63). A. WEISER said: "Jesus gilt als der durch seine Auferweckung zum Sohne Gottes Gezeugte, in die messianische Würde des Sohnes Gottes Eingesetzt. Daß diese durch die Auferweckung bewirkte Seinsweise derart ist, daß sie nicht mehr der Verwesung und Vergänglichkeit unterworfen, sondern nach hellenistischem Verständnis unvergänglich und deshalb im Unterschied zu allem 'Gewordenen' göttlich ist (Schmitt: Ps 16, S.240f.), wird durch die Zitation von Ps 16.10 LXX begründet" (*Apq II*, 335).

<sup>141</sup> D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 255.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. F.F. BRUCE, *Paul's Use*, 72.

was seen as a prophecy from David, which could not have applied to himself, but which has referred to Jesus.<sup>143</sup> The resurrection of Jesus to which it refers, was the result of God's action. This interpretation is also applied here (Ac 13:36-37).

#### 6. SECTION IV: ACTS 13:38-41

Interpretation of the content of the message and admonition. The quoted text from Hab 1:5.

One of the shared features between the second Petrine speech (Ac 2:14-41) and the first Pauline speech (Ac 13:16-41), is the fact that both of them present an explicit quotation from the *duodecim prophetae*.

##### 6.1 Composition of the section<sup>144</sup>

The parenthetic ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί in V.38 indicates the beginning of the next subsection.<sup>145</sup> An appeal is made here on the revelatory character of the message for the hearers (γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν).<sup>146</sup> Three grammatical aspects contribute to the seriousness of the appeal: (a) the emphatic position of this phrase in the sentence, (b) the use of οὖν,<sup>147</sup> and (c) the imperative form, ἔστω.

The rest of VV.38-39 makes it clear that the message which Paul and Barnabas are proclaiming (καταγγέλλεται) is that their sins are forgiven (ὑμῖν ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν). This happens through Jesus as the agent, with the expression "through this" (διὰ τούτου) properly referring back to the discussion of his death and resurrection in the preceding verses. The sins which are taken away are those from which the law of Moses could not justify them ([καὶ] ὅτι πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσέως δικαιοθῆναι). In addition to the identification of Jesus as the agent through whom this freedom is achieved, an additional qualification is added at the end of the sentence (V.39): everyone that believes in this, is justified (ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται).<sup>148</sup> This makes the appeal of the preachers' message

<sup>143</sup>. Cf. also D. GOLDSMITH, who says that this quotation "...is used merely to prove that, since David did see corruption, the verse now applies to Jesus" (*Pesher*, 324).

<sup>144</sup>. Compare here also the division of this speech by G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg II*, 129, and A. WEISER, *Apg II*, 322-323.

<sup>145</sup>. See also V.16 (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται) and V.26 (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί) for the role of ἄνδρες as a structural marker in this speech. So also G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 160.

<sup>146</sup>. See also Ac 2:14 (τούτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω); 4:10 (γνωστὸν ἔστω πᾶσι ὑμῖν); 28:28 (γνωστὸν οὖν ἔστω ὑμῖν) — all of them in speeches.

<sup>147</sup>. Cf. BL-DBR § 451: "After parenthetical remarks οὖν indicates a return to the main theme (resumptive)."

<sup>148</sup>. Cf. G. SCHNEIDER: "Freilich ist hier von μετάνοια keine Rede, sondern es wird (paulinisch!) von der Rechtfertigung des Glaubenden gesprochen" (*Apg II*, 139). Interesting is, however, that the verb δικαιοῶ is only to be found in Ac, here in this verse (*hapax legomenon*). W.H. BATES argued that V.39 "...hardly constitute a complete or exact summary of the doctrine of justification by faith. The writer would seem to be of the opinion that the law of Moses will justify you from some things but not from all. Where the Mosaic law falls short belief in Jesus takes over and will see you through. This is not Paul's own view of things." "It simply appears as a characteristic Pauline afterthought, appended to a characteristic Acts' kerygma" (*Note*, 10).

much more concrete, and places the possibility of achieving this new freedom in their own hands — they just have to believe this!

The appeal, which began in V.38, is now strengthened by the addition of a warning. Note the similarities between the beginning of the first sentence in this section (V.38) and the second sentence (V.40): (a) the emphatic position of the phrase (βλέπετε οὖν μὴ ἐπέλθῃ) in the sentence, (b) the use of οὖν, and (c) the imperative form, βλέπετε. The warning itself refers to the saying in the prophets (τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, V.40), which in its turn forms the introductory formula for the quoted text from Hab 1:5.

## 6.2 The quoted text from *Hab 1:5* in *Ac 13:41*<sup>149</sup>

### 6.2.1 Other occurrences of the quotation

No evidence is found of other places in the NT where this text is quoted. It seems as if this quotation appears here for the first time in the NT literature. Although there exists today no textual evidence that this passage was quoted before in Jewish literature, its interpretation in the Hab Commentary (1QpHab 2:1), which was found among the Dead Sea scrolls, is noteworthy. Within its original context, Hab refers to the Chaldaean invasion of Judah. This is reinterpreted by the author of 1QpHab to the Roman occupation of 63 BC.<sup>150</sup>

In the Pauline literature, Hab 2:4b was used in *Gl 3:11* and *Rm 1:17*. Although it is also Paul who is at word here in *Ac 13*, the Lukan Paul uses Hab 1:5. The contexts are different and their purposes too. The only similarity is the fact that both quote from Hab.

### 6.2.2 The introductory formula (*Ac 13:40*)

The introductory formula is here formed by the words: βλέπετε οὖν μὴ<sup>151</sup> ἐπέλθῃ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.<sup>152</sup> The τὸ εἰρημένον is also found as part of the introductory formula of the quotation from the prophets in *Ac 2:16*.<sup>153</sup> Although reference is made here to the "prophets" (plural), the quoted text itself is taken only from one prophet (Hab). The plural form probably refers here to the collection of the 12P.

<sup>149</sup>. The quotation is from Hab 1:5 and not 2:5 as mentioned by C.K. BARRETT, *Luke/Acts*, 239. D.L. BOCK does not include this quotation in his discussion on Luke's OT christology (*Proclamation*). He emphasizes only those citations which refer to the christology. In W.K.L CLARKE's classification, this quotation forms part of those quotations which are "Free Versions of the LXX. in Acts" (*Use of the Septuagint*, 88).

<sup>150</sup>. Cf. F.F. BRUCE, *Paul's Use*, 73.

