SECTION I:
INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER 1

RESEARCH HISTORY

1. INTRODUCTION

Early Christianity began and developed in a situation where Scripture was seen as important and authoritative, and the history of the church and of Christianity therefore became a history centred on "Scripture" as a source of God's revelation. This was due to Christianity's Judaistic background, as well as to the unique way of interpretation of Scripture by the early church, who took as their model the approach of Jesus and the apostles.[1]

This "Scripture" which was used by the writers of the NT, was thus the same Scripture used by Judaism. It was used, read and accepted as "Scripture" both in the Jewish synagogues as well as in the early Christian congregations,[2] although probably most of the time in different Greek versions. Both Judaism and early Christianity considered these Scriptures to be authoritative "Words of God" in a written form, some kind of "God's speech (which) has...become a *text*".[3] This written tradition, as found in today's Christian "OT", was circulating in two major forms. There was a Hebrew tradition, on the one hand, consisting of 22 (or 24) books, and divided into the Torah (Law), Prophets and Scriptures. It was probably used more by Palestinian Judaism. On the other hand, there was the Greek tradition, a translation from the Hebrew (sometimes representing a completely different and

---

[1]. According to G.W. BROMILEY: "From the very beginning, then, they (Jesus and the apostles, *GJS*) gave Holy Scripture to the infant church and taught the first believers, both Jews and Gentiles, to accept, read, study, revere, quote, and commend it as the written Word of God" (The Church Fathers and Holy Scripture, in: D.A. CARSON & J.D. WOODBRIDGE (eds), *Scripture and Truth*, Grand Rapids 1983, 199-220, here 199).

[2]. Cf. also H.F. VON CAMPENHAUSEN, Das Alte Testament als Bibel der Kirche, in: *idem., Aus der Frühzeit des Christentums. Studien zur Kirchengeschichte des ersten und zweiten Jahrhunderts,* Tübingen 1963, 152-196, here 154-5; and D.-A. KOCH, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHTh 69), Tübingen 1986, 1.

[3]. J.L. KUGEL, Early Interpretation: The Common Background of Late Forms of Biblical Exegesis, in: J.L. KUGEL & R.A. GREER (eds), *Early Biblical Interpretation* (Library of Early Christianity 3), Philadelphia 1986, 9-106, here 19).

older Hebrew tradition, or *Vorlage*), and which became known as the Septuagint (LXX). Before Christianity it was already in use among the Jews of the diaspora; later it included, apart from the 22 (24) books of the Hebrew Scripture, the so-called Apocrypha. During this time when the church grew fast and extended her borders outside Palestine, it became natural to use the better known and used Greek versions (LXX) of the hellenistic communities as "Scripture", both for Jewish and non-Jewish Christians.

Distributing the εὐαγγέλιον in the κοινή διαλέκτος to both non-Jews, as well as to Greek-speaking Jews, these Greek translations were used heavily by certain NT and other early Christian writers. They provided the NT writers (who wrote about three centuries after its first translations) with a kind of *praeparatio evangelica*,[4] and were used by them as a "vehicle"[5] which could help them in the creation of their documents to refer to these "Scriptures". They could easily make use of the already translated terminology which was to be found in these documents.

2. THE FOCUS OF THIS STUDY

The debate on the use (*Verwendung*) and interpretation (*Verständnis*) of the Jewish Scriptures by early Christianity (traditionally known as "the use of the OT in the NT"), is as old as Christianity itself. This comparative, or intertextual, field of inquiry has been studied from several different angles through the centuries. The use of "OT" material by the writers of the NT was studied mainly on three different levels in the past: (a) the influence on the *language* (grammar, style, etc. = exclusively linguistically orientated);[6] (b) the manifestation of LXX material by way of the *explicit quotations* which were used (their *Textvorlage*, form, function, etc. = historical-critically orientated); and (c) the most difficult to determine scientifically, *implicit influence*, as seen in references, allusions, imitations and transpositions of broader motifs — which all contribute to the re-writing of a certain "event" at a later stage in (church) history in a theological manner (hermeneutically orientated). Although almost always latently present in the past (from the viewpoint of canon-criticism), it is only during the last three decades that studies have begun paying direct attention to the third level, i.e. that of implicit influences.

In the past, most attention was paid to a great extent to the first and second levels. This was the result of the fact that such investigations were strongly connected with the methodological ways in which ancient documents were analyzed, i.e. with a tendency to focus more on fragments. There has since been a paradigm shift away from this approach, although this does not mean at all that this kind of study no longer has an important place! On the contrary, these age-old issues should be looked at again from the viewpoint of these new developments. Therefore, when looking afresh at these old problems, it should be borne in mind that some

---

[4]. Cf. G. BERTRAM, *Praeparatio Evangelica* in der Septuaginta, in: *VT* 7 (1957), 225-249.

[5]. Cf. G. MUSSIES, Greek as the vehicle of early Christianity, in: *NTS* 29 (1983), 356-369.

[6]. Cf. for instance, A. SPERBER, New Testament and Septuagint, in: *JBL* 59 (1940), 193-293; D. TABACHOVITZ, *Die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament*, Lund 1956.

important movements in the methodology of exegesis have taken place, the most important of which is the pendulum-swing in recent decades away from the fragmentary approach to a more holistic one, with the emphasis increasingly being laid on the *context*.

The purpose of this study is then to look again to the second level, the usage of LXX material as manifested in the explicit quotations which were used. This in itself, will be the first contribution of the study, as a book on explicit (LXX) quotations in Ac has not yet been written. A discussion of the explicit quotations in Ac, normally falls through, on the one hand, between general studies on Ac, and on the other hand, studies on "the use of 'the OT' in 'the NT'". There are thus numerous studies on Ac itself,[7] most of which simply refer to the explicit quotations without sufficiently explaining the changes to be found in the quoted texts. On the other hand, the existing studies on the use of "the OT" in Lk-Ac can be divided into three categories: (a) general studies (usually in scientific articles and essays) which deal with the problem as being part of the "use of the OT in the NT" in its broadest sense.[8] A general weak point of such studies is their lack of evidence for the conclusions at which they arrive, and their failure to sufficiently explain the changes in the quoted texts. They normally deal then with the interpretation of these quotations, without showing evidence of how they account for the changes in those quoted texts. The second group (b) narrows their focus down to Lk-Ac,[9] but, in most cases, deals with the problem from the perspective of only one aspect of the Lukan theology, of which the christology seems to be the most popular.[10] The third group (c) consists of those studies undertaken on the speeches in Ac[11] which, as with the first category above, tend to refer to the explicit quotations without sufficiently

---

[7]. E. PLÜMACHER has pointed out that "die Flut der Publikationen (schwillt auch in der Lukas-Forschung) ständig an," with monographs and unpublished dissertations appearing every ten weeks, while new titles of essays and other similar studies appear on a weekly basis (Acta-Forschung 1974-1982, in: *ThR* 48 (1983), 1-56, here 4).

[8]. Cf. for instance, C.K. BARRETT, The Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New, in: C.F. EVANS & P.R. ACKROYD (eds), *From the beginnings to Jerome* (CHB I), Cambridge 1970, 377-411; *idem.*, Luke/Acts, in: D.A. CARSON & H.G.M. WILLIAMSON (eds), *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, Cambridge 1989, 231-244; D.M. SMITH, The Use of the Old Testament in the New, in: J.M. EFIRD (ed), *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays. Studies in honor of William Franklin Stinespring*, Durham 1972, 3-65; E.E. ELLIS, How the New Testament uses the Old, in: I.H. MARSHALL (ed), *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*, Exeter 1979, 199-219; W.C. KAISER, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New*, Chicago 1985.

[9]. Cf. J. ERNST, Schriftauslegung und Auferstehungsglaube bei Lukas, in: *Theologie und Glaube* 60 (1970), 360-374; J. JERVELL, Zum lukanischen Verständnis des Alten Testaments, in: U. LUZ (hrsg), *Die Mitte des Neuen Testaments*, Göttingen 1983, 79-96; H. RINGGREN, Luke's Use of the Old Testament, in: *HThR* 79 (1986), 227-235.

[10]. Cf. for instance, T. JACOBS, De christologie van de redevoeringen der Handelingen, in: *Bijdr* 28 (1967), 177-196; M. RESE, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, Gütersloh 1969; D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern — Lukan Old Testament Christology* (JSNT Supp Ser 12), Sheffield 1987; D. JUEL, *Messianic Exegesis. Christological Interpretation of the Old Testament in Early Christianity*, Philadelphia 1988.

[11]. Cf. J. KURICHIANIL, The Speeches in the Acts and the Old Testament, in: *InThSt* 17 (1980), 181-186.

explaining the changes in the quoted texts. Most of these studies have concentrated only on the missionary speeches in general,[12] or on a single missionary speech,[13] while the other speeches (especially the remaining Petrine and Pauline speeches) have been greatly neglected.[14]

This investigation will also attempt, secondly, to look at these quotations *within* their immediate context, an aspect which has not received the attention it should have in previous studies undertaken in this direction.

Thirdly, the text-critical aspect of the problem will be addressed. The changes in the quoted texts will be investigated, and those which might be due to another *Textvorlage* will be identified.

Fourthly, the methodological aspect of the problem will receive attention by attempting to answer the question: *How* did Luke quote from his Scriptures?

Lastly, the hermeneutical aspect of the problem will come under discussion, with an attempt being made to understand the context in which those quotations are to be found, and the reason why specific changes were made to the quoted texts. This will be explained, at the end, within certain aspects of the Lukan theology.

This study is therefore an attempt to grasp something of Luke's use and understanding of his Jewish Scriptures in their Greek versions. The changes to be found within his quoted texts are taken as important pointers to this, and each change could refer either to another *Textvorlage* which he has used, or to a conscious change which was made due to his own set of theological *apriori*.

3. RESEARCH HISTORY

It should be made clear that what follows is not meant to be a research history on Ac,[15] nor to be a survey of the debate on the speeches in Ac,[16] or of the use of "the

---

[12]. Cf. for instance, U. WILCKENS, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte. Form und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (WMANT 5), Neukirchen 1974; R.C. TANNEHILL, The Functions of Peter's Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts, in: *NTS* 37 (1991), 400-414; E. PLÜMACHER, Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte und Dionys von Halikarnass, in: *NTS* 39 (1993), 161-177.

[13]. Cf. E. LÖVESTAMM, *Son and Saviour. A Study of Acts 13,32-37* (CNT 18), Lund 1961; C.A.J. PILLAI, *Early Missionary Preaching: A Study of Luke's Report in Acts 13*, Hicksville 1979; M.F.-J. BUSS, *Die Missionspredigt des Apostels Paulus im Pisidischen Antiochien. Analyse von Apg 13,16-41 im Hinblick auf die literarische und thematische Einheit der Petrusrede* (fzb 38), Stuttgart 1980.

[14]. Studies such as those of B.J. KOET have only recently started to put this right (cf. B.J. KOET, Prophets and Law: Paul's Change as Interpreter of Scripture in Acts; and *idem.*, Paul in Rome (Acts 28,16-31): A Farewell to Judaism?, in: *idem.*, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (SNTA 14), Leuven 1989, 73-96, 119-139).

[15]. For this, cf. E. GRÄSSER, Acta-Forschung seit 1960, in: *ThR* 41 (1976), 141-194, 259-290; *ThR* 42 (1977), 1-68; W. GASQUE, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles* (BGBTh 17), Tübingen 1975; E. PLÜMACHER, Acta-Forschung 1974-1982, in: *ThR* 48 (1983), 1-56; *ThR* 49 (1984), 105-169; M.C. PARSONS, Reading Talbert: New Perspectives on Luke-Acts, in: K.H. RICHARDS (ed), *SBL Seminar Papers* 26 (1987), 687-711; I.H. MARSHALL, The Present State of Lucan Studies, in: *Themelios* 14 (1989), 52-56; F. BOVON, *Studies in Luke-Acts: Retrospect and Prospect*, in: *HThR* 85 (1992), 175-196.

[16]. This could be followed, among others, in: F.F. BRUCE, The Speeches in the Acts, London 1942; J.T. TOWNSEND, The Speeches in Acts, in: *AThR* 42 (1960), 150-159; R.B. WARD, The Speeches of Acts in Recent Study, in: *RestQ* 4 (1960), 189-198; E. SCHWEIZER, Concerning the Speeches in Acts, in: L.E. KECK & J.L. MARTYN (eds), *Studies in Luke-Acts*, Nashville 1968, 208-216; U. WILCKENS,

OT" in "the NT".[17] The roots of the different branches in this debate will rather be established, with a brief representative review of developments in each branch, and with the focus on the development of the issue concerning explicit quotations, and how these can contribute to the study of explicit quotations in Ac.

3.1 Identification of quotations

One of the earliest works to show signs of a comparison between "the OT" in general (not the LXX in particular) and "the NT", was to be found during the 16th century, in the Greek NT of R. Stephen (1550),[18] which included a list of quotations. F. Junius (1588),[19] and J. Drusius (van der Driesche) (1588)[20] also included parallels between the Testaments in their text editions. From this early tendency to identify

---

Missionsreden; C.F. EVANS, "Speeches" in Acts, in: A. DESCAMPS & A. DE HALLEUX (eds), Mélanges Bibliques en hommage au Béda Rigaux, Gembloux 1970, 287-301; W.L. LANE, The Speeches of the Book of Acts, in: E.R. GEEHAN (ed), Jerusalem and Athens: Critical discussions on the theology and apologetics of Cornelius van Til, Nutley 1971, 260-272; J. NAVONE, Speeches in Acts, in: BiTod 65 (1973), 1114-1117; W.W. GASQUE, The Speeches of Acts: Dibelius Reconsidered, in: R.N. LONGENECKER & M.C. TENNEY, New Dimensions in New Testament Study, Grand Rapids 1974, 232-250; F.F. BRUCE, The Speeches in Acts — Thirty Years After, in: R. BANKS (ed), Reconciliation and Hope. New Testament essays on Atonement and Eschatology. Presented to L.L. Morris on his 60th Birthday, Exeter 1974, 53-68; M. WILCOX, A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts, in: J. NEUSNER (ed), Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Leiden 1975, 206-225; M.B. DUDLEY, The Speeches in Acts, in: EvQ 50 (1978), 147-155; A. WEISER, Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte, in: idem., Apg I, 97-100; G.H.R. HORSLEY, Speeches and Dialogue in Acts, in: NTS 32 (1986), 609-614; C.J. HEMER, Speeches and Miracles in Acts, in: idem., The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History, Tübingen 1989, 415-427; A. DAUER, "Ergänzungen" und "Variationen" in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte gegenüber vorausgegangenen Erzählungen. Beobachtungen zur literarischen Arbeitsweise des Lukas, in: H. FRANKEMÖLLE & K. KERTELGE (hrsg), Vom Urchristentum zu Jesus. Für Joachim Gnilka, Freiburg 1989, 307-324; S.E. PORTER, Thucydides 1.22.1 and Speeches in Acts: Is there a Thucydidean view?, in: NT 32 (1990), 121-142; F.F. BRUCE, The Significance of the Speeches for Interpreting Acts, in: SWJT 33 (1990), 20-28.

