

CHAPTER III

THE JOSEPH STORY (Ac 7:9-16)

1. INTRODUCTION

Stephen closes Abraham's story and opens Joseph's story with the same word, 'patriarchs'. Moreover, v. 15 says that "Jacob went to Egypt," whereas v. 17, as the starting point of Moses' story, points out that "the people in Egypt greatly increased." Besides, "[t]he name of Abraham appears in both vv 16 and 17, thereby providing an added link between the two episodes" (Richard 1979:257). These facts show that Luke makes proficient and deliberate use of the Joseph story within the structure of the entire speech.

At the same time, this section starts with an account of the rejection of Joseph because of his brothers' jealousy, i.e., in the context of Acts this is related to the Israelite fathers' attitude. This theme of the Israelite rejection of God's servants is also one of the main motifs in the Moses episode. However, in the final indictment (vv. 51-53), Joseph's story, unlike Moses', ends happily. "The 'happy ending', however, was not owed to Israel" (Kilgallen 1989:181). The Joseph narrative thus fits with the flow of the discourse as well as its ideological inclination at this point.

It should also be noted that there is no quotation in this episode. Nonetheless, Luke continues to employ the OT text implicitly for his review of Jewish history. Furthermore, his implied use of the OT never obstructs the narratological consistency and theological system of Stephen's defence.

2. COMPOSITION

Stephen passes over the story of Isaac and Jacob and focuses on Joseph's story in this section. Stephen continues to speak: (a) "Because the patriarchs were jealous of Joseph, they sold him as a slave into Egypt" (Καὶ οἱ πατριάρχαι ζηλώσαντες⁴⁵ τὸν Ἰωσήφ ἀπέδοντο εἰς Αἴγυπτον, v. 9a). Stephen in v. 9 encapsulates the OT story very well (see Gn 37:11 "His brothers were jealous of him, but his father kept the matter in mind."). He, at the same time, begins to introduce the theme of the opposition. Jub 39:1-2 leaves out this facet of the account exclusively. BibAnt 8:9 retains the 'hatred'. Josephus emphasises that Joseph's brothers are filled with 'envy and hatred' in *Ant* 2:10-13. Moreover, Philo draws 'envy' into the topic in his book *Jos*: envy (5, 17), hatred (5), disturbance and upheaval (10), grief and anger (10-11), and rage leading to slaughter (12). The story of Joseph appears in T12P. (cf. TGad 3:3; 4:5-6; 5:1; TJos 1:3-4; and especially TSim 2:6-7, 11, 14; 3:2-3; 4:4-9).

According to the NIV translation of Gn 37:28, the OT story is described as follows: "So when the Midianite merchants came by, his brothers pulled Joseph up out of the cistern and sold him for twenty shekels of silver to the Ishmaelites, who took him to Egypt." In this section, the name Αἴγυπτος occurs six times.⁴⁶ Here the theme of people's misunderstanding and their failure to acknowledge the Saviour dispatched by God is clearly displayed.

(b) "But God was with him" (καὶ ἦν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτοῦ, v. 9b). In Gn 39 the phrase καὶ ἦν κύριος μετὰ Ἰωσήφ appears analogously four times (vv. 2, 3, 21, 23). Other occurrences are also found in Jub 39:4; Philo, *Jos* 37; and especially Ac 10:38.

⁴⁵ For the usage of Luke, see also Ac 5:17; 13:45; 17:5.

⁴⁶ Αἴγυπτον occurs five times (vv. 9, 10, 11, 12, 15), while Αἴγύπτου is used once (v. 10).

(c) “and rescued him from all his troubles” (καὶ ἐξείλατο αὐτὸν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν θλίψεων αὐτοῦ, v. 10a). Compared with Genesis, Stephen crudely shortens the narrative of the OT in v. 10: after Joseph’s first favour with Potiphar, an Egyptian who was one of Pharaoh’s officials, the trial to tempt him by his master’s wife (39:6-18) led to his custody (39:20) and his being slighted for more than two years (41:1), before his reinstatement (41:39).⁴⁷

(d) “He gave Joseph wisdom and enabled him to gain the goodwill of Pharaoh king of Egypt” (καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ χάριν καὶ σοφίαν ἐναντίον Φαραῶ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου, v. 10b). Luke connected σοφία with Stephen (Ac 6:3, 10) and even the young Jesus (Lk 2:40, 52) as well as Joseph (Ac 7:10) and the young Moses (Ac 7:22) in his books.