<sup>151</sup>. G. SCHNEIDER (*Apg II*, 141) draws attention to the fact that the introductory reminder βλέπετε (οὖν) with the following μὴ also stands in the same connection in *Mt 24:4/Mk 13:5/Lk 21:8*; *1 Cor 8:9*; *Gl 5:15*; *Col 2:8*; *Heb 3:12*; *12:25*. Cf. also to *Lk 8:18* and *Eph 5:15* (βλέπετε οὖν).

<sup>152</sup>. So also, among others, C.A.J. PILLAI, *Early Missionary Preaching*, 40; and C.K. BARRETT, *Luke/Acts*, 239.

<sup>153</sup>. The semantic weight of this τὸ εἰρημένον was already clearly formulated by G. SCHNEIDER: "τὸ εἰρημένον ist wie *Lk 2,24* (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ) und *Röm 4,18* (absolut) das 'Schriftwort'" (*Apg II*, 141).



### 6.2.3 Determining and explaining the textual differences

There are almost no textcritical difficulties in determining the NT text. The only changes to be found here are clearly due to the influence of codex D.

In this case we are fortunate also to have comparative Greek texts from Qumran: 8H<sub>ev</sub>XIIgr and the Commentary on Hab (1QpHab).

NT (NA26) Ac 13:41	LXX Hab 1:5	CODEX W Hab 1:5
<p>Ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί,  καὶ θαυμάσατε  καὶ ἀφανίσθητε, ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, ἔργον ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν.</p>	<p>Ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια καὶ ἀφανίσθητε, διότι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται.</p>	<p>Ἴδ[ε]τε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε [καὶ] θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια καὶ ἀφανίσθητε, [διότι ἔργ]ον ἐγὼ ἐργάζ[ομαι ἐ]ν τα[ῖς ἡ]μέρα[ις ]ὑμῶν, ὃ οὐ] μὴ πι[στεύσητε] ἐάν τις ἐκδι[ηγῆ]ται</p>
8H <sub>ev</sub> XIIgr Hab 1:5	MT Hab 1:5	1QpHab Hab 2:1
<p>----- [καὶ -----, καὶ ----- θαυμ]άσατε  ὅτι ἔρ]γον ----- ἐν ταῖς ἡμέρ]αις ὑμῶν. οὐ [μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐκδιηγ]ηθῆ</p>	<p>כַּאֲרֹ 5 כְּגוֹיִם (הַכְּבִיטוּ) (הַתְּמַהוּ) מַהוּ כִּי-פַעַל פַּעַל כִּי מִיָּכֶם לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּ כִּי יִשְׁקַר :</p>	<p>כַּאֲרֹ 5 כְּגוֹיִם (הַכְּבִיטוּ) (הַתְּמַהוּ) מַהוּ כִּי-פַעַל פַּעַל כִּי מִיָּכֶם לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּ כִּי יִשְׁקַר :</p>

#### The midrash-pesher of Hab (1QpHab 2,1-10)

2 "The prophetic meaning of the passage concerns those who were traitors along with the Man of / Lies, for

3 they [did] not [believe the words of] the Teacher of  
Right (which came) from the mouth of / God. It also  
concerns those who were trait[ors to the] New  
4 [Covenant], f[or] they were not / faithful to the  
covenant of God, [but profaned] His [h]oly na[me]. /  
5 And thus the prophetic meaning of the passage  
6 [concerns] also [the trai]tors of the last / days  
They are vio[lat]ors of the coven[ant] who will not  
7 believe / when they hear all that is com[ing upon]  
8 the last generation from the mouth of / the priest  
in [whose heart] God has put [understandi]ng to give  
9 the prophetic meaning of all / the words of His  
servants the prophets, [through] whom God foretold /  
10 all that is coming upon His people and [His]  
c[ongregation].<sup>154</sup>

(a) *Textual differences between MT and LXX (and their relation with Ac)*

[1] The  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{G}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$  ("behold the Gentiles/nations!" or "gloat over the discomfiture of the nations!") of the MT, was probably read by the translator of the LXX as  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$  (translated by  $\text{o}\text{i}\ \text{k}\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$ , "You treacherous ones!"), and so followed by the reading of the NT.<sup>155</sup> It is very interesting that this  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$ -reading was found in 1QpHab.<sup>156</sup>

[2] The  $\text{k}\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\text{i}\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\psi\alpha\tau\epsilon$  of the LXX is not to be found in the readings of the MT or 1QpHab. It is also left out by the NT text. At this point Ac and MT are thus nearer to each other than to the LXX.<sup>157</sup>

When taking into account these changes, the text of Ac seems to be closer to the reading of 1QpHab than to that found in the versions of the MT and LXX.

(b) *Textual differences: Ac 13:41 and Hab 1:5 (LXX)*

<sup>154</sup>. Translated by W.H. BROWNLEE, *The Midrash Peshet of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24), Missoula 1979, 53.

<sup>155</sup>. Cf. also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 19. G.L. ARCHER & G. CHIRICHIGNO, say "the vocative  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$  would harmonize much better with the context than  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{G}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$  does; it is therefore quite possible that this was the reading in the Hebrew *Vortage* of the LXX.  $\text{K}\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\upsilon\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  is 'despiser; an imposter who acts cleverly and treacherously'. It is used in Zph 3:5 to mean 'perfidy', and its verb,  $\text{k}\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\rho\upsilon\eta\omega$  = 'act treacherously' ( $\text{I}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$ ) in Pr 13:16; Hs 6:7; Hab 1:13. Therefore we must consider the distinct possibility that  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$  or  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{G}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$  is indeed the original reading. It is more likely that the MT scribe would have inadvertently omitted  $\text{I}^{\text{I}}$  than that the scribe of the LXX *Vortage* accidentally inserted a  $\text{I}^{\text{I}}$ . (It is therefore best to amend MT to  $\text{D}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}\text{I}^{\text{I}}$ )" (*Quotations*, 159).

<sup>156</sup>. We can accept that this is the correct reading in 1QpHab on the grounds that (a) "the textual variant  $\text{b}\acute{o}\text{g}\acute{e}\text{d}\acute{a}\text{m}$  ('traitors') for M.T.  $\text{b}\acute{a}\text{g}\text{-g}\acute{o}\text{y}\acute{a}\text{m}$  ('among [or, upon] the nations') is implied both by the constant reference to 'traitors' in the commentary" and (b) "by the absence to any reference to the 'nations'" (W.H. BROWNLEE, *Midrash-Peshet*, 54). There are however, some who still prefer the reading of the MT here, e.g. M. BURROWS, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, Grand Rapids 1955, 265.