[17]. Cf., for instance, H. BRAUN, Das alte Testament im Neuen Testament, in: ZThK 59 (1962), 16-31; R. WAY-RIDER, The distinctive Uses of Scripture in the New Testament, in: E.A. LIVINGSTONE (ed), Studia Evangelica VI (TU 112), Berlin 1973, 604-608; E.E. ELLIS, How the New Testament Uses the Old, in: idem., Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity. New Testament Essays (WUNT 18), Tübingen 1978, 147-172; idem., The Old Testament Canon in the Early Church; and, Biblical Interpretation in the New Testament Church, in: M.J. MULDER & H. SYSLING (eds), Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity (CRINT II 1), Philadelphia 1988, 653-650, 691-725; idem., The Old Testament in Early Christianity. Canon and Interpretation in the light of Modern research, Tübingen 1991; R.N. LONGENECKER, 'Who is the prophet talking about?' Some reflections on the New Testament's use of the Old, in: Themelios 13 (1987), 4-8; I.H. MARSHALL, An assessment of recent developments, in: D.A. CARSON & H.G.M. WILLIAMSON (eds) It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, Cambridge 1988, 1-21; T. HOLTZ, Zur Interpretation des Alten Testaments im Neuen Testament, in: E. REIMUTH & C. WOLFF (hrsg), Geschichte und Theologie des Urchristentums. Gesammelte Aufsätze, Tübingen 1991, 75-91.

[18]. Cf. H. GOUGH, NT Quotations, London 1855, iii; and E.E. ELLIS, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, Edinburgh 1957, 2.

[19]. F. JUNIUS, Sacrorum Parallelorum libri iii, Heidelberg 1588.

[20]. J. DRUSIUS, Parallela Sacra, Franeker 1588.

parallels there developed, over time, the independent study of explicit quotations from "the OT" in "the NT". Also later, during the 17th century, *L. Capellus* (1650) included an addendum on NT quotations in his work, and identified parallels between the OT and the NT.[21]

Two centuries later, a stream of independent studies appeared, focusing on quotations in the NT. They were no longer dealt with in the NT text editions, but independently in monographs. Of these, the work of *F.A.G. Tholuck* (1849/68),[22] *H. Gough* (1855)[23] and *E. Böhl* (1878)[24] are but three examples. Apart from paying attention to the use of OT quotations by the Jewish writers, *Tholuck* also discussed the OT quotations in the Jesus speeches, by Paul, the Gospel writers and in the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the meantime the emphasis was moving away from the *fact* that quotations were used, to attempts to identify the *number* of quotations. *C. Toy* (1884),[25] for instance, counted 613 quotations and references, while *W. Dittmar* (1899) of Walldorf (Hessen)[26] found 1640, and *E. Hühn* (1900)[27] as many as 4105! One assumes that any word or phrase in the NT which looked in any way comparable with LXX variants was identified by *Hühn* as a quotation or a reference. All 27 books of the NT are discussed in the first part of his book. It forms a brief reference work in which each possible reference to the OT is itemized; in the end it is no more than a collection of text references. It further follows the typical trend of the linguistics of that time where a single word could dominate the argument, with little attention being paid to the context in which it stands. Words which seem to be similar between the LXX and the NT, are dealt with on an *ad hoc* basis. These are presented with a division on each page between the parallels with regard to messianic use, on the one hand, and other (non-messianic) parallels, on the other hand. *Hühn* also delineates the specific way in which the NT typifies the OT — as a whole, and also under the categories of Torah, Prophets and Book of the Pss. With his identification of the OT quotations and references in the NT, *Hühn* thus relies on form criticism, as it was in use in the system of the historico-critical method of this time.[28]

During the same year when the work of *Hühn* was published, appeared also the well known work of *H.B. Swete* (1900).[29] It was the first comprehensive

[21]. L. CAPELLUS, *Quaestio de Locis Parallelis Veteris et Novi Testamenti. Critica Sacra*, Paris 1650.

[22]. F.A.G. THOLUCK, *Das Alte Testament im Neuen Testament: Ueber die Citate des Alten Testaments im Neuen Testament und Ueber den Opfer- und Priesterbegriff im Alten und Neuen Testament*, Gotha [3]1849, 1868. Also translated into English: A. THOLUCK, The Citations of the Old Testament in the New, in: *BibSac* 11 (1854), 568-616.

[23]. H. GOUGH, *NT Quotations*.

[24]. E. BÖHL, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate im Neuen Testament*, Wien 1878.

[25]. C.H. TOY, *Quotations in the New Testament*, New York 1884.

[26]. W. DITTMAR, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo. Die alttestamentlichen Parallelen des Neuen Testament im Wortlaut der Urtexte und der LXX*, Göttingen 1899.

[27]. E. HÜHN, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate und Reminiscenzen im Neuen Testamente*, Tübingen 1900.

[28]. This was explicitly stated in the title of his book, that the "Messianischen Weissagungen..." will be "historisch-kritisch untersucht und erklärt" (E. HÜHN, *Citate*, title page).

[29]. H.B. SWETE, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge 1900. It was issued in 1914 in a reworked form by R.R. OTTLEY, and reprinted again in 1968 with the foundation of the "International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies" (IOSCS).

"Introduction" to the independent field of LXX studies, and is viewed by many scholars, even today, as being a good starting point for LXX studies. Faithful to his time, he also included lists of where the quotations are to be found in Scripture. In terms of Ac, probably his most relevant and important contribution is his conclusion that all these quotations in Ac (except 8:32) are found in the speeches, and that these OT quotations are taken from the LXX.

Writing in 1947, *B.F.C. Atkinson* regarded the NT use of OT material as being of such an extent that, all the allusions together with the direct quotations, "...there would be little of the New Testament with which we should not have to deal".[30] According to him, six out of every seven quotations could be traced back to the LXX.

The first comprehensive and synthetical work dealing with all the NT books in a brief but relatively thorough manner, was published in four volumes by *C. Smits* between 1952-1963.[31] It was at that time probably the most comprehensive work ever to be published on this topic. *Smits* discussed the problem with which this field deals, within three categories: (a) the text of the quotations, (b) the hypothesis of *florilegia* and (c) the exegetical problem. What makes the work of *Smits* so useful is not only its comprehensiveness, but also its good synthetical character.

One of the more recent "tools" or reference works on the identification of quotations in the NT was published under the editorship of *R.G. Bratcher* (1961).[32] It was prepared as an aid to NT translators, to enable them to see the correct relations between the OT quotations in the NT, and their possible source(s). It presents a simple list, in the order of the NT books, in which the identified quotations are listed on one side, and the OT reading on the other side. Its purpose ends here, and it is nothing more than an identified list of quotations.

Probably the first attempt after *Hühn* to count all the quotations in the NT, is to be found in the work of *H.M. Shires* (1974),[33] who calculated a total of 239 quotations in the NT.

One of the latest comprehensive surveys, undeniably an important tool for the study of explicit quotations in the NT, is a synopsis by *G.L. Archer* and *G. Chirichigno* (1983).[34] Divided into four columns, it gives a synopsis of the readings to be found in the MT, the LXX, the quotation in the NT, and a column with brief remarks on the differences to be found.

---

[30]. B.F.C. ATKINSON, The Textual Background of the Use of the Old Testament by the New, in: *JnlTrInst* 79 (1947), 39-69.

[31]. C. SMITS, *Oud-testamentische citaten in het Nieuwe Testament. Deel I: Synoptische Evangeliën*, Malmberg 1952; *idem., Deel II: Handelingen van de Apostelen, Evangelie van Johannes, Apocalyps en Katholieke brieven*, Malmberg 1955; *idem., Deel III: De Brieven van Paulus*, Malmberg 1957; *idem., Deel IV: De Brief aan de Hebreeën, Het Oude Testament in het Nieuwe, Algemene beschouwingen*, Malmberg 1963.

[32]. See R.G. BRATCHER (ed), *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament* (HcTr), New York 1961.

[33]. H.M. SHIRES, *Finding the Old Testament in the New*, Philadelphia 1974.

[34]. G.L. ARCHER & G. CHIRICHIGNO, *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament*, Chicago 1983.

With the publication of *W.C. Kaiser*'s work (1985),[35] it was stated for the first time *explicitly* that the problem of identifying OT quotations in the NT is one which is based on *how* a quotation or allusion is defined. Quotations can be identified relatively easily with the help of introductory formulas, but "Allusions may be clauses, phrases or even a single word, and, therefore, we may not always be sure that the NT writer deliberately intended that the OT connection should be made in the minds of his readers."[36] According to *Kaiser*, this was then the reason for scholars disagreeing on the number of identified quotations. Bearing this in mind, he reckons that approximately 300 explicit quotations can be identified "...in addition to an almost incalculable influence on the language, modes of expression, and thought in the NT".[37]

3.2 Introductory formulae

E. Hühn (1900) was the first to draw explicit attention to the formulas introducing direct quotations.[38] He paid attention to (a) the general formula to be found in quotations; (b) specific formulas indicating the Pentateuch, Prophets and Pss; and to (c) the only formula explicitly introducing "the second Ps" (Ac 13:33). According to him, this had to read "the first Ps". Also during 1900, *H.B. Swete* stated that formal quotations are those which are introduced by (a) a clearly defined introductory formula, as well as (b) those which, although without a clearly defined formula, are meant to be quotations, or compare closely with the reading of a certain part in the OT.[39]

Both *H.M. Shires* (1974)[40] and *W.C. Kaiser* (1985)[41] agree that explicit quotations are relatively easy to isolate, because of the presence of the clearly identifiable introductory formulae which introduce them.

3.3 The origin and *Textvorlage* of the quotations[42]

3.3.1 The character of the Textvorlage which was used

As early as 1650, *L. Capellus*[43] had concluded that the apostles quoted from the Greek, and not from the Hebrew — as was generally accepted during his time.
More than a century later, *T. Randolph* (1782)[44] found that although the NT writers are generally in accordance with the Hebrew, they do sometimes quote the LXX,

35. W.C. KAISER, *Uses of the OT*.
36. *Ibid.*, 2.
37. *Ibid.*, 3.
38. E. HÜHN, *Citate*, title page. It was done within the broader scope of a study on "Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes bis zu den Targumim".
39. H.B. SWETE, *Introduction*, 392.
40. H.M. SHIRES, *Finding the OT*, 66.
41. W.C. KAISER, *Uses of the OT*, 2.
42. Cf. also M. RESE, *Motive*, 26f.
43. L. CAPELLUS, *Quaestio*, 53-67.
44. T. RANDOLPH, *The Prophecies and other Texts Cited in the New Testament*, London 1782.

and even sometimes other translations or paraphrases. He found that 120 quotations are traceable back to the Hebrew, while 119 follow the LXX.

However, one of the first explicit textcritical studies on the NT quotations in comparison with the LXX, was done by *H. Owen* (1789).[45] He emphasized the differences between the readings of the quotations in the NT and the texts from which they were probably taken, and concluded that the NT writers normally used the LXX.

One of the best known works on the LXX and the NT is probably that of *E. Hatch* (1889) of Oxford,[46] which was reprinted almost a century later.[47] Attention was given to the enormous value of the LXX and the fact that LXX quotations were not only limited to the NT alone. He paid special attention to the first two centuries AD, in order to (a) compare the quotations of a single passage with the other data to make a decision about the specific passage; (b) compile all the quotations (from either a single book or the whole OT) used by a single author and to compare them with each other. He concentrated especially on extra-biblical authors (Philo, Clement of Rome, Barnabas and Judas).

W. Staerk,[48] in a series of articles published between 1892-1895, was the first to draw attention to differences between certain of the text traditions. In these articles he stated that considerable evidence is to be found in favour of the fact that the Evangelists used a recension of the LXX which is nearer to codex A than to our oldest, codex B. Evidence from the NT (almost without exception) showed that these quotations are nearer to Sinaïticus, Alexandrinus, Ambrosian and Lucian, rather than to Vaticanus.

During the nineties of the previous century then, both *W. Staerk* (from the perspective of the gospels) and *H. Vollmer* (1895)[49] (from the perspective of the Pauline literature) were in agreement that the used recension(s) of the LXX agree more with the Alexandrian tradition than with that of codex B. *H.B. Swete* (1900) too, noted that, according to the recensional changes of the quotations in the synoptic gospels, the usage of LXX material seems nearer to codex A than to codex B.[50] Although *T. Zahn* has reckoned the previous year (1899)[51] that the text

---

[45]. H. OWEN, *Modes of Quotation Used by the Evangelical writers explained and vindicated*, London 1789.

[46]. Oxford stood out prominently during this time as a learning centre for LXX studies, with the existence of the Grinfield chair for LXX studies, — which exists still today.

[47]. E. HATCH, *Essays in Biblical Greek. Studies on the value and use of the Septuagint, on Origen's revision of Job, and on the text of Ecclesiasticus*, Amsterdam [1889] 1970.

[48]. W. STAERK, Die alttestamentlichen Citate bei den Schriftstellern des Neuen Testament, in: *ZWTh* 35 (1892), 461-485; 36 (1893), 70-98; 38 (1895), 218-230.

[49]. H. VOLLMER, *Die alttestamentlichen Citate bei Paulus*, Freiburg 1895.

[50]. There is no doubt for H.B. SWETE that "the LXX is the principal source from which the writers of the N.T. derived their O.T. quotations" (*Introduction*, 392). But "not the Old Testament only, but the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, has left its mark on every point of the New Testament, even in chapters and books where it is not directly cited. It is not too much to say that in its literary form and expression the New Testament would have been a widely different book had it been written by authors who knew the Old Testament only in the original, or who knew it in a Greek version other than that of the LXX (*Introduction*, 404).