(e) “so he made him ruler over Egypt and all his palace” (καὶ κατέστησεν αὐτὸν ἡγούμενον ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον καὶ [ἐφ’] ὅλον τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ, v. 10c). Although it is natural that the subject of κατέστησεν is Pharaoh, it should rightly refer to God. For this reason, the phrase points to Gn 45:8 rather than to Gn 41:38-45 (Lake and Cadbury 1933:72). Further, it makes sense that this small paragraph of phrases fit together under one subject in vv. 9b-10.

What Stephen speaks in v. 10c seems to be summed up in Gn 41:38-45, but is nearer materially to Ps 104:21 (LXX). Haenchen (1971:279) notes that “this Psalm is important as exemplifying the edification drawn by the Jews from their history between Abraham and Moses” (see also Josephus, *Ant* 2:87-94; Philo, *Jos* 119-162; Jub 40:10; Artapanus, *On the Jews and Joseph and Aseneth*). Wilcox (1965:27-28) remarks that the Lukan reading may be connected with “the textual tradition” sustained in the late Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (the

⁴⁷ For the various descriptions of Joseph’s life by Josephus and Philo, see Josephus, *Ant* 2:41-86; Philo, *Jos* 40-104.

similarity corresponds to Targum Yerushalmi). That is why the equivalent of the Gk word ἡγούμενος is lacking in the MT, LXX, and the Samaritan version, but it is found in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of Gn 41:41, 43. The Lukan text however may have a greater effect on that tradition (Fitzmyer 1998:373).

(f) “Then a famine struck all Egypt and Canaan, bringing great suffering” (ἦλθεν δὲ λιμὸς⁴⁸ ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν Αἴγυπτον καὶ Χανάαν καὶ θλίψεις μεγάλη, v. 11a). The majority of MSS read ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου. P⁴⁵ P⁷⁴ X B A C Ψ 1175 pc have ἐφ’ ὅλην τὴν Αἴγυπτον. D has ἐφ’ ὅλης τῆς Αἰγύπτου.

(g) “and our fathers could not find food” (καὶ οὐχ ἠύρισκον χορτάσματα οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, v. 11b). On the term χορτάσματα there is some disagreement among scholars. Certain scholars (e.g., Wilson 1962:172) maintain that the noun means ‘fodder’, ‘forage’ for animals. Others (Lake & Cadbury 1933:73; Bruce [1951]1976:164; Kilgallen 1976^a:138) state that it denotes ‘provender’, or ‘food’ for men. Barrett (1994:348) claims that Stephen may have it in mind that the ancestors were graziers or the term may be employed unusually to imply human food. Lastly, some (Haenchen 1971:279; Conzelmann 1987:46; Richard 1979:260) assert that the term indicates ‘sustenance’, or ‘supplies’.

(h) “When Jacob heard that there was grain in Egypt, he sent our fathers on their first visit” (ἀκούσας δὲ Ἰακώβ ὄντα σιτία εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐξαπέστειλεν τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν πρῶτον, v. 12). Both σιτία (P⁷⁴ X A B C D E 945 1175 1739 a) and σῖτα (Ψ M) are better translations of שִׁבְרָ than πρᾶσις (Barrett 1994:349). Some MSS (D Ψ) have ἐν instead of εἰς. However, Moulton (1963:254) rightly indicates that εἰς and ἐν are frequently exchangeable. Ramsay (1914:254) has argued that πρῶτον ought to represent the first of three visits, asserting that the third is

⁴⁸ For the LXX usage of the term (famine), see Gn 41:54, 56, 57; 42:5.

when Jacob's whole family went down to Egypt in v. 14. However, Bruce ([1951]1987:148) reckons that the classical force of “Gk. πρῶτος cannot be pressed in this way in Hellenistic times. Here ‘the first time’ is simply correlative to ‘the second time’ of v. 13.”