<sup>157</sup>. Of the LXX manuscripts, only 763 omits these words, probably under the influence of the NT text.

The quotation agrees broadly with the reading of our known LXX readings. There are, however, some noteworthy differences to be found.<sup>158</sup> In a comparison between Ac and the LXX witnesses, the following 6 changes to the reading of Ac were identified: Two additions, ἔργον and ὑμῖν; two omissions, the phrase καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε and θαυμάσια; one substitution where διότι (LXX) has become ὅτι (Ac); one transposition where ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι (LXX) has been changed to ἐργάζομαι ἐγώ.

### b.1 Additions

#### [1] ἔργον<sup>159</sup>

It is clear that there is no intertextual evidence that this addition might be due to some source text of Lk (at least those known and available today).<sup>160</sup> There is no single witness in the LXX tradition which supports the inclusion of this word here.<sup>161</sup> It can therefore relatively safely be assumed that Luke has consciously added this himself<sup>162</sup> on stylistic grounds for the sake of clarity.<sup>163</sup> An antecedent is here picked up for the ὅ that was implied by the previous ἔργον ἐργάζομαι.<sup>164</sup>

#### [2] ὑμῖν

There is no NT textual support for the omission of this word.<sup>165</sup> Among the witnesses of the LXX are some that include this word in their readings.<sup>166</sup> It is difficult to decide if this word was part of Luke's *Vorlage* or not. It makes also sense

<sup>158</sup> Contrary to C. SMITS (*Citaten II*, 196) who typified these as "enige onbelangrijke afwijkingen" (some unimportant differences), and STR-BILL who unqualifiedly said "Die angezogene Prophetenstelle Hab 1,5 ist nach den LXX zitiert" (*Kommentar II*, 726).

<sup>159</sup> E. HAENCHEN's remarks (*Schriftzitate*, 161) — i.e. that the addition of ἔργον here is in keeping the general trend in codex B to give frequent repetitions — are not valid at this point because this addition also appears frequently in other manuscripts. The word is included by the following NT textual witnesses: P<sup>74</sup> X A B C Ψ 33.36.81.453.945.1175.1739 *al* vg, and excluded by D E M *gig* p. According to B.M. METZGER this ἔργον was probably omitted by codex D *et al* "...either because it was felt to be redundant, or in order to assimilate the text to the Septuagint text of Hab 1.5" (*Textual Commentary*, 416). Cf. also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 19.

<sup>160</sup> Cf. J. ZIEGLER, *Duodecim Prophetae*, 261.

<sup>161</sup> So also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 19.

<sup>162</sup> G. SCHNEIDER explains this "unerwartete ἔργον" as follows: "das Gott den Verächtern der Botschaft ankündigen läßt, ist nach lukanischem Verständnis 'die Annahme der Heiden unter Verwerfung der Juden'" (*Apg II*, 141). He also reckons that this meaning, as well as its "Einführungswendung", leads to the conclusion "daß dieses Zitat zu den selbständigen Zitaten zu rechnen ist, die Lukas entweder selbst der LXX entnommen hat oder deren Text er doch im wesentlichen selbständig nach seiner LXX bietet, auch wenn sie in irgendeiner Form mit der Tradition des christlichen Schriftbeweises vorgegeben sein sollten" (quoting T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 21).

<sup>163</sup> Cf. also H. RINGGREN, *Luke's Use*, 234.

<sup>164</sup> So also G.L. ARCHER & G. CHIRICHIGNO, *Quotations*, 159.

<sup>165</sup> According to W.K.L. CLARKE its inclusion is due to "recensional" grounds, i.e. that "the quotations in Acts show the usual New Testament tendency in that they follow the A text of the LXX, as against the B" (*Use of the Septuagint*, 95).

<sup>166</sup> Its inclusion is supported by N<sup>ca</sup> A (106,26)-49(613)-198-407 36-62-LII(46,86,711). T. HOLTZ said: "d.h. in der großen Mehrheit der A-Gruppe, in der L-Gruppe und bei einigen Vertretern der C-Gruppe" (*Untersuchungen*, 20). See also the table in App. A.

in terms of the hearers in this speech. See also V.38 (two times). He reinterprets and contextualizes it.<sup>167</sup>

*b.2 Omissions*

[1] καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε

There is no evidence of any NT textual witnesses which support the inclusion of these words. In leaving out this phrase, the Ac-reading stands nearer to the MT which also omits it, than to the LXX.<sup>168</sup> The omission is thus either the result of another *Textvorlage* which might have been nearer to the MT text, or it was simply omitted by Luke himself, due to stylistic reasons, namely, that it seems to be superfluous after ἴδετε.<sup>169</sup>

[2] θαυμάσια

This omission is not supported by a single textual witness among those of the LXX.<sup>170</sup> Its inclusion in the text of Ac is also not supported by any single witnesses in the textual history of Ac. It can, therefore, relatively safely be assumed that this omission is due to the hand of Luke himself.

*b.3 Substitution: διότι (LXX) ---> ὅτι (Ac)*

The διότι of the LXX is substituted by ὅτι in the NT text. There is no clear textcritical support among the textual witnesses, either the LXX in favour of this NT reading, or of the NT in favour of the LXX reading.<sup>171</sup> What should be noted, however, is that it is also to be found in S<sup>h</sup>evXlIgr and codex N!<sup>172</sup> It might thus be due to another *Textvorlage*,<sup>173</sup> or simply due to the personal stylistic preference of the final author.

*b.4 Transposition:*

*ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι (LXX) ---> ἐργάζομαι ἐγώ (Ac)*

Not a single LXX textual witness supports this change of the reconstructed NT (NA26) text.<sup>174</sup> It can therefore relatively safely be presumed that this change was

<sup>167</sup> Cf. to the pronoun change in Ac 3:22.

<sup>168</sup> So also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 20; and G.L. ARCHER & G. CHIRICHIGNO, *Quotations*, 159. The only textcritical witness of the LXX which supports this omission, is the minuscule 763 (11th century AD). This was probably done by the influence of the NT text. Refer also to the table in App. A.

<sup>169</sup> So also H. RINGGREN, *Luke's Use*, 234.

<sup>170</sup> So also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 20. See the table in App. A.

<sup>171</sup> See the table in App. A.