[51]. See T. ZAHN, *Einleitung in das Neuen Testament*, Leipzig 1899.

witnesses on which *Staerk* relied, could have been influenced by the NT itself, *Swete* has defended the issue on the basis of the fact that a similar tendency is also to be found by Josephus, and also to a lesser degree by Philo. *Swete* reckons that there are also closer similarities with the Theodotion recension, against that of the LXX.[52]

In *E. Hühn*'s study, it was clearly said that there are also quotations in the NT that are to be found in extra-biblical sources. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha were mentioned as examples — and with that the reader was referred back to the LXX! With the LXX text edition of *Swete* and the NT edition of *Westcott and Hort*, *Hühn* tried to come to terms with this complex comparative study. But he also recognized the need to look into this comparison with the LXX and into its text variants. In consultation with *Dittmar*'s study of the previous year, he decided to work with the *Urtext* theory of De Lagarde.[53]

Contrary to *Staerk, Vollmer* and *Swete*, who accepted codex A as a true witness of the LXX for the quotations in the NT, *A. Sperber* (1940)[54] preferred to see codex B as being closer, based on the fact that it is the oldest. He refers to an earlier article by himself[55] in which he has gone carefully through the whole Greek NT,[56] based on codex B. He has marked all the passages which are direct quotations from the OT, without paying attention to the introductory formulae. According to him, even in the absence of these formulae, the specific material could be traced back to the OT. This then was proof for him of the degree to which the language and thought of the NT writers were influenced by the OT text. Hereafter he has compared the identified OT material in the NT with the relevant OT passages in the Greek of codex B. After omitting those that were in agreement, there were approximately 300 passages in the NT which come to the foreground as quotations, but whose wording differs to a certain extent from that of their parallel readings in the OT. *Sperber* emphasizes the fact that these differences are of theological importance. The question is then: Did the NT writer changed the quotation arbitrarily where it differed with our known LXX readings, or did they have an OT translation in Greek at their disposal which agreed verbally with the NT quotations? These questions brought to a climax the long-standing quest for the reason for these differences with regard to certain NT quotations. *Sperber* then looked to what Jerome had said about this; he also looked at the work of previous researchers in the field, concentrating his criticism on *H.B. Swete* in particular.[57]

---

[52]. H.B. SWETE, *Introduction*, 395.

[53]. According to *P.A. de Lagarde* (1827-1891), all the existing Greek texts of the OT could be traced back to a so-called proto-LXX, or *Urtext*, which would have been the "mothertext" from which the others evolved. This text theory has influenced especially the *Septuaginta Unternehmens* at Göttingen, of which the work of *Dittmar* is probably the first evidence.

[54]. A. SPERBER, NT and Septuagint, 193-293.

[55]. Which has appeared in Hebrew during 1934: A. SPERBER, The New Testament and the Septuagint, *Tarbiz* 6 (1934), 1-29.

[56]. The textcritical edition of Nestlé.

[57]. Without hiding his viewpoint on H.B. SWETE, he said: "I hope that on the basis of my preceding expositions I may say that Swete was far from realizing the problem as such, and that all his remarks are consequently to be put into the discard" (*Introduction*, 204).

With regard to the NT writers' use of LXX material, *B.F.C. Atkinson* (1947)[58] has reckoned that the NT writers would not correct the LXX on the basis of the "original" Hebrew. Differences between the MT and the LXX would be either the result of another Hebrew *Textvorlage* than that known today, or the result of an incorrect translation. Regarding the text of the quotations, *C. Smits* (1952-63) deals with the question about the differences of the NT quotations in comparison with the known and existing LXX editions. He states that the quotations show differences with the LXX, that is, they differ from the LXX as we read it. The outstanding question is then: In which textform did the NT writers have the Greek Bible before them?[59] According to *Smits*, there are no indications of explicit quotations (i.e. quotations introduced by intoductory formulae) from the memory of the NT writers. The NT writers must have had an open written text in front of them. Although he realized the complexity of this issue,[60] he is clearly convinced that we should not talk too easily about quoting from memory. Minor differences with our known text editions do not prove this and even major differences might go back to another text tradition.

After the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls (from 1947 onwards), these documents were added to the list of comparative material regarding the use of "the OT in the NT."

In *M. Karnetzky*'s work (1955),[61] the possible *Textvorlage* underlying that which was used for the quotations, came under discussion when he dealt with the textcritical aspect of his investigation. He suggests that the quotations from earlier sources (originally Aramaic), which are to be found in the *Sondergut* material of the Synoptic Gospels, could be traced back to the "Hebrew text" of the OT, which goes back to an Aramaic Targum. With the adoption of these, most of the quotations (except those in the *SMt*) were translated according to the LXX. However, quotations which are cited directly from the LXX are to be found in the *SLk* as well as in the other source material of Luke's Gospel.

The last volume of *C. Smits* appeared during 1963. In addition to dealing with the remaining NT document not covered in his first three volumes (Hebrews), he also sets aside a major section for a general discussion on the "Oude Testament in het Nieuwe". Again emphasis is laid on the fact that the text used by the NT writers was in general a Greek text. However, the original problem with which this field of studies has always had to deal, remains in the foreground: the differences between the known recensions of the LXX, or the answer to the question of whether other translations were in use which could have been produced within a Christian environment.[62] *Smits* then concludes that throughout the NT the quotations clearly demonstrate a unique character, in that they agree, generally speaking, with the LXX readings. Some of the slight differences were clearly necessary for the re-use of this OT material within the context or argument of the relevant NT writer. But then

---

[58]. B.F.C. ATKINSON, *Textual Background*, 39-69.
[59]. C. SMITS, *Citaten I*, 9.
[60]. *Ibid.*, 14.
[61]. M. KARNETZKI, Die alttestamentlichen Zitate in der synoptischen Tradition, Tübingen 1955.
[62]. C. SMITS, *Citaten IV*, 597.

there are also some major differences, sometimes with regard to both the LXX and Hebrew readings. Earlier it was suggested that these cases were an indication of *ad hoc* translation by the NT writer. According to *Smits*, however, there is no proof for this. This does not mean that he himself has a complete solution, but he is convinced that certain indications for a solution are nonetheless present. Issues which should be taken thoroughly into account then, are the following: (a) each instance must be investigated individually and on its own, and (b) apart from the personal characteristics of the writer, there is also a Jewish influence present in the method or general rules which the NT writer has applied.

Paul's use of the OT has received much attention in the past, but from 1964 onwards the situation became more balanced, with the Lukan literature in particular receiving greater attention. During that year, *T. Holtz* submitted his "Habilitationsschrift" at Halle-Wittenberg, which dealt with the OT quotations to be found in Lk-Ac.[63] He deals especially with the question of the origin of the quotations.[64] Once again, the LXX text traditions were seen as the most probably source material, in this case, for Lk-Ac, "...denn nur sie hat er als die maßgebende Form des Alten Testaments gekannt".[65] The synoptic material also presents itself magnificently for such a study, as it could be worked with comparatively. *Holtz*'s conclusion is that the explicit quotations are clearly traceable back to the LXX.[66] An important result from his study is that quotations which were taken from the 12P and from Is are clearly traceable back to the textform as it is to be found in codex A. This material is then to be found especially in the *Sondergut Lukas* (which, in turn, does not support evidence in favour of any other OT texttradition, than that of codex A.[67]

For *H.M. Shires* (1974) too, the LXX "...was without question one of the most creative factors in the emergence of the N.T".[68] With regard to the Lukan writings, Lk shows almost no influence from the Hebrew texttraditions, while Ac has made exclusive use of LXX material.

In 1977 *I.H. Marshall* edited a collection of essays on the principles and methods of NT Interpretation. The third section, on the task of exegesis, included an essay by *E.E. Ellis*,[69] in which he formulated the results of his time, saying that the OT quotations in the NT are generally in agreement with the LXX, but also sometimes with other Greek editions, Aramaic targumim or independent translations from the Hebrew. Although the difference in textform might be due to

---

[63]. T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, Berlin [1964] 1968.

[64]. "...ob und in welchem Umfang ihr Text direkt einer der Formen des Alten Testaments entnommen ist oder ob er dem behandelten Schriftsteller durch die Tradition, sei es die mündliche oder die schriftliche, zugekommen ist (T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 1).

[65]. T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 1.

[66]. He said: "Nirginds hat sich ein Anhaltspunkt dafür ergeben, dass Lukas eine andere Textform des Alten Testaments bekannt gewesen ist" (*Untersuchungen*, 166).

[67]. On this point, T. HOLTZ thus agrees with W. STAERK, H. VOLLMER and H.B. SWETE.

[68]. He continues to say that, "No problem was raised for the Christian writers in citing O.T. passages from the translated Greek version rather than from the original Hebrew. Thus, an overwhelming majority of the O.T. citations are drawn from the LXX (*Finding the OT*, 82).

[69]. E.E. ELLIS, *Uses*, 199-219.

the author's memory letting him down, this viewpoint attracts less attention now than it has done in the past.[70]

W.C. Kaiser (1985) refers to the fact that some explicit quotations point to a source, or sources, which are unknown today. In his discussion of this issue, he could be linked with previous scholars, as far back as *Johnson* (1896),[71] when he typifies these quotations as "quotations of substance", and with *Gardiner* (1887)[72] when he describes these as being "summaries of the teaching of various parts of the older Scriptures".[73]

3.3.2 Text-theories about the availability of OT material

Several theories were developed to answer the question about the practical availability of OT material for the writers of the NT. This was done after it became clear that there are several places in the NT where the readings of explicit material differ, in both minor and major detail, from its supposed source material. Although some of these differences could be explained by way of reference to the diversity of existing textmaterial, or by reference to the specific (exegetical) method used by a certain NT writer, there still seem to be some remaining instances for which, scholars believe, these explanations are inadequate.

Further possible explanations have therefore been developed. These theories fall into either of two basic categories: either the differences are explained in terms of a written source (testimonies, florilegia, etc.), or in terms of an oral source (including quotation from memory).

(a) Testimonies and/or florilegia[74] (E. Hatch, J.R. Harris)

Some of the most important *supporters* or representatives of this hypothesis, are the following:

E. Hatch[75] who, as early as 1889 argued, on scientific grounds, in favour of the existence of florilegia. According to this hypothesis, the writers of the NT made use of already existing collections of OT textmaterial. In 1895 this hypothesis was tested

---

[70]. He said: "...citations diverge from the LXX because of deliberate alteration, i.e. by *ad hoc* translation and elaboration or by the use of a variant textual tradition, to serve the purpose of the New Testament writer. The variations, then, become an important clue to discover not only the writer's interpretation of the individual Old Testament passage but also his perspective on the Old Testament as a whole" (*NT Uses*, 199).

[71]. F. JOHNSON, *The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old considered in the light of General Literature*, London 1896.

[72]. F. GARDINER, *The Old Testament and the New Testament in their Mutual Relations*, London 1887.

[73]. Cf. W.C. KAISER, *Uses of the OT*, 4.

[74]. Cf. to O. MICHEL, *Paulus und seine Bibel*, Darmstadt 1972, 213-221; A.C. SUNDBERG, On Testimonies, in: *NT* 3 (1959), 268-281; M. RESE, *Motive*, 217-223; E.E. ELLIS, *Paul's Use*, 98-107; idem., *OT in Early Christianity*, 59-61; and P. GRECH, The 'Testimonia' and Modern Hermeneutics, in: *NTS* 19 (1972/73), 318-324; C.A.J. PILLAI, *Early Missionary Preaching*, 43-44; W.C. KAISER, *Uses of the OT*, 10-13; D.A. KOCH, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 247-256.

[75]. E. HATCH, *Essays*, 203-204.

by *Vollmer*[76] on the quotations of Paul. He concluded in favour of the hypothesis on the basis that the quotations differ so much from the LXX witnesses, that they could not have been taken from the LXX.

Two studies by *J.R. Harris*[77] made their appearance between 1916-1920 in three volumes under the title, "Testimonies". *Harris* wanted to prove that Christianity followed Judaism in their use of a collection of texts with a polemic-literary genre. He identified this collection with the well known Logia of Papias. The identification of the Logia with an anti-Jewish testimony-book was rejected in 1935, in a dissertation of *N.J. Hommes*[78] on the whole matter of testimonies as such. The latter thought, nonetheless, that there may have been some written collections in existence during the early Christian times, but concluded that these came into existence after the era of the NT. Comparing the quotations of the four gospels, he also suggested the possibility that these writers might have worked with already existing groups of texts. In 1947 the discovery of *the Dead Sea scrolls* presented some concrete evidence of the existence of early dated collections of texts in the forms of both testimonies as well as florilegia. This proved the theory of *Vollmer* that such collections were in existence in Hebrew at an early date. During the same period, *C. Smits* (1952) too argued that one had to take seriously the possibility of such written collections which could have been used by the writers of the NT.[79]

The theory continued to receive support. Also *M. Wilcox* (1955), prefers a type of *testimonia* fragment which might contain a selection of "OT" excerpts with a messianic trend.

Some of the most important *non-supporters* or representatives against this hypothesis, are the following:

As early as 1929, even before the criticism by *Hommes* (1935) of *Harris*, *O. Michel*[80] stated in his study on Paul that the existence of such florilegia, or a testimony book, could only be limited to early Christian writers outside the NT corpus. *Michel* explained the strange text-combinations that are used by Paul, from the perspective of a rabbinic method of quotation.

K. Stendahl too, in his study on Mt (1954), found no grounds for accepting the theses of testimonia as an explanation for the occurrence of combined quotations. He thought that there are simpler reasons at hand to explain these combined quotations. This was supported by the later study (1975) of *R.H. Gundry*, who has also worked on Mt. His viewpoint is clearly summarized as follows: "First, it is

---

[76]. H. VOLLMER, *Citate*.

[77]. J.R. HARRIS, *Testimonies I-III*, Cambridge 1916-1920.

[78]. N.J. HOMMES, *Het Testimonieboek. Studiën over O.T. citaten in het N.T. en bij de Patres, met critische beschouwingen over de theorieën van J. Rendel Harris en D. Plooy*, Amsterdam 1935.

[79]. C. SMITS said: "...dat in het vroeg-christelijk milieu uit de paranese, uit polemiek en propaganda, ook schriftelijk vastgelegde collecties vroegtijdig zijn gevormd in de vorm van afzonderlijke tractaten over diverse onderwerpen, die mogelijkerwijze voortkomen uit oudere collecties, en naar omstandigheden vrij werden gebruikt. Tekstcombinaties worden reeds gevonden in sommige jongere boeken van het Oude Testament" (*Citaten I*, 20).