According to Hasel (1982:281), “Egyptian sources refer to numerous instances in which inhabitants from other nations, or even whole nations, sought help from Egypt during periods of famine. Against this background the seven-year famine in Joseph’s day has a ring of historical accuracy.” The numerous references to this story are also found in the following variety of documents: Gn 42:1-2; 1QapGn 19:10; Josephus, *Ant* 2:97; Philo, *Jos* 165-167; *BibAnt* 8:10.

(i) “On their second visit, Joseph told his brothers who he was” (καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ ἀνεγνωρίσθη Ἰωσήφ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, v. 13a).⁴⁹ The majority of MSS (P⁷⁴ & A B C Ψ and NA27) have the compound verb ἀνεγνωρίσθη, which employs the equivalent verb ἀνεγνωρίζετο in Gn 45:1 (LXX), but others (A B p vg) have the simple verb ἐγνωρίσθη. In both occurrences, the passive voice must be comprehended in a middle meaning (Fitzmyer 1998:373).

(j) “and Pharaoh learned about Joseph’s family” (καὶ φανερόν ἐγένετο τῷ Φαραῶ τὸ γένος [τοῦ] Ἰωσήφ, v. 13b).⁵⁰ The word γένος may point out race or family (Haenchen 1971:280; Barrett 1994:350). The noun occurs again in Ac 7:19. P⁴⁵ D Ψ M read τοῦ Ἰωσήφ, but Ἰωσήφ – without the article - (P³³ B C pc) is possibly accepted. P⁷⁴ & A E vg read αὐτοῦ.

(k) “After this, Joseph sent for his father Jacob and his whole family, seventy-five in all” (ἀποστείλας δὲ Ἰωσήφ μετεκαλέσατο Ἰακώβ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ

⁴⁹ For the original narrative of v. 13a, see Gn 45:1-3.

⁵⁰ For the original account of v. 13b, see Gn 45:16.

πάσαν τὴν συγγένειαν ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε, v. 14). For Moulton (1908:103), ἐν may mean “amounting to”.

In relation to numerical elements of this passage there is once more a disagreement between the OT and the NT.⁵¹ Stephen says that there were seventy-five persons in all (ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε) who went down to Egypt. But in the OT (MT) the members of Jacob's family, who went to Egypt, were seventy in all (שבעים). Interestingly, the reading of the LXX has seventy-five (ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε) within the same text of Gn 46:27 and Ex 1:5, - similar to this reading which has πέντε καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα. In the text of the MT, on the one hand, it is evident that seventy persons equal sixty-six in Gn 46:26 plus Jacob, Joseph, and Joseph's two sons. On the other hand, the reading of the LXX is also not wrong that seventy-five equals the numbered sixty-six plus nine of Joseph's sons (see Dt 10:22; 4QGn-Ex^b 17-18:2; 4QEx^b 1:5; Josephus, *Ant* 2:183; 6:89; Philo, *MigrAbr* 199-201).

(l) “Then Jacob went down to Egypt” (καὶ κατέβη Ἰακώβ εἰς Αἴγυπτον, v. 15a).⁵²
(m) “where he and our fathers died” (καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, v. 15b). The story of the death of Jacob is described in Gn 49:33. The narrative of the death of Joseph and his brothers also occurs in Gn 50:26 and Ex 1:6.

(n) “Their bodies were brought back to Shechem” (καὶ μετετέθησαν εἰς Συχέμ, v. 16a). (o) “and placed in the tomb that Abraham had bought from the sons of Hamor at Shechem for a certain sum of money” (καὶ ἐτέθησαν ἐν τῷ μνήματι ᾧ ὠνήσατο Ἀβραάμ τιμῆς ἀργυρίου παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἑμμὼρ ἐν Συχέμ, v. 16b). ἐν Συχέμ (ℵ* B C 36 323 945 1175 1739 a) is probably correct. ℵ^c A E pc have τοῦ ἐν Συχέμ, but it does not alter the meaning seriously. τοῦ Συχέμ (P⁷⁴ D Ψ M vg)

⁵¹ For comprehensive debate, cf. Koivisto (1982:90-126).

⁵² For the original depiction of v. 15a, see Gn 46:7.

means the father of Shechem.