<sup>172</sup> This seems to be a typical characteristic of codex N, according to J. ZIEGLER, *Duodecim Prophetarum*, 35.

<sup>173</sup> So preferred by T. HOLTZ: "Vielmehr wird in der LXX des Lukas nur ὅτι gestanden haben. Zwar hat sich davon an dieser Stelle keine Spur in der Überlieferung erhalten." He draws attention to the fact that in Hab 1:6 and also in 2:3, codex A reads ὅτι instead of διότι (*Untersuchungen*, 20).

<sup>174</sup> Among the textual witnesses of the NT, the ἐργάζομαι ἐγώ reading is supported by A B D 13.61 k vg sa sy arm, while the reversed order (ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι), as found in the LXX, is supported by C E I L P al pler cat vg<sup>dem</sup> aeth Chr. The first reading might be taken as the original, as it is the most difficult, both grammatically and contextually. Cf. also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 19.

made by the hand of Luke himself, probably as a stylistic improvement.<sup>175</sup> The fact that the ἐγώ, which seems to be superfluous, is still retained, might denote some intention that this is an act of God.<sup>176</sup>

#### 6.2.4 Method of quotation

There are no traces of this quotation being used elsewhere in the NT, and Luke has therefore probably found this quotation by himself and not from tradition.<sup>177</sup> He has probably used a *Textvorlage* which differs from that to be found in the reconstructed version of the LXX, if the changes of καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε and ὅτι are taken to be part of that specific *Textvorlage*. But there are also indications that he has made stylistic improvements (the addition of ἔργον, the word order of ἐργάζομαι ἐγώ, and the omission of θαυμάσια) and has interpreted the quotation within its new context (ὕμιν).

The prophetic motif which has played an important role in the usage of Scripture thus far, is to be found here once again. The quoted text from Hab is used as a prophecy from Scripture, being God's Word itself. It cannot be questioned and nothing can change it.

Attention was also drawn to the fact that Peter has quoted from the scroll of the 12P (Ac 2:17-21 = Jl 3:1-5), and so did Paul (and Barnabas) here (Ac 13:41 = Hab 1:5).

The same pattern reveals itself here as has become clear from the first Petrine, first part of the second Petrine and the third Petrine speeches, i.e. that the first section containing a quotation, or combined quoted texts, is presented as being fulfilled. The next section, however, is presented as not yet being fulfilled. All this fits then into God's plan and control of (salvation) history. In this instance (first Pauline speech), the trilogy of quotations, which is to be found in VV.32-37, deals with the theme of the Davidic promises and the exalted Christ. These are fulfilled. The next section (VV.38-41) deals with the theme of the acceptance of this message by the Jews, quoting Hab 1:5 which is not yet fulfilled. If they do not accept this, and if they do not listen, what was prophesied there, *will* happen! The first section deals thus with what God has done, and the second with what these hearers should do. It could structurally be presented as follows:

- (a) Theme: Davidic promises and the exalted Christ (VV.32-37)
- (b) Quoted texts: Ps 2:7; Is 55:3; Ps 15(16):10 (VV.33-35) = Fulfilled
- (c) Theme: Appeal for acceptance of this message (VV.38-41)
- (d) Quoted text: Hab 1:5 (V.41) = Yet unfulfilled

This unfulfilled quotation will find its fulfillment in the verses following thereafter (VV.44-46), when exactly that happens against which they were warned.

<sup>175</sup>. Cf. also T. HOLTZ: "Die unmittelbare Folge von ἐργον ἐργάζομαι bringt die etymologische Figur zu besserer Geltung; 'die schöne Anaphora des zweiten ἐργον vor dem Relativsatz' verleiht dem Satz stilistischen Schwung" (*Untersuchungen*, 20).

<sup>176</sup>. Cf. also T. HOLTZ. *Untersuchungen*, 20,n.5.

<sup>177</sup>. So also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 21. Contrary to C.H. DODD, *Scriptures*, 87f.

### 6.2.5 Interpretation of the quoted text by Luke

This quotation functions as a warning to the diaspora Jews<sup>178</sup> and the God-fearers of Antioch in Pisidia not to repeat the mistake made by the Jerusalemites and their leaders.<sup>179</sup> VV. 38-39 makes it clear that the forgiveness of sins and justification could not have been achieved by the law of Moses. This can only happen through him (Jesus), and all who believe in him are justified. The quotation is then linked as a threat of what could happen, if they do not listen and do not accept this message. They are addressed by way of the quotation itself as "treacherous ones".

When looking now at the interpretation of 1QpHab, the resemblance in terms of *how* Hab 1:5 is interpreted, is striking. The hearers are seen as "treacherous ones". They are not faithful to the covenant of God and have profaned his holy Name. This has probably happened because they have not fulfilled their part in the contract which was made in God's name (an oath). They did not believe the words of the Teacher, words which were coming from the mouth of God. It was God who helped the priest to understand the prophetic meaning of all the words of the prophets, who are the servants of God.

The following elements in the interpretation are shared in both 1QpHab and Ac 13: (a) the audience is addressed as "treacherous" (V.41), (b) their disbelief to the words which are spoken (V.45-46), (c) these are God's words (V.44,46,48), (d) they have profaned the name of the covenantal God, Jahweh (κύριος in the LXX), and here Jesus' name through which forgiveness of sins and justification takes place (VV.38-39), (e) the fact that Paul and Barnabas were given a understanding by God for the interpretation of the Scriptures, the prophetic meaning, has already become clear.

Although Ac 13:41 cannot be seen as a Christian pesher of Hab 1:5<sup>180</sup> — as its application here in Ac 13:41 differs from that of 1QpHab<sup>181</sup> — the resemblance in terms of the manner in which this quotation is interpreted, is striking. Both Qumran and the NT sometimes quote without bearing in mind either the context from which the quotation comes, or the "original text meaning".<sup>182</sup> Within its original context in Hab, this quotation had an eschatological intention, but here it is meant as a warning to immediately accept the forgiveness of sins through Jesus.<sup>183</sup>

<sup>178</sup> A. WEISER points to the fact that the "Ermahnung" of which this quotation consists, is comparable to the "Schema" of the missionary speeches before the Jews (cf. Ac 2:38-40; 3:19f; and 3:26), all of which end with such an "ermahnende Abschluß" (*App II*, 328).

<sup>179</sup> So F.J. MATERA, *Responsibility*, 86.

<sup>180</sup> Contrary to F.F. BRUCE, *Christianity*, 181f.