[80]. O. MICHEL, *Paulus*, 213-221.

probable that the early Christians availed themselves of already existing Jewish catenae of Messianic texts and, following the Jewish example, compiled their own. Second, it is impossible to determine which quotations might have belonged to testimony traditions. Third, the heavy Semitic element throughout synoptic quotations, outside Marcan formal quotations, means that a Semitic textform does not imply testimony origin. Many of these Semitic quotations are not of the testimony kind. Fourth, the Testimony Book is not to be equated with τὰ λόγια which Papias said Mt wrote in the Hebrew dialect. Thus, the Testimony Book is a partially confirmed hypothesis which disappointingly explains little or nothing".[81]

(b) "Bible of the apostles"/"of the early church" (A. Sperber, C.H. Dodd)

According to *C.H. Dodd* (1952),[82] the following conclusions could be made with regard to the testimonia-book-hypothesis: (i) this "book" of isolated prooftexts was the result, and not the starting-point of Scripture study by the early Christians; (ii) a study of OT texts which are quoted in more than one group of authors in the NT, points to the fact that the early church has studied and used only a highly selective corpus of OT passages; (iii) early Christian interpretations of the Scriptures were not atomistic — the citing of specific texts functioned much more as references to complete contexts; (iv) an oral tradition of Scripture interpretation is the substructure of all Christian theology; (v) the method and pattern of early Christian interpretation of the Scriptures was already laid down by Jesus himself. *Dodd* then, proposed a so-called "Bible of the early church".

This was not such a new idea, as already in the previous decade *A. Sperber* had indicated that there had been in existence a "Bible of the Apostles".[83] He posited the existence of a further Greek translation of the OT, independent of the LXX. This hypothetical "Bible of the Apostles" was then used as a source for quotations by the NT writers. The aim of his investigation was to focus on the problem of the source, or sources, of these differences as resulting from the influence of a completely different Greek OT translation than the known and existing witnesses. This theory of *Sperber* has not received any support at all.

(c) Targumim (M. Black, P. Kahle)

M. Black (1948) has contributed to the Aramaic stream of thinking, especially in his study on the Gospels and Ac,[84] although also in his other studies.[85] In these were to

---

[81]. R.H. GUNDRY, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel: With Special reference to the Messianic Hope*, Leiden 1975, 165-166.

[82]. C.H. DODD, *According to the Scriptures*, London 1952.

[83]. A. SPERBER has said: "By the term 'Bible of the Apostles' we don't mean to imply that the OT in Greek, which the respective authors or compilers of the entire NT used either as a basis for their narratives of events, or while expounding their theology, was a uniform textual type, so that all OT references therein could be made use of in our endeavors to reconstruct this Bible" (*NT and Septuagint*, 204-5).

[84]. M. BLACK, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 1946[1], 1967[3].

[85]. *Ibid.*, Aramaic Studies and the New Testament: the Unpublished Work of the late A.J. WENSINCK of Leyden, in: *JThS* 49 (1948), 157-165; *idem.*, Unsolved New Testament Problems: The Problem of the Aramaic Element in the Gospels, in: *ET* 59 (1948), 171-176.

be found probably some of the most acceptable arguments to date for explaining a reasonable amount of Semitisms in the NT. He has postulated, for example, against *G. Dalman* (1898) that Targumim Onkelos and Jonathan were influenced on its own by Hebrew and Babylonian Aramaic, and that they could therefore not be faithful witnesses. The work of *A.J. Wensinck* (1948) plays an important role for *Black*. *Wensinck* has reckoned that the old Palestinian Targum of the Pentateuch (which was found among the Cairo Geniza), was used with related *haggadaic* parts, which were preserved in the so-called pseudo-Jonathan and fragmentary targumim.[86]

P. Kahle[87] (1947) has reckoned that the quotations and the readings in the NT which have no similarities with the LXX, represent the textforms of written Greek targumim. These targumim were in general use before Christianity adopted the LXX as the standard version of "the OT". This opinion of *Kahle* relates with his text-theory with regard to the origin of the Old Greek Version. He believed that it originated from the compilation of a group of Greek targumim, which in turn, had evolved naturally in the synagogues. There are supporters of this theory even today, although time has shown that it does not hold water. In addition to the several arguments against his hypothesis, one could also argue against the fact that the writers of the NT, who were responsible for quotations which could not to be traced back to the existing LXX traditions, were not limited to the Greek only.

(d) Jewish-Hellenistic and Liturgical-homilies (G.D. Kilpatrick)

G.D. Kilpatrick[88] (1946) suggested that the documentary source material of Mt, Mk, Q and M were read liturgically and expanded homiletically until it gained a certain stereotyped form. It was eventually written down as, for example, Matthew's gospel, which was meant for further liturgical use. However, *Kilpatrick* never explains the textform of the Matthean quotations. In particular, he has no criterion by which to consider if a LXX quotation is coming from the gospel writer himself, or from the liturgic homiletic tradition.

This theory has also influenced the study of the speeches in Ac, especially that of Ac 13. *J.W. Doeve* (1953),[89] *J.W. Bowker* (1967),[90] *D. Goldsmith* (1968),[91] *E.E. Ellis* (1971),[92] *L. Wills* (1984)[93] and *D.L. Bock* (1987)[94] are some of those who have argued about the underlying form of a (Hellenistic) Jewish sermon in Ac 13.

[86]. See C.F.D. MOULE, *An Idiom-book of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge 1977, 189.

[87]. P.E. KAHLE, *The Cairo Geniza*. (The Schweich Lectures 1941), Oxford 1959.

[88]. G.D. KILPATRICK, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, Oxford 1946.

[89]. J.W. DOEVE, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, Assen 1954. [Diss. Leiden 1953].

[90]. J.W. BOWKER, Speeches in Acts. A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form, in: *NTS* 14 (1967/68), 96-111.

[91]. D. GOLDSMITH, Acts 13:33-37: A *Pesher* on II Sam 7, in: *JBL* 87 (1968), 321-324.

[92]. E.E. ELLIS, Midraschartige Züge in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte, in: *ZNW* 62 (1971), 94-104.

[93]. L. WILLS, The Form of the Sermon in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity, in: *HThR* 77 (1984), 277-299.

[94]. D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*.

(e) Semitic sources translated (C.C. Torrey)

Some of the first most prominent works in this direction, were those of *G.E. Lessing* (1729-1781), who has proposed a primitive Aramaic gospel as being the origin for the three synoptic gospels,[95] as well as those of *G. Dalman* (1898)[96] and *J. Wellhausen* (1905).[97]

     This trend, to find Aramaic sources (orally or written), would continue to attract scholars. *C.F. Burney* (1909-1925) and *C.C. Torrey* would contribute the most in this direction. *C.F. Burney* has focused upon John's Gospel, and tried to indicate that it was to be traced back to an Aramaic origin.[98] According to *C.C. Torrey*, the quotations to be found in Mt and Mk were written in metrical Hebrew in an Aramaic book. The Greek translator of Mt then took those quotations which are similar in both Mt and Mk, from the Greek gospel of Mk. The remaining quotations in Mt were translated independently and accurately from the Hebrew.[99] He reckoned even that the gospels were done in their totality in Aramaic. It is therefore no wonder that, on the basis of his own reconstructions, he later found it necessary to publish new translations of the gospels! *Torrey*'s contribution [100] was so far-reaching that it was later said to be an overstated case for actual Aramaic sources.[101] Probably one of the most comprehensive criticisms of the work of *Torrey* came from *J. de Zwaan* who has proved that several of *Torrey*'s conclusions were false.[102]

     But also *M. Wilcox* (1955) would criticize *Torrey*, saying that the Semitic element of the NT could not be attributed to one factor alone (Aramaic).[103] He made, for example, a distiction between three categories with regard to the Semitisms in Ac: (a) words, phrases, and verses reflecting some kind of affinity to, or

---

[95]. Cf. G.E. LESSING, Theses aus der Kirchengeschichte, Teil 21, (1776), in: J. PETERSEN & W. VON OLSHAUSEN (hrsg), *Lessings Werke: Vollständige Ausgabe in funfundzwanzig Teilen*, Berlin 1925.

[96]. G. DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu. Mit Berücksichtigung des nachkanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache, Vol. I*, Leipzig 1898. According to C.F.D. MOULE, Dalman has tried to reconstruct "the actual words used by Jesus in speaking of the leading ideas of his message. He distinguished between Judean and Galilean Aramaic, and conjectured that Jesus might have used both. To reconstruct the former, Dalman used mainly the Targum of Onkelos to the Pentateuch and that of Jonathan to the Prophets. For Galilean, he used mainly Talmudic sources" (*Idiom-Book*, 189).

[97]. Cf. J. WELLHAUSEN, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, Berlin 1905.

[98]. C.F. BURNEY's most important works in this area included: *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, Oxford 1922; *The Poetry of our Lord: An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ*, Oxford 1925.

[99]. R.H. GUNDRY shows, however, that "...wholesale revision of the LXX toward the NT is very improbable, especially in allusive quotations, which would hardly come to the mind of LXX-copyists" (*Use of the OT*, 153).

[100]. Cf. for instance: *The Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels*, New York 1912; *The Composition and Date of Acts* (HThS 1), Cambridge 1916; The Aramaic Origin of the Gospel of John, in: *HThR* 16 (1923), 305-344; and others.

[101]. So C.F.D. MOULE, *Idiom-book*, 189.

[102]. Cf. J. DE ZWAAN, The Use of the Greek Language in Acts, in: F.J. FOAKES JACKSON & K. LAKE (eds), *The Beginnings of Early Christianity. Part II: The Acts of the Apostles*, London 1922, 30f.

[103]. M. WILCOX, *The Semitisms of Acts*, Oxford 1965. This is the publication of his Ph.D thesis at the University of Edinburgh in 1955 with the title: *The Semitisms of Acts i-xv*.

knowledge of, OT traditions, not Greek but Semitic; (b) words and phrases, Semitic in nature, possibly traceable to some kind of influence of the LXX; and (c) other words and phrases, Semitic in nature, not explicable in terms of LXX influence.

When looking specifically at the then controversial "Hebraic character of Ac 1-15", the fact of (a) has already led to the question of whether parts of Ac (especially Ac 1-15,[104] according to *Torrey*, were not probably translations of an Aramaic or Hebrew document. *Wilcox* reckoned, however, that "...whatever evidence we have here does not justify or even suggest the actual direct use by Luke of Semitic documentary sources".[105] Then there are also some Semitisms which, although they could probably be traced back to Hebrew or Aramaic, were possibly used by Luke in their already translated Greek forms.[106] *Wilcox* sees the case of the speeches in Ac as being different, with the LXX as the main source, but loose elements from other Scripture text traditions (mostly targumim) being used too. The fact that the "OT" material in these speeches could probably not be traced back to an alternative Greek "OT" textual witness, is more acceptable to *Wilcox*. Such a variant would be too complicated on the one hand, and would not be able to explain the remaining Semitisms, on the other hand.

Torrey's hypothesis was thus proved to be unsubstantiated by *Wilcox* and others, while these so-called Aramaisms could be traced back via the influence of the LXX language, and could therefore be typified as "Septuagintisms".[107]

R. Martin (1987)[108] has conveniently summarized the various theories for the cause of Semitisms, which have been postulated and vigorously defended over the years, under the following categories:[109] (i) the use of Semitic sources; (ii) translation of an entire Semitic Gospel or, in the case of Ac, a Semitic document roughly equivalent to Ac 1-15; (iii) thinking in Hebrew or Aramaic[110] whether the result of (a) those languages being the writer's vernacular, and/or (b) the writer's

104. The fact that many more references to the "OT" are to be found in the first half of Ac, was also later pointed out by W.K.L. CLARKE (The Use of the Septuagint in Acts, in: F.J. FOAKES-JACKSON & K. LAKE (eds), *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*, London 1922, 66-105; here 98); and was later agreed to by M. WILCOX (*Semitisms*, 60); as well as by E. PLÜMACHER (*Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*, Göttingen 1972, 39).

105. M. WILCOX, *Semitisms*, 181.

106. M. WILCOX said of these: "These little 'knots' of Semitic material surviving unrevised, although affording a rather strong indication of the general authenticity of the stories in which they are embedded, nevertheless do not permit us to argue in favour of translation of Aramaic or Hebrew sources by Luke" (*Semitisms*, 181).

107. So also in the same direction, E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 39-40; and A. WEISER: "Die angeblichen 'Aramaismen' erklären sich fast ausschließlich durch Sprachstil der Septuaginta. Ihr hat Lukas ja auch seine Zitate entnommen" (*Apg I*, 37).

108. Cf. R. MARTIN, Semitic Traditions in Some Synoptic Accounts, in: K.H. RICHARDS (ed), *SBL Seminar Papers* 26, Atlanta 1987, 295-335. Also *idem., Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*, (SCS 3), Cambridge 1974.

109. R. MARTIN, *Semitic Traditions*, 295-335. However, according to him "...the question arises whether it is possible to distinguish between those Semitisms which indicate underlying sources and traditions, rather than merely being features of the writer's natural or consciously-artificial Semitic style" (295).

110. Cf. N. TURNER, Papyrus Finds (Second Thoughts 7). *ET* 76 (1964), 44-48.

familiarity with the LXX which has resulted in a "Biblical Greek' vernacular; and (iv) conscious imitation of the language and style of the LXX.

(f) Quotation from memory

There is a trend in scholarship, although extremely small, to explain the differences between the readings of the LXX and the quotations in the NT, as being the result of quotation from memory. *Smits* has warned already against this in 1952.[111]

3.4 Categorization, classification and modes of quotation

One of the earliest writings on the different modes of quotation was written by *H. Owen* (1789).[112] About a century later (1896), *F. Johnson*[113] not only identified and numbered the quotations in the NT, but also paid attention to the modes of quotation. These categories could best be described as a conflation between the methods (modes) of quotation, on the one hand, and the exegetical hermeneutical method of the NT writer, on the other hand. He distinguished between: (a) quotation from memory, (b) fragmentary quotations, (c) combined quotations, (d) quotations where the main issue is stated, (e) changed meaning in quotations to suit their purpose, and (f) quotations with double references in the Bible. He attempted to explain, organize and classify the unqualified use of quotations in the NT. Important is that he constantly used the LXX as source and said that: (i) The writers of the NT, instead of translating their quotations directly from the Hebrew, and thus presenting us with exact transcriptions of the original text, have taken them, generally, from the LXX version, which is not free of faults; (ii) Their quotations from the LXX are often verbally inexact, and their variations from this version are seldom of the nature of corrections, since they seem usually to have quoted from memory.

In the second part of *E. Hühn*'s book (1900), he has presented a discussion on, and a description of, the quotations (and references) under a *Rückblick*. Here he has tried to categorize the OT material identified in the first part. He has also realized that some of the quotations and references are to be found outside the "OT" corpus. On the same track as *Johnson*, attention was paid here also to the modes of quotation, although within only two categories: (a) formal use, and (b) factual (precise) use.

H.B. Swete (1900) searched for reasons (in the synoptic gospels) for the differences between the readings of the NT quotation and its source text: (a) free quotation, (b) substitution by way of a gloss for the precise words that the reader has pretended to quote, (c) need to adopt a prophetic context for the circumstances under which it is thought to be fulfilled, (d) the conflation of passages taken from different contexts, (e) recensional changes, (f) changes due to translation, independent from the original.