A discrepancy on the burial place of Jacob is also found between the Scriptures (cf. Koivisto 1982:127-143). Jacob was buried in the cave of Machpelah near Mamre, that is Hebron (Gn 23:19) in Canaan. Abraham bought the field from Ephron the Hittite for four hundred shekels of silver (Gn 23:16; 49:29-33; 50:13).⁵³ Joseph was buried at Shechem, in the plot of ground which Jacob bought from the sons of Hamor in Shechem for a hundred pieces of silver (Gn 33:18-19; Jos 24:32). The OT does not report any further on where the other sons of Jacob were buried. Other than the Bible, Josephus (*Ant* 2:199) describes that the other sons of Jacob were buried at Hebron (see also Jub 46:8-10; TRou 7:2).

According to Barrett (1994:351), the original name of Hebron was Kirjath Arba, which denotes the city of Four. From this name, the Jews inferred that four were buried there – Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and (by the majority) Adam. Barrett (2002:100) continues:

It has been concluded that Stephen (Luke) was either expanding Josh. 24.32 to cover Joseph's brother or was dependent on local Shechemite tradition. If the latter alternative is adopted we may have a further link between Stephen and Samaritans. This must be judged not impossible, but not probable.⁵⁴

⁵³ On the problem of Abraham's tomb purchase, cf. also Koivisto (1982:144-207).

⁵⁴ For various opinions, see also Wilcox (1965:31, 160); Kilgallen (1976^a:56-63); Bruce ([1951]1976:166; [1951]1987:149); Marshall (1980:138-139); Dunn (1996:93).

3. INTERPRETATION OF THE STORY BY LUKE

After the simple historical reference to the twelve patriarchs in v. 8b, Stephen recounts Joseph's story. Luke starts the story of Joseph "by detaching him from the rest of the patriarchs" (Martín-Asensio 1999:245): "and Isaac became the father of Jacob, and Jacob of the twelve patriarchs" (v. 8). "The patriarchs became jealous of Joseph and sold him into Egypt. Yet God was with him" (v. 9 NASB).

Clearly, the end of v. 8 and the opening of v. 9, which end with the same word *πατριάρχης* seem to be Luke's literary connection between two sections (cf. Richard 1979:257). V. 8b thus helps to make a transition between the stories of Abraham and Joseph (cf. Bihler 1963:vii; Kilgallen 1976^a:45-46; Fitzmyer 1998:372). Kilgallen (1976^a:45) states:

The parallels for *patriarchai* in the traditions, Hebrew, Greek, Aramaic, are few and rather appear only in the first two centuries before Christ and thereafter. The reason for its usage here ... is perhaps that it clearly defines the sons of Jacob as the heads of the tribes of Israel.

Furthermore, within the NT writings, the word *πατριάρχης* appears only four times, three times in Acts and once in Hebrews. In Acts, except for the two occurrences in vv. 8-9, the only other appearance is found in Peter's second speech (Ac 2:29), where he calls David τοῦ πατριάρχου. The biblical word is also unusual in the LXX, only appearing five times in the book of 1 and 2 Chronicles,⁵⁵ largely with a general meaning. While the word need not to be

⁵⁵ For the occurrence of *πατριάρχει*, see 1 Chr 24:31; 27:22 and see also 4 Macc 7:19; 16:25. For the occurrence of *πατριάρχας*, see 2 Chr 23:20. For the occurrence of *πατριάρχων*, see 2 Chr 19:8; 26:12.

regarded exclusive in Luke-Acts, the application of it to Joseph's brothers is most likely to be exclusive within the speech where the writer chooses mainly the word πατήρ.

In fact, based in part upon Dibelius' evaluation of Stephen's speech as a "neutral history of Israel" (1956^c:169), many scholars (Foakes-Jackson 1931:61; Bruce [1951]1987:148; Dibelius 1956^c:169; Easton 1955:47, 177; Wilson 1962:171, 236; Haenchen 1971:288; Wilson 1973:134-136) maintain that the Joseph episode is a largely factual recounting of the story of Joseph without polemical or theological overtones. This view of Joseph's story is due to its place within the first part of Stephen's speech (vv. 2-34), seen by some as a straightforward history, while the second part of the speech is primarily understood as polemical in character (cf. Richard 1979:256).