<sup>181</sup> "Das bedeute für 1QpHab: im Blick auf das Geschehen um die Qumrangemeinde; für das Neue Testament: im Blick auf Jesus" (H. BRAUN, *Qumran*, 162).

<sup>182</sup> According to H. BRAUN: "Eine historische Betrachtung des Alten Testaments wird vielmehr festzustellen haben, daß Qumran wie Acta-Verfasser ein alttestamentliches Zitat oft kontextfrei und ohne Rücksicht auf den ursprünglichen Textsinn handhaben." J. DANIELÉLOU reckons that the reason for this manner of context free quotation is to be found in the fact that "...beide Seiten, Qumran wie das Neue Testament, meinten, in der letzten, der Endzeit zu leben, und von ihr rede das Alte Testament und sei daher im Blick auf die Endzeit auszulegen" (H. BRAUN, *Qumran*, 162).

<sup>183</sup> So U. WILCKENS: "Wenn die angeredeten jüdischen Predigthörer nicht augenblicklich diese Verkündigung der Sündenvergebung durch Jesus annehmen, so wird eine neue Epoche der Geschichte des Evangeliums und damit zugleich eine neue Epoche innerhalb der ganzen Erwählungsgeschichte eintreten: das Evangelium wird auf die Heiden übergehen" (*Missionsreden*, 52).



There might be some implied conflict present here between the speakers and the hearers on the importance of the law for justification.<sup>184</sup>

## 7. SECTION V: ACTS 13:42-45<sup>185</sup>

### Reaction of the hearers

The speech which starts at V.16b, ends at V.41. The narrative which follows (VV.42-45) describes the reaction of the hearers at the synagogue. This literary feature of describing their reaction, was also to be found at the end of the Petrine speeches.<sup>186</sup> The second Petrine speech and this first Pauline speech have in common the shared feature of an "interruption" of the whole speech by the hearers' reaction. In both instances the hearers ask for more information, but what, in the first instance, is merely a request for information<sup>187</sup> becomes, in the second, a plea.<sup>188</sup> The authority of the message as God's words,<sup>189</sup> remains official and directly linked to the sabbath and the synagogue. However eager (παρεκάλουν, V.42) the hearers are to know more, they will wait until the next sabbath (μεταξὺ σάββατον, V.42) to do so.

While the above situation seems to be a more general reaction of the people present, the next event is more explicit and describes how "many Jews and devout converts to Judaism followed Paul and Barnabas, and urged them to continue in the grace of God" (ἤκολούθησαν πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρναβᾷ...ἔπειθον αὐτοὺς προσμένειν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ, V.43).<sup>190</sup>

The narrative continues in V.44 immediately with the setting of the context on the next sabbath, when "almost the whole city gathered together to hear the word of the Lord"<sup>191</sup> (σχεδὸν πᾶσα ἡ πόλις συνήχθη ἀκούσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου). Apart from the importance of the message, being "the word of the Lord", and the Jews and Jewish proselytes involved here, the quantity of people who are affected is also striking. V.42 speaks of "they" (αὐτῶν), V.43 speaks of "many" (πολλοὶ<sup>192</sup>), and in V.44 the number has grown to include "almost the whole city" (σχεδὸν πᾶσα ἡ πόλις). For the reader of Ac this should come as no surprise; Ac 13:2 has already

<sup>184</sup> Cf. B.J. KOET, *Paul and Barnabas*, 117.

<sup>185</sup> Cf. also B.J. KOET, Paul and Barnabas in Pisidian Antioch: A Disagreement over the Interpretation of the Scriptures (Acts 13.42-52), in: *idem., Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (SNTA 14), Leuven 1989, 97-118.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. Ac 1:23-26; 2:37,41-42; and 4:1-4.

<sup>187</sup> Ac 2:37 = τί ποιήσωμεν, ἄδρες ἀδελφοί;

<sup>188</sup> Ac 13:42 = ...παρεκάλουν εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ σάββατον λαλεῖν αὐτοῖς τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα.

<sup>189</sup> Compare: τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, V.42; τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ, V.43; and τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, V.44. G. SCHNEIDER refers to Ac 5:20; 10:44; 11:14, and says that λαλεῖν τὰ ῥήματα relate to the proclamation of the Christian message (*App II*, 141).

<sup>190</sup> For the debate on "God-fearers" and "proselytes", see H. SOLIN, Juden und Syrer im westlichen Teil der römischen Welt, in: *ANRW II*, 29.2, Berlin/New York 1983, 587-789, 1222-1249, here 618-621; A.T. KRAABEL, The Disappearance of the "God-Fearers", in: *Numen* 28 (1981), 113-126; M. WILCOX, The "God-Fearers" in Acts — A Reconsideration, in: *JSNT* 13 (1981), 102-122; T.M. FINN, The God-fearers Reconsidered, in: *CBQ* 47 (1985), 75-84; G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 161-162.

<sup>191</sup> So wrongly translated as "the word of God" by the RSV.

<sup>192</sup> Cf. also Ac 4:4; 6:7; 8:7-8; 9:42; 10:27; 11:21; 14:1; 16:35; 17:4,12; 18:8,10; 19:18; 28:23.

shown the Holy Spirit directing Paul and Barnabas to be set apart for the work to which he calls them. The climax in the number of people who received this message, forms a contrast with the reaction of "the Jews": "they were filled with jealousy<sup>193</sup> and contradicted what was spoken by Paul, and reviled him" (ιδόντες δέ οι Ἰουδαῖοι τοὺς ὄχλους ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου καὶ ἀντέλεγον τοῖς ὑπὸ Παύλου λαλουμένοις βλασφημοῦντες,<sup>194</sup> V.45).<sup>195</sup>

#### 8. SECTION VI: ACTS 13:46-48

The message is not only for Jews but also for the Gentiles (non-Jews).

The quoted text from Is 49:6.

##### 8.1 Composition of the section

The delivering of God's message, "God's word", resulted in a clear division among the hearers, with the Jews being the antagonists and the Gentiles the protagonists. After the reaction of their hearers (VV.42-45), and without hiding their rejection of this attitude among the Jews, Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly (παρρησιασάμενοι τε ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ὁ Βαρναβᾶς εἶπαν, V.46). The εἶπαν introduces the last section of their speech. Again, the divine necessity of events is pointed out, by telling the Jews that "it was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to them" (ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, V.46). However, they have thrust it from them, thereby judging themselves unworthy of eternal life (ἐπειδὴ ἀπωθεῖσθε αὐτὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀξίους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς, V.46).<sup>196</sup> The rhetorically attention marker, ἰδοῦ, signals that the preachers are turning now to the Gentiles (ἰδοῦ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, V.46). Substantiation for this is found in Scripture, interpreted as a command of the κύριος himself to the bearers of his message, by quoting Is 49:6.<sup>197</sup> This substantiation (οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος, V.47) then forms the introductory formula for the quotation which, in its turn, simultaneously ends their speech on a climactic note.