---

[111]. C. SMITS, *Citaten II.*
[112]. H. OWEN, *Modes of Quotation.*
[113]. F. JOHNSON, *Quotations of the NT.*

B.F.C. Atkinson (1947) has stipulated some ways in which, he believes, the NT writers have used the passages at their disposal: (a) inaccuracy when quoting from memory, (b) shortening of passages, because of the omission of single words, phrases, and even full sentences, (c) grammatical or syntactical adaptation, and (d) the syncretism or conflation of two or more passages in a single quotation.

An important distinction was made by *C. Smits* between "explicit quotations", being those which are introduced by a proper introductory formula, and "implicit quotations", being those without a clear introductory formula.

The study of *T. Holtz* (1964/68) is divided into three major categories: independent quotations, the Pentateuch in Lk-Ac, and quotations from different origins. Apart from this categorization, he also distinguishes more closely between quotations from the 12P, Is and the Pss when dealing with the independent quotations.

Although *H.M. Shires* (1974)[114] has not drawn up an explicit typology of modes of quotation, his discussion implicitly identifies eight such categories: (a) free quotations, (b) combined quotations, (c) unidentified quotations, (d) extra canonical quotations, (e) series of joint quotations, (f) brief quotations, presupposing the rest of the context, (g) quotations repeated several times, and (h) quotations changed to suit the arguments.

In their synopsis, *G.L. Archer* and *G. Chirichigno* (1983) divided the quotations into six categories: (a) "reasonably or completely accurate renderings from the Hebrew of the MT into the Greek of the LXX and from there...into the NT passage"; (b) "...instances where the NT quotation quite closely adheres to the wording of the LXX, even where the LXX deviates somewhat"; (c) "...citations in which the NT adheres more closely to the MT than the LXX does..."; (d) "...passages in which the NT quotation adheres quite closely to the LXX rendering, even when it deviates somewhat from the MT"; (e) "...consists of those that give the impression that unwarranted liberties were taken with the OT text in the light of its context"; (f) "...many cases of close resemblance or complete identity between the OT source and the NT application".

With regard to the modes of quotation, *W.C. Kaiser* (1985) has made an important observation. Different modes of quotation were attributed in the past to causes such as (a) quotation from memory, (b) translation problems which have developed during the translation process from the Hebrew or Aramaic to the Greek, (c) the availabilty of different recensions of the Greek (as codex A^{LXX} or codex B^{LXX}). *Kaiser*, however, reckons that after the discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls, another explanation could be put forward. In these documents were found clear traces of the *pesher* method of exegesis. According to this method, the quoter or commentator could simply incorporate his own application or interpretation into the centre of his quotation.[115] The pendulum has probably now started to swing away from focusing on the modes of quotation (described previously on the basis of differences which were detected via textual criticism), to the exegetical and hermeneutical methods which were employed by the NT writer.

---

[114]. H.M. SHIRES, *Finding the OT*.
[115]. W.C. KAISER, *Uses of the OT*, 6.

3.5 Function and interpretation of the quotations

F. Johnson (1896) has already paid implicit attention to the issue of the NT writers' interpretation of their scriptural material, and decided between (a) exegetical paraphrasing, (b) allegory, (c) non-logical arguing, and (d) rabbinic interpretation as possibilities for the occurrence of readings which differ in the NT and related LXX source material.

The doctoral thesis of *A. Vis* was published in 1936.[116] According to him, the early Christians have seen these Scriptures (OT) as "Holy Scripture".[117] His work then also touches upon the issue of changed LXX readings in the NT. He strongly emphasized the reason for this, which he found in the understanding of the authority of Scripture by the writers of the NT on the one hand, and their exegetical analyses on the other hand, in order to indicate that Jesus was the Messiah. According to him, the early Christians used the known methods of the rabbinics, and found nothing strange in this as they were, for all practical purposes, still Jews.

The point of departure for *Smits* (1952), when discussing the quotations, is the messianic theme, as expounded earlier by *E. Hühn* (1900). From this starting-point, one can easily proceed to the theme of "Jesus and the OT (Scriptures)". *Smits* divides Jesus' use of the OT (Scripture) on the basis of his use of the Law, Prophets and implicit quotations in the expressions and speeches of Jesus.[118] Longer speeches by Jesus show specific trends. The Sermon on the Mount would, for instance, be heavily inspired by expressions from the wisdom literature. In this type of literature, which emphasizes moral aspects, a more literal type of citing is found. In the parables, according to *Smits*, the quotations are of minor importance, as quotations in this *genre* are extremely rare; the few quotations which do appear are taken, largely, from the wisdom literature, and are used simply by way of illustration. The real theme is God's kingdom. In eschatological expressions, however, OT material is used extensively. Texts are combined, and this forms the basis for the compilation of the whole speech. The basis is formed by the prophetic books which are eschatologically focused.[119]

---

[116]. A. VIS, *The Messianic Psalm Quotations in the New Testament - A critical study on the Christian "Testimonies" in the Old Testament*, Amsterdam 1936.

[117]. A. VIS wrote: "In this Word of God they expected, as a matter of course, a confirmation of their belief that in Jesus the expected Messiah had appeared". "...like the Jewish scribes, in giving a Messianic turn to the OT words, they ignored and distorted the meaning and intention of the original wirters". "From the text available for them (in most cases this was the LXX) they drew out the hidden significance which they believed to underlie the words of the Scripture" (*Messianic Psalm Quotations*, 82).

[118]. C. SMITS summarizes the situation as follows: "In talrijke korte gezegden druk Jesus zijn gedachten uit in aanhalingen uit het Oude Testament. Door de omstandigheden, waarin ze worden uitgesproken, of door de context waarin ze worden gezet, krijgen deze uitspraken een zeer reële en diepe betekenis, die niet altijd volledig beantwoord aan die oorspronklijke zin, maar gewoonlik wel ligt in die lijn der oud-testamentische teksten. Elk geval moet op zichzelf in de context gezien worden" (*Citaten I*, 108-9).

[119]. C. SMITS, *Citaten I*, 109.

In the last volume of *Smits* (1963), he states explicitly that the discoveries at the Dead Sea have brought interesting parallels to the fore, which have confirmed previous presuppositions about texts and Jewish exegesis of them.[120]

In his study of the explicit quotations *M. Rese* (1965/69) shifts the focus in the direction of the contextual use of the quotations. Attention is now paid to the functional aspect of the quotations in their context.[121]

A few years later, *C.K. Barrett* (1970) gave an exposition of "The Interpretation of the OT in the New".[122] It gives a summary of the OT hermeneutics of Philo, the rabbinic exegetical methodology (in which the seven rules of Hillel figure prominently), the Qumran exegesis, and a discussion on the exegetical methods, as well as the contents and purpose of the use of OT material by the NT writers. It is an useful synthesis of the research results of the time.

During 1972 a collection of essays was presented in honour of *W.F. Stinespring*, edited by *J.M. Efird*, with the main contribution by *D.M. Smith*.[123] Although the main focus here is on the hermeneutical aspect of the use of the OT in the NT, attention should also be paid to *Smith*'s categorized division in this field. After a brief introduction on the anachronism of the phrase "the OT in the New", the study field is discussed thematically, although still within a chronological development. Important issues to which attention is paid, are the problems of the OT canon, the existence of several texts and recensions, and the use of the OT in late Judaism (all of which are discussed under the nomer of the use of the OT at the beginning of the Christian era). Jesus' use of the OT, that of the early church, and the function of the OT in the early Christian preaching and education, are treated later, under the discussion on the use of the OT by early Christianity. After this a brief discussion follows on the use of the OT by the NT writers. The study ends with a discussion on the importance of the OT for the NT. *Smith* reckons that the problem of Jesus' use of the OT is extremely complex. Ultimately, it cannot be separated from the question of the historical Jesus and the proclaimed Christ.[124]

In the study of *H.Shires* (1974), he implicitly denies the standpoint of *Smits* (that the OT material in Jesus' parables are of minor importance. The difference between them is probably to be found in the emphasis on explicit quotations in *Smits'* study, while that of Shires could be labelled much more a study of "motifs". *Shires* has started to pay attention to the broader context and the intertextual relationship between the OT and the NT on a semantic basis, rather than approaching the study on the basis of *ad hoc* syntactical expressions. He pays attention to the already mentioned methods of promise-fulfillment and typology, and mentions also the literal method of exegesis which was used by the NT writers.[125]

---

[120]. Cf. C. SMITS, *Citaten IV*, 598.

[121]. M. RESE said: "Die Frage nach den alttestamentlichen Motiven in der Christologie des Lukas ist also ein Versuch, die Theologie des Lukas näher zu bestimmen" (*Motive*, 25).

[122]. C.K. BARRETT, *Interpretation*, 377-411.

[123]. D.M. SMITH, *Use of the OT*, 3-65.

[124]. "...there is a real problem as to the extent to which the use of the Old Testament in the New - even in the Gospel - reflects directly or indirectly Jesus' own meditation over, and interpretation of, the Scriptures" (*Use of the OT*, 21).

[125]. H.M. SHIRES, *Finding the OT*, 35.

During 1975 an extensive study by *R. Longenecker* was published on "Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period".[126] Although it is a study which discusses the exegetical methods exclusively from the perspective of the OT quotations in the NT, these insights have implications for the rest of the OT material in the NT. *Longenecker* is of the opinion that the early Christian writings should be compared with Jewish interpretative documents from the same period, in order to understand first century exegetical procedures. It is of great importance to him that in such a determining study of these exegetical procedures, the LXX documents must remain at the background. Due to the fact that it might be seen as a "theological commentary", and as a "primary source for a knowledge of the hermeneutical procedures of the day", he is convinced that the importance of the LXX has been over-emphasized, "...therefore, the LXX will not be considered of major significance in determining the exegetical practices of first century Judaism".[127] The basic idea behind this is that *Longenecker* realizes that the LXX is a translation, and that any translation is in itself already an interpretation. With the targumim, however, he is of the opinion that this is a different issue, as "...their purpose in rendering the Hebrew into Aramaic was not just to give a vernacular translation of the Bible, but...'to give the sense and make the people understand the meaning'".[128] In addition to the targumim, also the Mishna, midrashim, Jewish apocalyptic works, Dead Sea scrolls and Philo of Alexandria are used as witnessess for the study of early Jewish exegesis. *Longenecker* identifies then the following exegetical methods: (a) literal interpretation, (b) midrash, (c) pesher, and (d) allegory. With these as a frame, he then discusses Jesus' and Paul's use of the OT on the basis of their quotations. With regard to the hermeneutics of the NT writers, he showed that they have interpreted these Scriptures christologically. Paul, for instance, understood the OT (as the early Jewish Christians) christologically.[129]

W.C. Kaiser (1985) elaborates further on the manner in which the NT writers have dealt with their Scriptures.[130] He discussed five such ways: (a) apologetic, (b) prophetic, (c) typological, (d) theological, and (e) practical use of the OT. Under the "apologetic use", he has taken those materials which were used for the purposes of an argument. It is the same as the literal interpretation of *Shires* and of *Longenecker*.[131] With regard to the "prophetic use", *Kaiser* shares the understanding of the same as *Ellis* with his "New Covenant Exegesis" (promise-fulfillment).[132] Today, however, this viewpoint is supported by only a handful of scholars. The

---

[126]. R. LONGENECKER, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, Michigan 1975.

[127]. R. LONGENECKER, *Biblical Exegesis*, 21.

[128]. *Ibid.*

[129]. "And he worked from the same two fixed points: (1) the Messiahship and Lordship of Jesus, as validated by the resurrection and as witnessed to by the Spirit; and (2) the revelation of God in the Scriptures of the Old Testament" (R. LONGENECKER, *Biblical Exegesis*, 104).

[130]. W.C. KAISER, *Uses of the OT*.

[131]. "It is in those texts more than in any other that we would expect the meaning of the OT text to be the same as the NT meaning" (W.C. KAISER, *Uses of the OT*, 17).

[132]. He here moves within the stream that believes "The amazing feature of OT prophecy is that there is a unity and a single plan throughout the testament - not diverse, separate, and scattered predications. Each new word is invariably added to the ongoing and continious promise-plan of God..." (*Uses of the OT*, 63).

"typological use" deals with an exegetical method already known and accepted at the time. When *Kaiser* arrives at his discussion of the "theological use", he believes that he has pushed through to the heart of the problem of the relation OT-NT. At the end, one deals here with the "centre" of both testaments, i.e. God. His dealing with the "practical use", includes the NT writers' handling of wisdom literature and legal parts, in order to establish a practical and ethical lifestyle for their readers. It is clear that *Kaiser* uses a strong theological-hermeneutical basis as his point of departure, when establishing the exegetical hermeneutical methods of the NT writers. One could ask if his work is, in the end, perhaps nothing more than a compilation of existing viewpoints on OT theology and the relation OT-NT, and therefore the formation of his own hermeneutics, rather than the scientific result of historical research of the exegetical methods of the early Christians.

The 1982 doctoral study of *D.L. Bock* was published in 1987.[133] The particular focus of the study is *P. Schubert*'s "proof from prophecy"-thesis, formulated in 1954, on the basis of Lk 24. According to *Bock*, this thesis was later contradicted by *M. Rese*, who tried to establish the influence of the OT on Luke, and its re-interpretation within the context of Luke's handling of the christology. The question that *Bock* then poses, is: Who is right? *Rese* or *Schubert*? He therefore once again pays attention to Luke's handling of the OT. What is important here is *Bock*'s description of how researchers in the past have evaluated the "proof from prophecy"-motif in Lk-Ac. It has come increasingly under fire. This has led to increased efforts towards a clear understanding of Luke's purpose in his use of the OT. Where it was said in the past that Luke's purpose was to show that the Christ should suffer, be raised from death, and offer forgiveness of sins, *E. Franklin*[134] has seen it differently, i.e. that the use of the OT indicates that Jesus is the Lord.[135] All this again brought the question concerning Luke's hermeneutical method prominently to the foreground. According to *Bock*, this is then to be found in Luke's use of the OT for his christology. The christology thus forms the hermeneutical key to Luke's use of the OT. An important point of departure for *Bock*'s work is to be found in the fact that he uses a far more thematic and contextual approach than most previous studies, which tended to a more fragmentary and *ad hoc* approach. Having selected a specific set of NT documents (Lk-Ac), *Bock* takes account of the context of the passages he discusses, as well as the hermeneutics of the NT writer with regard to his OT material.

In 1983 *D.-A. Koch* submitted his "Habilitationsschrift" at the Johannes-Gutenberg-Universität at Mainz; this was published in 1986 in the series "Beiträge zur historischen Theologie" under the title "Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus".[136] It is an excellent study, in which the long research history of Paul's use of the OT

---

[133]. D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*. (It was originally submitted in 1982 as a Ph.D-thesis at the University of Aberdeen).