However, Kilgallen (1976^a:10) says that "[t]he single greatest impetus to our writing of this book is the need to determine the relationship of the first 15 verses (vs. 2-16) of Stephen's speech to the rest of the speech." Richard (1979:262) supports that, saying

The author, rather than offering a straightforward account of Joseph and his brothers, has presented a very unique and indeed severely polemical picture of the patriarchs. And to add insult to injury, he again borrows his inspiration from the Jewish scriptures: the positive/negative construct (Joseph/the brothers) and most of the vocabulary of the Joseph episode.

In v. 9, Richard (1979:258-259) argues that two words – ζήλω and ἀποδίδωμι – serve to emphasize the victimization of Joseph at the hands of his brothers. Firstly, for theological reasons Luke seems to borrow the verb ζήλω from Gn 37:11. Although Haenchen (1971:288) says that the Joseph episode "is not in

itself polemical – Ps. 105.17 also does not pass it by,” the choice of the word is deliberate and intends to bring out the motivations behind the patriarchs’ action.

Indeed, other résumés of OT history such as Jos 24, Neh 9, 2 Esd 19, and Jdt 5 exclude the event completely. Only here in the biblical writings is the feature of the brothers’ jealousy explicitly noted. Moreover the word appears three times more in Acts. In Ac 5:17, the high priest and all his associates, who were members of the party of the Sadducees, were filled with jealousy (ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου) because of the apostles. In Ac 13:45, the Jews were filled with jealousy (ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου) because of Paul and Barnabas. In Ac 17:5, the Jews were jealous (ζηλώσαντες) because of Paul and Silas. In each case, it is interesting to note that jealousy is attributed to Jews and it is continuously followed by a rejection of God’s messengers.

Secondly, as mentioned earlier, this event where Joseph is sold as a slave is derived from Gn 37. In Gn 37, however, it is not his brothers who sold (ἀπέδοντο) Joseph into Egypt. For this part Gn 45:4 is much closer than Gn 37:28, 36: “I am your brother Joseph, whom you sold into Egypt” (NASB). It shows that Luke finally chooses and organizes the story for himself, though the story is clearly from the OT.

Richard (1979:259) states that “Acts 7:9 is as violently polemical as are vv 51-53 of the speech. Only Joseph is seen favourably. The same is not true of the Joseph episode of Gen 37-50 or of later treatments of Joseph in Jewish literature” (cf. Harrington 1976:165-171; Ward 1976:173-184). Along with two words, attention is also focused on the activities of Joseph’s brothers whom Stephen identifies with the patriarchs, thus continuing the disobedience of the fathers motif introduced in Abraham’s story.

The key phrase of the story of Joseph - "God was with him" - is found in v. 9b, although he was sold into Egypt. The earlier theme of God's omnipresence is restated here. At the same time, in the Joseph story, the motif of 'outside the land' occurs once again through God's salvation history of Israel (cf. Richard 1979:260).

As in the Abraham episode, the motif of God as Master of history is also confirmed here, owing to the use of two verbs that are attendant with the subject, 'God' in v. 9; 'rescued, gave' (v. 10). The word ἐξαιρέω in v. 10 appears eight times in the NT - five times in Acts (see Ac 7:10, 34; 12:11; 23:27; 26:17). The two occurrences in Matthew mean 'pull out' (see Mt 5:29; 18:9), while only Gl 1:4 shares its meaning with the Acts passages i.e., 'rescue'.

The phrase ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ χάριν seems to be drawn from the Joseph narrative in Genesis (see Gn 39:21 (LXX)), while Luke adds here καὶ σοφίαν. The Heb word חַכְמָה does not occur at all in Genesis, and the Gk word σοφία is rather rare in the Synoptic Gospels. It appears once in Markan material (see Mk 6:2; Mt 13:54), and three times in Q material (see Mt 11:49; 12:42; Lk 7:35; 11:31, 49), and then three times in Lukan material (see Lk 2:40, 52; 21:15). All four occurrences in Acts are in chapters 6 and 7 (see Ac 6:6, 10; 7:10, 22).⁵⁶