The joyful reaction of the Gentiles, and their reaction of glorification towards the word of the κύριος, is an indication of the impact of that message, driven by the

<sup>193</sup>. According to B.J. KOET, the "Jews are not jealous but their attitude shows a certain zealotry and especially a zeal against Paul's interpretation of the *Torah*, as presented in 13:38-41" (*Paul and Barnabas*, 105).

<sup>194</sup>. βλασφημέω points to the "cursing" of Paul by these Jews. So also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apk II*, 145. He draws attention also to Lk 22:65; 23:39; Ac 18:6 and 26:11.

<sup>195</sup>. B.J. KOET reckons that "Considering their use elsewhere and the content of the preceding speech it is clear that ἀντιλέγω and βλασφημέω in Acts 13,45 are used to depict a discussion about the interpretation of the Scriptures." This is in line with his contribution to VV.42-52 which he understands as being "a disagreement over the interpretation of the Scriptures" (*Paul and Barnabas*, 101.97).

<sup>196</sup>. Compare also Lk 20:35: "...those who are accounted worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection from the dead..." (οἱ δὲ καταζωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν).

<sup>197</sup>. So also B.J. KOET: "Paul and Barnabas react to the ζήλος of the Jews on the basis of a scriptural argument." He sees this then as a confirmation "that the attitude of the Jews in 13,45 is 'zeal for an interpretation of Scripture'" (*Paul and Barnabas*, 105).

Spirit himself: ἀκούοντα δὲ τὰ ἔθνη ἔχαιρον καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, V.48. Note the change here from τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου (V.44) to τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (V.46b), to κύριος (V.47) and τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου (V.48).<sup>198</sup> The meaning in V.44 is dubious. It could mean either "the word about *Jesus*", or "the word of *God*" — which is anyway understood here as being the message of salvation which has become a reality in Jesus of Nazareth.<sup>199</sup> V.46 would then confirm the latter alternative. Also V.47 and V.48 probably refer to Jesus.

Still within the context of the divine plan (predestination?), it is now stated that "as many as were ordained to eternal life believed" (καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, V.48).

## 8.2 The quoted text from *Is 49:6* in *Ac 13:47*

This is clearly an explicit quotation from the LXX.<sup>200</sup> The change in person as indicated by ἡμῖν (V.47a) against σε (V.47b,c), as well as the break between κύριος and τέθεικά, clearly substantiate this.

### 8.2.1 Other NT occurrences of the quoted text

Although not explicitly quoted, there are some clear references to this same phrase of *Is 49:6* earlier in Luke's writings: *Lk 2:32*<sup>201</sup> and *Ac 1:8*.<sup>202</sup> Simeon refers to the infant Jesus in the temple as the salvation of his people, and a light to the nations (*Lk 2:32*). A further messianic interpretation of *Is 49:6* occurs in *Enoch 48:4*, which speaks of the expected messiah, who will be the light of the nations. In *Ac 13:47* Luke transfers this motif from Jesus to his messengers. See also *Rv 7:4* for an implicit reference to this quotation.

### 8.2.2 The introductory formula (*Ac 13:47*)

The introductory formula is formed by the words: οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος.<sup>203</sup> Interesting is the strong expression ἐντέταλται<sup>204</sup> ὁ κύριος. It is presented here as a direct command<sup>205</sup> of the κύριος (Jesus),<sup>206</sup> to his

<sup>198</sup> But take note also of the differences among the textual witnesses with regard to the reading in V.48: B D E 049.323.453 *pc sa*<sup>ms</sup> *bo* support the reading τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

<sup>199</sup> Along similar lines, cf. G. SCHNEIDER who says that the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ is the Christian message (*Apg II*, 145, n.19).

<sup>200</sup> With T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 32; M. RESE, *Funktion*, 76; and E. RICHARD who reckoned that "...there is ample, important textual support for the text form of Acts 13:47". Contrary to M. WILCOX who thought that the LXX form of this quotation "is very uncertain" (*OT in Acts*, 339).

<sup>201</sup> *Lk 2:32* = φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν.

<sup>202</sup> *Ac 1:8* = ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

<sup>203</sup> So also C.K. BARRETT, *Luke/Acts*, 240.

<sup>204</sup> See also *Lk 4:10* and *Ac 1:2*.

<sup>205</sup> Cf. also C.K. BARRETT, *Luke/Acts*, 240.

<sup>206</sup> So also interpreted by H. CONZELMANN, *Apg*, 86; and M. RESE, *Funktion*, 78. The latter draws attention to an observation already made by H.J. CADBURY, that κύριος is often used in a double sense in *Ac*, but when it refers to Jesus it is (apart from a few explainable exceptions) preceded by the article (The Titles of Jesus in Acts, in: *The Beginnings of Christianity I, Vol.5*, London 1933, 354-375.360).

messengers,<sup>207</sup> (Paul and Barnabas).

### 8.2.3 Determining and explaining the textual differences

NA26 does not indicate here that the Chester Beatty Papyrus II<sup>208</sup> omits the second σε at this point.<sup>209</sup>

NT(NA26) Ac 13:47	LXX Is 49:6	MT Is 49:6	p45 Ac 13:47
Τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.	ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.	בְּנִסְתִּיק לְאִר גִּוּרִים לְהִי יְשַׁעְי עַד-קֶצֶה :פְּרָקִים	τέθεικά σε εἰς[ς.....] ..... εἶναι εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

#### (a) Textual differences between MT and LXX (and their relation with Ac)

The LXX has only one major addition<sup>210</sup> to the text against that represented in the MT, i.e. the attention marker ἰδοῦ. This addition in the LXX text is also absent in the reading of Ac<sup>211</sup> (if it is not accepted that the quotation was simply meant to begin with τέθεικα), so that the readings as represented in the MT and the NT correspond exactly at this point.<sup>212</sup>

<sup>207</sup> J. ROLOFF supposes that this application to the κύριος and his messengers, against the context of the quotation in Is 49, "...ist schwerlich Werk des Lukas; es ist anzunehmen, daß Jes 49,6 zusammen mit anderen deuterojesajanischen Texten schon sehr früh zur Begründung der Heidenmission gedient hat" (*App.*, 209).