[134]. E. FRANKLIN, *Christ the Lord. A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*, London 1975.

[135]. "The OT texts are not used for apologetic but merely to interpret or explain theologically the meaning of the events of Jesus' career" (D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 37).

[136]. D.-A. KOCH, *Schrift als Zeuge*, title page.

reached a climax.[137] This is a study in which careful and conscious attention is paid to methodological accuracy. The author takes full account of the problematics surrounding the text which Paul could have had in front of him, the exegetical methods which Paul could have shared with his Jewish and Hellenistic contemporaries, the testimonia hypothesis, as well as the hermeneutical use of Scripture in the individual Pauline letters. The first two issues centre on Paul's use of Scripture ("Schriftverwendung") and the last two on Paul's understanding of Scripture ("Schriftverständnis"). In contrast with earlier studies, *Koch* points out that Paul's handling of introductory formulae is proof that his exegetical procedures did not follow those of the rabbinics as found in Alexandrian Judaism and at Qumran, but rather those of the diaspora Jews. According to *Koch*, Paul made primary use of material from Is, the Pss, Dt and Gn. Instead of following the hypothesis of testimonia, *Koch* is of the opinion that Paul rather used a LXX text, but one which was changed to be closer to the Hebrew. He admits that this does not explain all the differences between Paul's OT material and that of existing textual witnesses. The remaining differences could, on the other hand, also not be explained away as being the result of Paul quoting from memory. In his investigation into this category, he found that 52 of the 93 texts which are to be found in the 7 letters of Paul, were changed. These changes vary from minor differences (such as changes from singular to plural, or first-, second- and third-person changes to fit the context in which the quotation is presented) to major differences (in which omissions and additions are made, in order to give a new meaning to the OT material used by Paul).

With regard to Paul's exegetical methods, *Koch* highlighted four prominent methods: allegory, typology, midrash and pesher. Also the manner in which Paul deploys his quotations in his argumentation, is focused on: as illustration, or to confirm or explain what he is saying, to form a basis for his argument, and to continue an earlier argument.

According to *Koch*, Paul found the gospel in the OT, where it is a witness for the gospel, rather than a prophecy which had to be fulfilled.[138]

A collective work under the editorship of *M.J. Mulder* and *H. Sysling* was published in 1988.[139] One of these essays deals with "Biblical Interpretation in the NT Church", written by *E.E. Ellis*.[140] This is a continuation and elaboration of the insights of *Ellis*' previous works of 1957 and 1977 specifically, with regard to the exegetical and hermeneutical methods of the NT writers. A usable overview is given on the introductory formulae, other exegetical terminology, the seven rules of Hillel, and on midrash exegesis. Regarding the NT writers' perspective on their Scriptures, *Ellis* is of the opinion that they had certain presuppositions in mind in at least four areas: (a) eschatology, (b) typology, (c) a corporate understanding of humanity and the Messiah, and (d) a concept of the Scriptures as the hidden Word of God. This is

---

[137]. It is therefore no wonder that R.B. HAYS also, in his recension on D.-A. KOCH's work, typified it as "...the most comprehensive book ever written on Paul's use of Scripture, and probably also the best" (in: *JBL* 107 (1988), 331-333).

[138]. Cf. E. BEST, Recent Continental New Testament Literature, in: *ET* 99 (1988), 296-300.

[139]. M.J. MULDER & H. SYSLING (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT II 1), Philadelphia 1988.

[140]. E.E. ELLIS, *Biblical Interpretation*.

a kind of redivision, to a certain extent, of the previous "traditional" division of exegetical methods. With regard to the exegetical methods themselves, *Ellis* deals primarily with the explicit quotations which are introduced by introductory formulae, as well as the use of the rabbinic rules of Hillel and the midrash method. Typology is rather seen as a hermeneutical point of departure than a specific exegetical method.[141] His "new covenant" concept of 1957 still underlies his work as a "prophecy-fulfillment" schema. It is clear that for *Ellis*, it centres on a messianic focus — just as was the case with *E. Hühn* (1900), *A. Vis* (1936), *C. Smits* (1952) and *R.H. Gundry* (1975).[142]

---

[141]. E.E. ELLIS therefore said: "...Jesus and the NT writers present the new covenant as a 'fulfilment' that was prophesied by the OT...and that remains in a typological relationship to it. In this way the messianic hermeneutic continues, admittedly in a highly climactic manner, earlier prophetic interpretations of Israel's scriptures in terms of the current acts of God within the nation" (*Biblical Interpretation*, 691).

[142]. E.E. ELLIS said: "Biblical interpretation in the NT church...followed (the) exegetical methods common to Judaism and drew its perspective and presuppositions from Jewish backgrounds. However, in one fundamental respect it differed from other religious parties and theologies in Judaism, that is, *in the christological exposition of the OT totally focused upon Jesus as the Messiah*" (*Biblical Interpretation*, 724) (my own cursivation: GJS).

CHAPTER 2

IDENTIFICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF EXPLICIT QUOTATIONS

In any investigation the question which is asked determines both the approach, or method, which will be employed, as well as the *apriori* which underlies the investigation. The following remarks are necessary in order to place this investigation within its broader framework of Lukan studies. They will reflect the fact that this investigation is historically orientated, and will give an indication of the presuppositions which will function during the course of the study.

What should be kept in mind constantly is that these remarks are simply a reflection on the result of other Lukan studies. It is not at all the intention to discuss them, but only to use them as a frame of reference in which this investigation could be placed.

1. LUKE'S USE OF SOURCES

Luke has used some sources during the compilation of his works. His introduction to his gospel (Lk 1:1-4) states this explicitly. Sources which it is assumed Luke might have used during his compilation of Ac specifically, are normally identified as: an "Antiochene source",[1] a source for the so-called "We-sections",[2] an "itinerary" source,[3] a "Pauline-novelle",[4] and a source for the "Pauline-wonders".[5] What is left might be ascribed to the creative hand of Luke himself and might be typified as "Sondergut-Lukas". However, this does not mean at all that every piece of information to be found there has its origin with Luke. This SLk material normally reflects thorough knowledge of earlier traditions and motifs, closely integrated and interwoven within a complete new Lukan version.

In his gospel too, Luke has used as sources Mk as well as a so-called "Logion"-source,[6] known both to him and Mt. The rest of his material is typified as being

---

[1]. Cf. G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg I*, 82-103. Probably used in Ac 6:1-8:4; 8:5-13; 8:26-40; 11:19-26; 11:27-30; 12:25.

[2]. Probably used in Ac 16:10-17(-24); 20:5-8(-15); 20:13-15; 21:1(-8)-18; 27:1-28:16. Sometimes definitely a stylistic feature (27:1f,6 for example).

[3]. Cf. M. DIBELIUS, Die Apostelgeschichte als Geschichtsquelle, in: H. GREEVEN (hrsg) *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (FRLANT 60), Göttingen 1953, 91-95; J. ROLOFF, *Apg*, 274; G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg II*, 254f; A. WEISER, *Apg II*, 388-390. Probably used in Ac 16:6-8,10b,11-15; 17:1-4,10-11a,15a,34; 18:1-5a,7f,11,18,19-21b,22; 20:13-15. Although M. DIBELIUS has included also 13:5; 14:21; 14:24-26, this is not accepted today.

[4]. Probably used for Ac 9:1-19. The sources for 9:19b-30 cannot be reconstructed, i.e. the flight from Damascus. Some suggest that Ac 22:5-16 and 26:12-26 are based on it. Ac 22:1-21 is, however, a Pauline speech.

[5]. Probably used in Ac 13:8-11; 14:8-11; 16:16-18; 16:25-34; 19:11-19; 20:7-12; 28:1-10.

[6]. Also known in other circles as "Q".

"SLk". This material is peculiar to Luke, with no clear evidence of its being found in other written sources. Interesting is his knowledge and usage of "the" LXX in this "SLk" material.[7] It demonstrates both a very thorough knowledge of these Jewish documents in their Greek form, as well as close textual similarities between their readings and Luke's own re-use of them. When reading Lk, it seems as if he had at his disposal collections of scriptural material already arranged in three groups under the headings — Moses, the Prophets and the Pss.[8] This becomes especially clear when attention is paid to the following passages:

* Lk 24:25-27 = καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ.[9]

* Lk 24:44-45 = Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ. τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς.

If it is now assumed that these collections might also have been available during the compiling of his second work, one possible way in which the extent of LXX influence could be studied in Lk-Ac, would then be to try and trace this supposed influence back by way of the division of these three categories of scriptural sources.

When looking again at Ac as Luke's second work, it is striking to notice that all the explicit quotations are found in the speeches — and the speeches, in turn, are the creations of Luke![10] Thus in Ac a trend similar to that in Lk is manifested, in which the conscious usage of explicit scriptural (LXX)[11] material by Luke is most frequent in the "SLk".

2. THE SPEECHES[12]

The use of speeches in ancient literature was a widely accepted literary technique.[13] It can be found both in the oldest Jewish, as well as in the Greek literature. Normally the idea was not to give a *verbatim* report of speeches delivered by ancient authorities, but rather to place specific important information in the mouths of

---

[7]. Cf. G.J. STEYN, LXX-invloed op die taal en styl van die Lukas-evangelie, Pretoria 1987 (MA-thesis), 136; *idem.*, Die manifestering van LXX-invloed in die 'Sondergut-Lukas', in: *HTS* 45 (1989), 864-873; *idem.*, The Occurrence of 'Kainam' in Luke's Genealogy: Evidence of Septuagint Influence?, in: *EThL* 65 (1989), 409-411; *idem.*, Intertextual Similarities between Septuagint Pretexts and Luke's Gospel, in: *Neot* 24 (1990), 229-246. So also M. KARNETZKY, *Zitate*.

[8]. So also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 166. According to him, the quotations from Is and the Minor Prophets resembles the text form of codex A. Cf. also G.D. KILPATRICK, Some Quotations in Acts, in J. KREMER (ed), *Les Actes des Apôtres - traditions, rédaction, théologie* (EThL 48), Leuven 1978, 81-97, here 89.

[9]. Compare also in Ac, for instance, Ac 3:18,21-25; 8:30-35 with Dt 18:15 (Law), Ps 22 (Pss) and Is 53 (Prophets).

[10]. The speeches are "SLk"-material. Cf also the work of M. DIBELIUS, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, in: H. GREEVEN (hrsg), Göttingen 1968, 157.

[11]. Cf. A. WEISER: "Außerdem basieren die umfangreichen Schriftzitate in diesen Reden größtenteils auf der Septuaginta, der Bibel des Lukas, nicht aber der des Petrus" (*Apg I*, 99).

[12]. Cf. also A. WEISER, *Apg I*, 30,98-100.

[13]. A. WEISER typifies it being a "literarische Gattung" which is "tragisch-pathetisch" and even nearer, as "biblisch-früjüdischen, hellenistisch-römischen Geschichtschreibung" (*Apg I*, 30-31).

authoritative people. This meant that this was far more than the simple communication of historical information; the importance attached to the strong rhetorical flavour of such speeches gives them the character of an appeal, or exhortation. Students were even trained in the Graeco-Roman societies to imitate the rhetorical discourses of their masters.[14]

The primary purpose of the speeches in Ac was not to attempt an exact account of what may have been said, but rather to use historical information rhetorically (or "kerygmatically") in order to persuade the hearers (and thus implicitly the readers) to change their minds.[15] Supposing that the speeches of Peter, Paul, Stephen, etc. were based on the same principle as their Graeco-Roman counterparts, they must then be seen as rhetorical imitations of Jesus' speeches, as found in Lk.[16]

The role which the spoken word in the mouth of an accepted authority has played for the people of those times should not be underestimated. This was, to a large extent, still an oral society; strong evidence suggests that even when people did read from scriptural sources, they read aloud. The *spoken word* of Peter, Paul, etc. is seen as becoming here the *written word* by Luke.[17]

However, the purpose of this investigation is not to study the speeches in Ac. Rather, the aim is to explain the differences between the text readings of the explicit quotations in Ac (almost all of which are to be found in speeches) and the quoted texts of the LXX. Are these differences to be explained as being due to another *Vorlage* which Luke has used, or to his own hand, or to both? Both the existing textmaterial, as well as the NT context, must help here in order to explain each difference on its own merits.

For the purposes of this study, the speeches in Ac can be divided into three main groups, i.e. the Petrine, Pauline and other speeches.[18] An indication is given at which speeches explicit quotations from the LXX are to be found (marked with an *) and from which sections of the Scriptures are quoted:

(a) Petrine speeches:

    1* = 1:16-22 = The election of Matthias [Pss]
    2* = 2:14-41 = Peter at Pentecost (*Missionary speech*) [Prophets, Pss]
    3* = 3:11-26 = Peter at the Temple (*Missionary speech*) [Torah]
    4 = 4:8-12   = Leaders of the Nation [None]

---

[14]. Cf. the method of μιμῆσις (Lat: *imitatio*) among the Graeco-Roman historians: Dionesius of Halikarnass creates something; Sallust imitates Thukydides; Tacitus follows Sallust. Cf. Tac*An* II,24 and Jos*Ant* I 13,3.

[15]. M. DIBELIUS whas thus right in saying that "Lukas hat 'aus Geschichten Geschichte' gemacht" (*Aufsätze*, 113).

[16]. This aspect should, however, first be investigated thoroughly before this hypothesis could be accepted as a statement, but it does not fall within the scope of this study.

[17]. In the same way as Luke understood it in Ac 1:16, where "the Holy Spirit said through the mouth of David" and then quoting two passages from the Pss. (Cf. the discussion on this later in the study).

[18]. This does not deny the most popular differentiation between the normal speeches and the missionary speeches in Ac. "Die Gemeinsamkeiten zeigen sich vor allem im Zweck des Einfügens von Reden in größere Erzählzusammenhänge, in der Technik der *Mimesis* literarischer Vorbilder (in der Apg: LXX-Mimesis) und im Stilmittel der Archaisierung" (A. WEISER, *Apg I*, 99). Also E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 32-79.

      5 = 5:29-33 = Sanhedrin [None]
      6 = 10:34-43 = Baptism of Cornelius [None]
      7 = 15:6-11 = Apostolic Council [None]

(b) Pauline speeches:
      1* = 13:16-48 = In Antioch before the Jews and godfearers
                          (*Missionary speech*) [Prophets, Pss]
      2 = 14:14-18 = In Lystra before non-Jews [None]
      3 = 17:22-33 = In Athens before non-Jews [None]
      4 = 20:18-35 = In Milet before the oldest Christian church [None]
      5 = 22:1-21 = Jerusalem (*Defense speech*) [None]
      6* = 23:1-6 = Sanhedrin (*Defense speech*) [Torah]
      7 = 24:10-21 = In Cesarea before the Roman, Felix (*Defense speech*) [None]
      8 = 25:6-12 = Before Festus (*Defense speech*) [None]
      9 = 26:2-32 = Before Festus and Judean King Agrippa II
                          (*Defense speech*) [None]
      10* = 28:25-28 = In Rome before Jewish leaders (*Defense speech*) [Prophets]

(c) Other speeches:
      1* = 4:23-31 = Prayer of the believers [Pss]
      2* = 7:2-53 = Stephen before the Sanhedrin [Torah, Prophets]
      3* = 8:32-33 = Ethiopian and Philip [Prophets]
      4* = 15:14-21 = James at the Apostolic Council [Prophets]

It is astonishing that not much interest was shown by scholars in the past to *the function* of the explicit quotations within this context of the speeches.[19]

3. IDENTIFICATION OF EXPLICIT LXX QUOTATIONS IN ACTS

When dealing with the broad field of LXX influence in the NT ("use of the OT in the NT"), one can detect six different categories of influence on the language and style of the author:[20] (a) explicit quotations, introduced by clear introductory formulae; (b) direct phrases, without clear introductory formulae; (c) paraphrases, which are free versions of a foreign text;[21] (d) references, being a single formulation from that tradition and being completely integrated into the presentation of the author; (e) allusions;[22] and (f) and scriptural terminology, being words, concepts, technical terms, titles, etc. To these may be added a seventh category, namely (g)

---

[19]. Cf. M. RESE who made this observation just over a decade ago, saying: "Leider hat die Frage nach der Funktion der atl. Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apg kaum je so viel Interesse gefunden wie die Frage nach der Authentizität der Reden oder die nach in ihnen erhaltenen Traditionen" (Die Funktion alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte, in: J. KREMER (ed), *Les Actes des Apôtres - Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (EThL 68), Leuven 1979, 61-79, here 69. Although some *ad hoc* studies have been published since this trend is still to be found today.

[20]. The following are largely based on the division as found in D-A. KOCH, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 11f.

[21]. C. SMITS and H.M. SHIRES called these "free quotations". (See Ch.1).

[22]. Categories c,d and e are all taken as "Anspielungen" by M. RESE, *Motive*, 36.

"motifs"; that is, the imitation[23] of larger structural patterns, tellings and traditions which are based on similar versions in the source texts.

The focus of this investigation is the first category, the explicit quotation within its context in Ac (specifically, the speeches). This study attempts to determine the differences, and explain them in terms of (a) the possibility of another *Vorlage* or (b) the possibility of Luke's own independent reworking and interpretation of the quotation.

The two main reasons for limiting this investigation to the explicit quotations, is (a) the fact that this is the only category where the question of the *Textvorlage* which was used can be verified to a certain extent, and (b) it seems a practical and comfortable limitation regarding the parameters of this specific study.

3.1 Identification

There seems to be consensus that explicit quotations can only be identified in the presence of clearly formulated introductory formulae. These formulae would be an indicator that the author has quoted consciously from his source.[24] The absence of such formulae, in turn, would make it difficult (if not impossible) to deduce that the author has meant the allusive sentences or phrases to be explicit quotations. However, regarding those quotations which are clearly linked with introductory formulae, it might be questioned whether they were quoted from some written source, or simply from memory. This, too, may be difficult to prove conclusively, but some indications may be gained by investigating the complete picture, or pattern of quotation, of a certain author. From what has been said above in connection with Luke's use of sources, there can be no doubt that he has made use of written sources when compiling his works. The possibility that he might have done so also with regard to his Jewish Scriptures (in Greek), can therefore not be excluded.

3.1.1 Introductory formulae

The following introductory formulae introduce explicit quotations in Ac:
(a) From the Scroll of the 12 Prophets:

Ac 2:16 =	ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ᾿Ιωήλ [Jl 2:28-32 (3:1-5)]
Ac 7:42 =	καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν [Am 5:25-6]
Ac 13:40 =	βλέπετε οὖν μὴ ἐπέλθῃ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις [Hab 1:5]
Ac 15:15 =	καὶ τούτῳ συμφωνοῦσιν οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν καθὼς γέγραπται [Am 9:11-12]

---

[23]. Cf. E. PLÜMACHER: "... daß es sich hier offenbar nicht um unbewußte sprachliche Abhängigkeit, ein 'Nicht-anders-können', sondern vielmehr um ganz bewußte Anlehnung an diese bestimmte Sprachform, also um einen Stil, handelt" (*Lukas*, 39-40).

[24]. Cf. also M. RESE who finds such a distinction between quotations introduced by introductory formulae, and those without them, very important (*Motive*, 36).

(b) From the Scroll of Is:

Ac 7:48 = καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει [Is 66:1-2]

Ac 8:32 = ἡ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν ἦν αὕτη [Is 53:7-8]

Ac 13:34 = οὕτως εἴρηκεν ὅτι [Is 55:3]

Ac 13:47 = οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος [Is 49:6]

Ac 28:25 = ὅτι καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ
προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν λέγων [Is 6:9-10]

(c) From the Pss:

Ac 1:20 = γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν [Ps 68(69):26
and Ps 108(109):8]

Ac 2:25 = Δαυὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν [Ps 15(16):8-11]

Ac 2:34 = οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, λέγει δὲ αὐτός
[Ps 109(110):1]

Ac 4:25 = ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ
παιδός σου εἰπών [Ps 2:1]

Ac 13:33 = ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ [Ps 2:7]

Ac 13:35 = διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει [Ps 15(16):10]

(d) From the Torah:

Ac 3:21 = ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος
αὐτοῦ προφητῶν. Μωϋσῆς μὲν εἶπεν ὅτι [Dt 18:15-20 and
[Lv 23:29(?)]

Ac 3:25 = λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραάμ [Gn 22:18]

Ac 7:3 = καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν [Gn 12:1]

Ac 7:6 = ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ὅτι [Gn 15:13]

Ac 7:27 = ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπών [Ex 2:14]

Ac 7:33 = εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος [Ex 3:5,7-10]

Ac 7:35 = Τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες [Ex 2:14]

Ac 7:37 = οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἴπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ [Dt 18:15]

Ac 7:40 = εἰπόντες τῷ Ἀαρών [Ex 32:1,4,8,23]

Ac 23:5 = γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι [Ex 22:27]

Two *main forms* dominate in these formulae. In most cases they are found either
with a form of γράφω[25] or with a form of λέγω.[26] The *location*, or place from which
the quoted text is taken is clearly indicated several times in Ac. Quotations from (a)
the 12P and Is) are often indicated by referring to ὁ προφήτης.[27] This is even more
closely qualified in two instances, referring explicitly to Ἰωήλ[28] and Ἡσαΐας.[29] In
the same way (b) those which were taken from the Pss are often indicated as coming

---

[25]. Cf. Ac 1:20; 8:32; 7:42; 13:33; 15:15; 23:5 — used to introduce 7 of the 26 explicit quotations.

[26]. Cf. Ac 2:16,25,34; 3:21-22,25; 4:25; 7:3,6,27,33,35,37,40,48; 13:34,35,40,47(?); 28:25 — used to
introduce 19 of the 26 explicit quotations.

[27]. Cf. Ac 2:16; 7:42,48; 13:40; 15:15; 28:26. Totalling 6 times out of the 9 times that the Prophets are
quoted.

[28]. So in Ac 2:16. Cf. also the discussion on this later in the study.

[29]. See Ac 28:26.

either from the (βίβλων) ψαλμοι[30] or from Δαυίδ.[31] This too is, in one instance, even more finely qualified by the explicit statement that the quotation comes from the δευτέρου Ps.[32] And (c) those which were taken from the Torah, are often indicated as being from Μωϋσῆς.[33] That the *real origin* of the quoted texts is rooted in the announcement of God himself, is stated by way of parenthetic phrases such as λέγει ὁ θεός,[34] ὁ κύριος,[35] τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον[36].

3.1.2 Explicit quotations

Taking only the explicit introductory formulae as syntactic indicators of deliberate, conscious quotations, allows the following 25 such quotations[37] (i.e. 27 quoted texts from "the OT") to be identified and grouped as follows:[38]

(a) 4 Quotations from the Minor Prophets:
[1] Jl 2:28-32(3:1-5) = Ac 2:17-21   [2] Am 5:25-29 = Ac 7:42-43
[3] Hab 1:5 = Ac 13:41   [4] Am 9:11-12 = Ac 15:16-18

(b) 5 Quotations from Is:
[1] Is 66:1-2 = Ac 7:49-50   [2] Is 53:7-8 = Ac 8:32-33
[3] Is 55:3 = Ac 13:34[39]   [4] Is 49:6 = Ac 13:47
[5] Is 6:9-10   = Ac 28:26-27

(c) 6 Quotations from the Pss:
[1] Ps 68(69):26; Ps 108(109):8 = Ac 1:20 (One combined quotation)
[2] Ps 15(16):8-11 = Ac 2:25-28   [3] Ps 109(110):1 = Ac 2:34
[4] Ps 2:1 = Ac 4:25   [5] Ps 2:7 = Ac 13:33
[6] Ps 15(16):10 = Ac 13:35

(d) 10 Quotations from the Torah:
[1] Dt 18:15-20   = Ac 3:22; Lev 23:29 = Ac 3:23 (One combined quotation)
[2] Gn 22:18 = Ac 3:25   [3] Gn 12:1 = Ac 7:3

---

[30]. Cf. Ac 1:20 (introducing two Ps-quotations) and 13:33. Totalling 3 times (1:20 counted 2 times) from the 7 times when the Pss are quoted.

[31]. Cf. Ac 2:25,34; 4:25. Totalling 3 times from the 7 times when the Pss are quoted.

[32]. So in Ac 13:33. See the discussion on this later in the study.

[33]. Cf. Ac 3:22 (Dt); 7:35 (Ex); 7:37 (Dt). Totalling 3 times from the 10 times when the Torah is quoted.

[34]. Cf. Ac 2:17 (see the discussion on this later in the study); 3:21; 7:6.

[35]. Cf. Ac 7:33; 13:47.

[36]. Cf. Ac 4:25; 28:25.

[37]. Scholars differ slightly about the *number* of quotations to be found in Ac. This is due, as M. RESE has already pointed out, to the manner in which a quotation is defined by the specific scholar; this becomes especially evident in Stephen's speech (Ac 7), where it is not always easy to determine the difference between an explicit quotation and a direct phrase ("Anspielung") (cf. M. RESE, *Funktion*, 69). E.E. ELLIS therefore counts 23 quotations (*OT in Early Christianity*, 53), while M. RESE (*Funktion*, 69) and H.B. SWETE (*Introduction*, 388) count 24 quotations. But even when scholars agree on the same number (as the latter three above), they still differ on the identification of individual quotations. Others, as J. DUPONT, also includes the direct phrases, and ends, therefore with a higher number than the others (L'utilisation apologétique de l'Ancien Testament dans les discours des Actes, in: idem., *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1967, 247-282).

[38]. References are according to the division in the LXX.

[39]. Not seen as an explicit quotation by L. VENARD, Citations de l'Ancien Testament dans le Nouveau Testament, in: *DBS* II (1934), 23-51, here 25.

[4] Gn 15:13 = Ac 7:6-7   [5] Ex 2:14 = Ac 7:27-28[40]
[6] Ex 3:5,7-10   = Ac 7:33-34   [7] Ex 2:14 = Ac 7:35
[8] Dt 18:15 = Ac 7:37   [9] Ex 32:1,4,8,23 = Ac 7:40[41]
[10] Ex 22:27 = Ac 23:5[42]

4. OCCURRENCES AND DISTRIBUTION OF EXPLICIT LXX QUOTATIONS IN ACTS

These quotations (quoted texts) are distributed in Ac from the beginning of the work until its very end, but with a concentration especially on the first 15 chapters,[43] i.e. they are (almost?) exclusively used where the hearers consist primarily, though not always exclusively, of Jews. All of these explicit quotations are to be found in direct speeches — except that of Ac 8:32-33.[44]
Their manifesting frequence is as follows:

Scripture section	Petrine speeches	Pauline speeches	Other speeches	Total
12 Prophets				
Am	- - -	- - -	2x:Steph. + James	2 x
Jl	1 x	- - -	- - -	1 x
Hab	- - -	1 x	- - -	1 x
Is	- - -	3 x	2x:Steph. + Philip	5 x
Pss	4 x	2 x	1x:Prayer	7 x
Torah:				
Gn	1 x	- - -	2x:Steph.	3 x
Ex	- - -	1 x	4x:Steph.	5 x
Lv	1 x	- - -	- - -	1 x
Dt	1 x	- - -	1x:Steph.	2 x
TOTAL:	8 times	7 times	12 times	27 times

---

[40]. Not counted as explicit quotation by M. RESE (*Funktion*, 69).
[41]. H.B. SWETE also saw this as explicit quotation (*Introduction*, 388). Not counted as quotation by M. RESE (*Funktion*, 69).
[42]. Also seen as explicit quotation by M. RESE (*Funktion*, 69). H.B. SWETE, however, did not want to include this as a quotation (*Introduction*, 388).
[43]. With the exception of only two quoted texts: Ac 23:5 (Ex 22:27) and Ac 28:26-27 (Is 6:9-10).
[44]. So also M. RESE: "Bis auf eine Ausnahme (Apg 8,32f.) finden sich alle atl. Zitate in Reden oder redenartigen Stücken der Apg..". (*Funktion*, 69).

5. DIRECT PHRASES WITHOUT INTRODUCTORY FORMULAE

The following are phrases or sentences from Ac which, in most cases, so closely resemble an exact reading of the OT Scriptures, that they are often mistakenly regarded as explicit quotations. They are presented, however, without any introductory formula or any other clear indication that they were meant to be explicit quotations, and could have been meant either to be explicit quotations or only references presented in "Biblical words". This group must be distinguished clearly from the first, because it would be almost impossible to ask here any questions on a possible *Textvorlage* which might underly them.[45] The following are identified:

(a) *3 Similar phrases from the Pss:*

  Ps 89:21 = Ac 13:22[46]

  Ps 146:6 = Ac 4:24

  Ps 146:6 (again) = Ac 14:15

(b) *6 Similar phrases from the Torah*

  Gn 48:4 = Ac 7:5

  Ex 1:8 = Ac 7:18

  Ex 3:6 = Ac 3:13[47]

  Ex 3:6,15 = Ac 7:32

  Ex 20:11 = Ac 14:15

  Ex 21:4 = Ac 7:27,35[48]

6. THE PROBLEM, THESES AND PURPOSE OF THIS INVESTIGATION

The fact of LXX quotations in Ac centres on a threefold problem which can best be described as texthistorical, methodological and hermeneutical in nature.[49]

(i) *The first deals with the question of the origin of the quotations and the possible Textvorlage which Luke might have used for his explicit quotations.* Where did Luke get these quotations? Did Luke use material from independent oral or written traditions which have also referred, in their turn, to these ancient authoritative books (as in the hypothetical *testimonia* or *florilegia*), or did he get it himself personally from available "LXX" manuscripts? Is he thus simply the collector, compilor and re-writer of available traditions, or is he much more creatively and independently involved in the whole process of re-writing history by way of getting his own "LXX" material and reinterpreting it in order to suit his goal? When the origin, or at least, prior knowledge of the specific quotations are established, then their *Textvorlage* should be established.[50]

---

[45]. Cf. J. DUPONT, *L'utilisation*, 281f who did not make this distinction in his list of quotations.