<sup>208</sup> Probably to be dated in the first half of the 3rd cent. AD (F.G. KENYON, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus I; The Gospels and Acts*, London 1933, X).

<sup>209</sup> This does not, however, convince one to change the reading, as this is the only witness who reads this against the combination of the great majuscles. Cf. also F.G. KENYON, *Chester Beatty*, 46.

<sup>210</sup> The possible addition of εἰς διαθήκην γένους in Is 49:6 in the LXX (supported by N O<sup>1</sup>-Q<sup>m</sup> B L<sup>1</sup>-46-86<sup>c</sup>-233 C 198 239<sup>a</sup> 403<sup>a</sup> 449<sup>a</sup> 538 544 Co Syl Eus.dem.et ecl. Th. Tyc. Hi.: ex 42:6 — which reads then: τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν), might also be due to the influence of Is 42:6 (καὶ ἔδωκά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους, εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν) where emphasis is laid on διαθήκη in the same context of φῶς ἔθνῶν.

<sup>211</sup> Its inclusion in codex D is to be ascribed to the "stylistic improvements" of the Bezan scribe, according to E. HAENCHEN, *App.*, 50-54; and E. RICHARD, *OT in Acts*, 340. The latter, following J.H. ROPES (*Detached Note*, 128), agrees that "the 'Western' text altered the form by adding ἰδοῦ (LXX; not Hebrew), by improving the barbarous εἰς φῶς ἔθνῶν to τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, and by giving φῶς a more prominent position" (*OT in Acts*, 340).

<sup>212</sup> Against T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 32; H. CONZELMANN, *App.*, 86; G. SCHNEIDER, *App II*, 145; G.L. ARCHER & G. CHIRICHIGNO, *Quotations*, 117; A. WEISER, *App II*, 338. With E. HAENCHEN, *Schriftzitate*, 160; *idem.*, *App.*, 356.

(b) *Textual differences: Ac 13:47 and Is 49:6 (LXX)*

As indicated in the paragraph above, Ac and the MT are probably nearer to each other on the basis that both of them represent the same shorter reading (not having ἰδοῦ), against that to be found in the LXX.

*b.1 Omission: ἰδοῦ*

There are two possible explanations for the lack of ἰδοῦ in Ac 13:47. It could be that Luke was using here a *Vorlage* of the LXX which lacked this ἰδοῦ, and was therefore closer to the reading of the MT. On the other hand, assuming that ἰδοῦ was part of his source text, Luke may have omitted the word himself (probably on stylistic grounds) by simply beginning his quotation at this specific point!

Assuming that it was part of Luke's source text, it is possible that he quoted ἰδοῦ *indirectly* by introducing it into the sentence preceding the introductory formula to the quotation:<sup>213</sup> ἰδοῦ στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, V.46. On the other hand, the word is very common, both in Lk-Ac,<sup>214</sup> and in hellenistic Greek generally;<sup>215</sup> its use here may simply be due to the writer's own stylistic preference, unrelated to its presence in the LXX reading. Thus, though the omission may have been a conscious one on Luke's part, it may equally have been due to the reading of this source text; the agreement of the MT reading at this point tends to support the latter conclusion.<sup>216</sup>

*8.2.4 Method of quotation*

On the basis that this quotation is to be found nowhere else in the NT explicitly quoted, it may be assumed that it found its way into Ac through the hand of Luke himself. He probably used a *Textvorlage* which resembles that of our reconstructed LXX.

The authority and normativity of Scripture for Luke becomes vividly clear from the way in which this quotation is used. It asserts the divine will of the κύριος and is used as a direct command to Paul and Barnabas. This is similar to the usage of Ps 108(109):8 in the first Petrine speech (Ac 1:20d-21).

<sup>213</sup> So G. SCHNEIDER (*Apg II*, 146): "Apg 13,47 läßt das einleitende ἰδοῦ der Stelle weg (bzw. zieht es vor: V 46)." Also M.F.-J. BUSS indicates that the choice of words in the ἰδοῦ-sentence was probably influenced by Is 49:6 (LXX). "So könnte auch erklärt werden, warum Lukas bei dem anschließenden Zitat das einleitende ἰδοῦ nicht mitübernommen hat" (*Missionspredigt*, 137).

<sup>214</sup> Out of the 200 occurrences in the NT, it appears 80 times in Lk-Ac!

<sup>215</sup> Compare for example its occurrences in the rest of the NT and in the LXX.

<sup>216</sup> E. HAENCHEN, said: "Wie man sich aber auch entscheidet, deutlich ist, daß der lukanische Text nicht unmittelbar aus der LXX gewonnen ist, es sei denn, man setzt eine außerordentlich freie Behandlung durch Lukas voraus" (*Schriftzitate*, 160). It is, however, very difficult to take sides here against either the LXX or the MT because of a lack of any further evidence (no other differences in the quotation as it appears in Ac 13:47).

### 8.2.5 Interpretation of the quoted text by Luke

This quotation is used here by Luke (a) as a direct command of the κύριος to Paul and Barnabas, and (b) in order to support their argument that they have to go to the Gentiles with the gospel.<sup>217</sup> They will be a light to the nations by bringing the message of salvation. The function of this quotation here is thus to make it clear: this has to happen, they have to turn now from the Jews to the Gentiles with the message of salvation. Scripture has foretold it;<sup>218</sup> even better: the κύριος, Jesus, has commanded it! In Lk 2:32 Simeon interprets this text from the Jewish Scriptures in terms of Jesus.<sup>219</sup> The same phrase is now interpreted in terms of Paul and Barnabas.<sup>220</sup> There may be some distinction here between the "word of God" which was preached to the hearers in Antioch, and this "commandment of the κύριος". The latter probably refers to Jesus, implying that it was *Jesus*<sup>221</sup> who commanded them to turn to the Gentiles; this is supported by Lk 2:32 where Jesus himself is described as an instrument of revelation to the Gentiles. Remember that God himself has exalted Jesus and made him κύριος (Ac 2:36). His ascension took place "after he had given *commandment* (ἐντεταλόμενος) through the Holy Spirit to the apostles whom he had chosen" (Ac 1:2).