[46]. Taken by M. RESE as explicit quotation, in combination with 2 Ki(Sm) 13:14 (*Funktion*, 69).

[47]. Taken as explicit quotation by M. RESE (*Funktion*, 69), but not by H.B. SWETE (*Introduction*, 388).

[48]. This occurrence is counted as an explicit quotation by H.B. SWETE, *Introduction*, 388.

[49]Cf. R. HANHART, Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta in neutestamentlicher Zeit, in: *ZThK* 81 (1984), 395-416.

[50]Cf. also M. RESE who asks the question: "Was wird zitiert?" (*Motive*, 35).

(ii) *The second deals with the question of his usage of Scripture (more specifically his method of application).* How did he apply the quotations within their new context? What changes does he make? Here it is important to establish the way in which he quotes.[51]

(iii) *The third deals with the NT writer's own understanding of Scripture.* In what way does this "LXX" material contribute to his "salvation-historical approach"? Is it done with/via a certain theological perspective and a specific aim or purpose in mind, and if so, with what purpose? The function of the quoted text[52] within its new context therefore becomes crucial when considering this aspect.

Some of the most prominent *apriori* of this study are to be found in the hypothesis that Luke has used as part of his *repertoire* of written sources, some well known LXX documents as his "Scripture". From these he has selected material which he could use in such a way as to support his argument. The other part of his *repertoire* consists of traditions from early Judaism and early Christianity, which have already included material from these "Scriptures." He got his LXX quotations thus either from these early traditions or from the written LXX itself. He created and reconstructed his own understanding of the Christian message from these (written) sources to form a compendium of his own hermeneutical framework of events.

6.1 The text-historical aspect of the problem

Before any differences between the readings of the NT and the LXX can be determined, the texts of these versions must first be established. References to the OT found in the NT cannot simply be categorized as "LXX influence". The people of these times did not have bound copies of "a OT", "a NT" or "a LXX" at hand. Biblical manuscripts were scarce in those days and not widely available. They circulated mainly in the synagogues and libraries, and were therefore in very limited manner available to most of the people. They were handled almost exclusively by scribes and religious leaders. Thus, to speak of so-called "LXX influence" in the NT is to work anachronistically with more recent (religious) categorizations. Nearer to reality would be to work with a reconstruction of this early biblical history as a primary basis for any type of research. We must especially, for example, not categorically distinguish between the Hebrew and the Greek OTs — although we definitely have to do with different traditions and manuscripts.

In both instances, Ac and the LXX, one encounters an intensely complex problem. It must be stated clearly that the existing text editions of the NT (NA26) and that of the LXX (Göttingen) are reconstructed texts. The identification of certain changes or differences between "the" NT reading (Ac) and "the" LXX reading must therefore be done extremely carefully. Although it is a highly specialized field, one cannot ignore the fundamental importance of textual criticism at this point of intertextual comparison. When paying attention to the textcritical

---

[51]. Cf. also M. RESE who asks the question: "Wie wird zitiert?" This deals with the "Form des Zitats". (*Motive*, 35).

[52]. So taken to be important by M. RESE, who asks the question: "Warum wird zitiert?" The issue is then that of the "Bedeutung des Zitats" (*Motive*, 35).

data and all the alternative readings which exist, it becomes clear that at least some of the (so-called interpretive) changes between the readings of Ac and LXX might disappear if one were to reconstruct "the" reading of the quoted text in Ac.[53] But each reconstruction brings its own problems. When bearing in mind that the early Christian church (and also the church of the following centuries) modified their texts in order to correlate them with *their* known OT text readings, the situation even become more complicated.[54] For the purposes of this investigation, those reconstructed and printed critical editions of NA26 and the Göttingen editions are used as a basis in identifying the differences between Ac and the LXX. In discussing each of the differences between the texts of NA26 and the reconstructed Göttingen-LXX, attention will be paid to some of the most important and problematical textcritical problems.

Codex D (Bezae Cantabrigiensis)[55]

It is said that it seems as if this codex agrees in general more closely with our known LXX readings.[56] One must not forget, however, that codex D has a general tendency of making modifications, of which several "appear to reflect an emphasis on Gentile interests,[57] sometimes approaching what has been called the anti-Jewish bias of the Western reviser".[58]

6.1.1 The peculiar and problematic nature of the text of "the" LXX

a. A Text theory of a "Diversity of texts"

Several problems come to the fore when one proceeds to a study which includes the LXX. One of the most prominent issues to reckon with in such studies is the different versions which were already circulating during the time of the NT. One

---

[53]. Extensive studies with the purpose of establishing "the original text of Ac" have already been done, for example by L. CERFAUX, Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Actes, in: L. CERFAUX & J. DUPONT (eds), *Aux sources de la Tradition Chrétienne. Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel*, Paris 1958, 43-51; E. HAENCHEN, Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte, in: *ZThK* 51 (1954), 153-167; A.F.J. KLIJN, In Search of the Original Text of Acts, in: L.E. KECK & J.L. MARTYN (eds), *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*, Nashville 1966, 103-110; and G.D. KILPATRICK, *Some Quotations*, 1978.

[54]. Cf. M. RESE: "Die Lesarten, die der Intention des Verfassers entgegenkommen, haben einen gewissen Anspruch auf Ursprünglichkeit, wenn auch die Möglichkeit nicht ausgeschlossen werden darf, daß ein Späterer im Sinne des Verfassers ergänzt hat". "Höchstwahrscheinlich sekundär sind jene Lesarten, in denen sich klar die Tendenz von nur einem MS 'widerspiegelt' (z.B. D). Diese Tendenz müßte dann aber aufgrund einer Untersuchung des ganzen MS bekannt sein, ehe man sie einfach behauptet" (*Motive*, 48).

[55]. See also M. WILCOX, Luke and the Bezan Text of Acts, in: J. KREMER (ed), *Les Actes des Apôtres - traditions, rédaction, théologie* (EThL 48), Leuven 1979, 447-455; J.N. BIRDSALL, The geographical and cultural origin of the Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis: a survey of the *status quaestionis*, mainly from the paleographical standpoint, in: W. SCHRAGE (hrsg), *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments. Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven*, Berlin 1986, 102-114.

[56]. Cf. also G.D. KILPATRICK, *Some Quotations*, 96.

[57]. Compare here the work of E. EPP, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, Cambridge 1966.

[58]. So B.M. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, New York 1971, 295.

discovers very soon that it is almost impossible to talk of "a" or "the" LXX.[59]
The Old Greek Version was revised several times, not only by the Jews (cf. Kaige/proto-Theodotion, Aquila and Symmachus), but also later by the Christians (cf. Origen, Lucian and Hesychian).[60] In addition to all these revisions and recensions, it is assumed today that there could also have been several local translations which supplied the needs of specific groups. Some of these were verbal translations, others were much more paraphrased and interpretative. No wonder that certain text theories about the origin and development of the LXX assumed that it developed out of a targumim context.[61]

The most accepted text theory today is that which was developed by *Talmon*[62] and *Tov*.[63] The latter calls it a "synthetic view, which may be characterized as a theory of "multiple textual traditions"", in which "...one Greek translation must be presupposed as the base of the MSS of most, if not all the books of the LXX".[64] According to this theory then, there was once an existing single Greek translation of every book. Soon, however, there developed a diversity of texts, without the Hebrew texts being necessarily used again. Each text tradition - Hebrew, Targum or Greek - manifests its own movement of internal text tradition development, which leads to the development of new text forms, without being influenced by another tradition. One should therefore rather speak of *texts* than of *texttypes*. Four stages of development are being differentiated in the LXX tradition: (a) the original translation; (b) a diversity of text traditions based on the supplements and corrections until the first century A.D; (c) textual stability in the first and second centuries A.D; (d) the recensions of Origen and Lucian in the third and fourth centuries A.D.[65]

b. *Other prominent characteristics*[66]

It must never be forgotten that we are dealing with translated *Hebrew* religious terminology in the LXX documents. The LXX documents therefore bear a Jewish-Hellenistic nature.

---

59. Cf. G.J. STEYN on a hypothetical reconstruction of the history of the origin of the "Old Greek Version(s)": (Die ou Griekse vertaling (Septuagint) Deel I: 'n Kort oorsig oor die moontlike ontstaansgeskiedenis, in: *ThEv* 22 (1989), 9-18).

60. Cf. G.J. STEYN, Die ou Griekse vertaling (Septuagint) Deel 2: 'n Kort oorsig oor die ontwikkelingsgeskiedenis en bestaande teksteorieë, in: *ThEv* 22-3 (1989), 2-13).

61. Cf. the work of P.E. KAHLE: *Cairo Geniza*.

62. Cf. S. TALMON, The Old Testament Text, in: P.R. ACKROYD & C.F. EVANS (eds), *From the beginnings to Jerome* (CHB I), Cambridge 1970, 159-199.

63. Cf. E. TOV, *The Text-critical use of the Septuagint in Biblical research*, Jerusalem 1981. He based his theory to a large extent on E.J. BICKERMAN, Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint, in: S. LIEBERMAN (ed), *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume on the occasion of his 70th birthday*, New York 1950, 149-178. See also J. COOK, The Plurality of Old Testament Texts and Exegetical Methodology, in: J. MOUTON, A.G. VAN AARDE & W.S. VORSTER (eds), *Paradigms and Progress in Theology* (HSRC Studies in Research Methodology 5), Pretoria 1988, 362-377.

64. E. TOV, *Text-critical use*, 41.

65. So E. TOV, *Text-critical use*, 42.

66. See also F.E. DEIST, *Witnesses to the Old Testament. Introducing Old Testament textual criticism*, Pretoria 1988; S. OLOFSSON, *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint* (CBOTSer 30), Stockholm 1990.

Another important issue is the fact that several translators were involved, and we therefore find some books to be translated more literally (e.g. Gn) than others that are much more paraphrased in character (e.g. Pr).

6.2 The methodological aspect of the problem

This specific way of handling the comparatative material forces the researcher to ask explicitly for the framework of adaptation of those quotations by the specific NT writer. In order to achieve any understanding of the framework, one must try to grasp something of the quotational techniques, and the ways of adapting quoted material within its new context. In some circles it is thought that exegetical methods used in rabbinical circles could be especially useful in throwing light on the use made of OT material by the NT writers. Research has shown that the ancient methods of allegory, typology, midrash, pesher, (also midrash-pesher) and historical-literal analysis, have played at one or other stage an important role in this type of comparative study. There seems, however, to be considerable disagreement about just how widely these methods were known and used in the ancient world of first century Christianity. The fact that several of the *termini technici*, which were normally used to indicate these practices, are lacking in Lk-Ac, for instance, raises some doubt about the formal usage of these methods by Luke himself. Instead of trying to force Luke's peculiar method of scriptural adaptation into these categories, this study, when analysing the relevant passages, will simply describe the features he uses to apply and reinterpret each quoted text within its new context.

The emphasis will be on the *changes* which were made by Luke to the texts from which he quotes, while the *function* of those changes will be discussed under "Luke's interpretation" of his quoted text, i.e. the hermeneutical aspect of the problem.

6.3 The hermeneutical aspect of the problem

General changes in modern linguistics have contribute a great deal to the reconstruction of the ancient "biblical" era. Especially the general trend, started in the 1950's by *Saussure*, to move the focus of literary studies away from a fragmentary approach where words and phrases were dealt with by way of *ad hoc* studies, to a more holistic approach where the context and broader units were seen as central and the contents thereof as elements contributing to this context.

The first signs of explicit attention to the broader context and a more *functional approach* became therefore more visible during the middle of our current century. The focus was slowly but surely moving from the author and the text to the reader, his environment and interpretation of the text. With this paradigm-shift came the collapse of the one-sidedness of the diachronical methods, such as the grammatio-historical and historico-critical methods, and the increasing prominence of synchronical methods like structural analysis, narrative analysis and reader-response criticism.

However, the problem of one-sidedness remains. The pendulum has only moved away from the one side to the other. There has developed a drastic need in

biblical interpretation for something that could accommodate both the diachronical and synchronical approaches; some analysis where the relationship author-text on the one hand, *as well as* the relationship text-reader on the other hand, receives the necessary attention.

Especially for the purposes of this field of study, attention must be paid therefore not only to the linguistic *form*, to the syntax and the separate fragments of the text **as** a working object, but also to the linguistic *contents*, to the semantics and the context of the text. In such a combined methodology we are not working with an "either...or - method", neither with totally mixed methods, but instead with two main contributing elements which always draw the attention to the question of the *function* of the material found in a given context.

The main emphasis in this section will thus be on the function of these quotations within their immediate context, but also within the broader context of Luke's theological paradigm. Clarity should be found on Luke's *purpose* in using these quotations and his reasons for changing them in the way he did. Is his intention to present them simply as (a) Scriptural proof, or does he use them in (b) apologetical, historical and polemic ways?[67] Are they used in a (c) prophetical manner, especially in terms of promise-fulfillment,[68] or are they used (d) typologically, (e) christologically[69] and/or (f) eschatologically?

Most important is that each quotation, or rather, quoted text, should be taken first on its own and within its own context. Only after that might some general lines be drawn regarding Luke's peculiar way of understanding his Scripture.

---

[67]. Suggested by H.J. CADBURY, The Speeches in Acts, in: F.J. FOAKES JACKSON and K. LAKE (eds), *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Acts of the Apostles, Vol.5*, London 1933, 402-427.

[68]. Cf. P. SCHUBERT, The Structure and Significance of Luke 24, in: W. ELTESTER (hrsg), *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954* (BZNW 21), Berlin 1954, 165-186.

[69]. So suggested in the differents studies of M. RESE, *Motive* (1965/69); D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation* (1987), 278-279; and D. JUEL, *Messianic Exegesis* (1988).