The context of the second servant song, Is 49:1-6, deals with a mission beyond the restoration of Israel. The preceding context from which the quotation in Ac 13:47 was taken, makes this clear:<sup>222</sup> "And now the Lord says, who formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob back to him, and that Israel might be gathered to him, for I am honoured in the eyes of the Lord, and my God has become my strength — he says: 'It is too light a thing that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the preserved of Israel; I will give you as a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the end of the earth'" (Is 49:5-6). As was the case with the other quotations from the prophetic literature which have been discussed so far, so this quotation also comes from a section which

<sup>217</sup> So also C.K. BARRETT, *Luke/Acts*, 240: "The quotation from Is 49:6 justifies the turn to the Gentiles." See also U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 71; and M. RESE, *Funktion*, 78. D.E. JOHNSON points out that they "...appeal to a biblical warrant for turning to the Gentile world when Israelites are unresponsive" (*Isaianic Servant Songs*, 345). It could not be agreed with H. RINGGREN that Paul is speaking here to Gentiles — in order to explain the exclusion of the phrase, εἰς διαθήκην γένους (*Luke's Use*, 235). The audience consisted of Jews and God-fearers in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia (Ac 13:16,42-46). But it is the Gentiles who accepted the message of salvation with joy (V.48), in contrast with the Jews.

<sup>218</sup> U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 71.

<sup>219</sup> So also H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 86; M. RESE, *Funktion*, 78; and G. SCHNEIDER, *App II*, 145-146, n.25.

<sup>220</sup> Cf. also F.F. BRUCE, *Paul's Use*, 73. D.E. JOHNSON, following J. DUPONT, finds in Ac 13:47 "...an extension of Jesus' ministry and a preview of the scene with which Luke will close his two-volume account of the spread of the word of salvation" (*Isaianic Servant Songs*, 345). Also M. RESE, *Funktion*, 78.

<sup>221</sup> So also M. RESE, *Funktion*, 77-78; and B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 269. Contrary to B.J. KOET who argues that the term κύριος here refers to God (*Paul and Barnabas*, 107).

<sup>222</sup> Cf. also B.J. KOET, *Paul and Barnabas*, 108; and D.E. JOHNSON, *Isaianic Servant Songs*, 345-346, who argue in the same direction.



contains direct speech, the direct words of Yahweh.<sup>223</sup> Within the original Hebrew context this was interpreted in terms of "the collective Israel"<sup>224</sup> (an interpretation reinforced by the LXX); the servant-motif was subsequently re-interpreted by Luke in terms of Jesus, the servant of God (Lk 2:32); Ac 1:2 expands this interpretation in terms of Jesus' command to his apostles, who are now his servants.<sup>225</sup> Thus, in the context of Ac 13, the κύριος of Is 49 has become Jesus, the κύριος who commands his apostles, Paul and Barnabas.

This audience and the Jews of Jerusalem share the same moment of decision in salvation history, centering on the acknowledgement of Jesus, and with it that of the divine goal of salvation history,<sup>226</sup> as foretold by the prophets in the whole of Scripture.<sup>227</sup> The quotation from Is 49:6 functions thus as "...the deciding factor in the transition from the proclamation to the Jews to that to the Gentiles".<sup>228</sup>

## 9. SOME CONCLUSIONS ON THE USE OF THE EXPLICIT QUOTATIONS IN THE FIRST PAULINE SPEECH

9.1 Ps 2 was very well known during Luke's time. Also Luke makes use of it in order to designate the resurrected Jesus as the exalted Son of God. In line with Heb, Luke uses it christologically, especially in terms of Jesus' exaltation.

9.2 The Davidic motif plays an important role and combines all three quoted texts. The focus is on the promises which were made to David and which are fulfilled: Jesus was resurrected and exalted; he sits on the "Davidic throne" at the right hand of the Father.

9.3 Luke's creative compilatory hand could be seen at its best in his reconstructed parallel reading of Is 55:3 and Ps 15(16):10. The bodily resurrection of Jesus, as well as the immortality and incorruptibility of his body, is herewith substantiated, and that, in turn, is proof of God's fulfillment of his promises made to David.

9.4 The two Ps-quotations (Ps 2:7 and 15(16):10) are used as promises or "prophecies" which are fulfilled. The three prophet-quotations (Is 55:3, Hab 1:5 and Is 49:6) are also used as prophecies. On this, the occasion of Paul's first speech, the first is regarded as having already been fulfilled; the second is yet to be fulfilled. By the time the third prophecy is used, on the following sabbath, the second prophecy has reached fulfillment. At this point the third prophecy becomes relevant, and is next in line to be fulfilled. Probably only the first three of these five are to be

<sup>223</sup> Compare Ac 2:17-21 (*Jl 3:1-5(2:28-32)*); 13:34 (*Is 55:3*); and 13:41 (*Hab 1:5*).

<sup>224</sup> Cf. B.J. KOET, *Paul and Barnabas*, 109-110.

<sup>225</sup> So also H. CONZELMANN, *ApG*, 86; and M. RESE: "Kein Leser der ApG wäre auf den Gedanken gekommen, jemand anders als Jesus hätte Paulus und Barnabas zur Mission beauftragt" (*Funktion*, 77). Along similar lines, also B.J. KOET, *Paul and Barnabas*, 112-114. But he includes the other Jews too, and concluded that the issue concerning this is "a false dilemma" (114). Compare B.J. KOET for an overview of other proposed alternatives to whom this *oe* in the quotation might refer to (111-112). None of these, however, is convincing.

<sup>226</sup> Cf. B.J. KOET: "The problem for these Jews is whether and how the Gentiles are allowed to take note of the Word of God and thus hear of their salvation" (*Paul and Barnabas*, 110).

<sup>227</sup> U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 53.

<sup>228</sup> Cf. B.J. KOET, *Paul and Barnabas*, 107. Also M. RESE, *Funktion*, 77.

understood in a (christological) messianic-eschatological manner. The remaining two have different functions.

9.5 While the first three quotations were used in an informative manner, the next quoted text (Hab 1:5) is used in a normative way. It is God's word, nothing can alter, change or question it. With the information concerning Christ, the hearers have to make a decision, which, if negative, will result in the fulfillment of this quoted text and its consequences.

9.6 The last quotation confirms what God has planned: salvation to all. With the Jews rejecting it, the quotation is used as a clear demand to Paul and Barnabas to turn to the Gentiles with this message of salvation. Also this quoted text is thus used in a normative manner.