It is probable that 'God' is again the subject of the verb κατέστησεν ('appointed') in v. 10. The noun θλιψις in v. 10 is a specialized eschatological expression in Matthew and Mark, but it is used here as the common Lukan non-eschatological meaning (cf. Conzelmann 1960:98-99). Here Luke emphasizes God's activity on Joseph's behalf rather than the sufferings of Joseph, which are described in

⁵⁶ Once again, for the Gk word σοφία, the occurrence of the nominative form is found nine times in Mt 11:49; 13:54; Mk 6:2; Lk 2:40, 52; 7:35; 11:49; Ac 6:10; 7:22, and the accusative form is found three times in Lk 11:31; 21:15; Ac 7:10, and then the genitive form is found once in Ac 6:3.

the original context.

Furthermore Soards (1994:63-64) portrays God's role for this section, paying attention to two verbs ἐξαπέστειλεν and μετεκαλέσατο. The first verb ἐξαπέστειλεν in v. 12 relates to God's working and authority. It occurs in Ac 9:30; 11:22; 12:11; 13:26; 17:14; 22:21, which frequently entails God's command. The second verb μετεκαλέσατο in v. 14 also puts forward the act in obedience to God's purposes. It appears only four times (see Ac 7:14; 10:32; 20:17; 24:25) in Acts in the NT, which implies people's deeds in compliance with God's plan, but Ac 24:25 is likely to be a different case. As Conzelmann (1987:52) comments, "[t]he bearers of the promise themselves bring about the crisis (Gen 37:11, 28; 39:21), thus placing the stress on divine guidance."

The noun χόρτασμα in v. 11 is a *hapax legomenon* in the NT, but it occurs nine times in the LXX (Gn 24:25, 32; 42:27; 43:24; Dt 11:15; Jdg 19:19; Sir 33:25; 38:26; PssSol 5:10). Amongst scholars the meaning is problematic, though Richard (1979:260) states that "the term means 'sustenance' (influence of Ps 36:19) or 'supplies' as it does in the papyri."⁵⁷ Via the arrangement of the elements, it is well presented as follows: (Richard 1979:260-261)

⁵⁷ For the former case, cf. Haenchen (1971:279). For the latter case, cf. Moulton & Milligan ([1930]1949:690).

Positive Aspect: Joseph

God was with him

he delivered him from all his tribulations (θλίψεις)

he gave him favor and wisdom before Pharaoh king of Egypt

he appointed him ruler over Egypt and over his whole house.

Negative Aspect: The Patriarchs

[God was not with them]

but there came a famine upon all Egypt and Canaan

[there came] great tribulation (θλίψεις)

the fathers were unable to find sustenance (χορτάσματα).

Concerning this paradigm which is evidently confirmed by the OT passages (see Dt 31:17;⁵⁸ Ps 36:18-19 (LXX),⁵⁹ 2 Chr 20:6-17⁶⁰), Richard (1979:261) concludes that God is not with evil men and thus there follow many evils, famine, afflictions, and deficiency of provisions; in contrast, God is with the righteous and he rescues them from all their troubles and gives them immeasurable goodwill.

As discussed earlier, the mentioning of Shechem as the burial site in v. 16 is contentious among scholars. Harrison (1975:115-116) states that:

Stephen's mention of Shechem was probably not casual but deliberate ... A

⁵⁸ "And I will be very angry with them in that day, and I will leave them and turn my face away from them, and they shall be devoured; and many evils and afflictions (θλίψεις) shall come upon them; and they shall say in that day, Because the Lord my God is not with me, these evils have come upon me" (LXE).

⁵⁹ "The Lord knows the ways of the perfect; and their inheritance (κληρονομία; cf. Ac 7:5) shall be for ever.

They shall not be ashamed in an evil time;

and in days of famine they shall be satisfied (χορτασθήσονται)" (LXE).

⁶⁰ Especially, v. 9: "If there should come (ἐπέλθῃ) upon us evils, sword, judgment, pestilence, famine (λιμός), we will stand before this house, and before thee, (for thy name is upon this house,) and we will cry to thee because of the affliction (θλίψεως), and thou shalt hear, and deliver" (LXE).

rigid Jew might want to forget the patriarchal contacts with Shechem, but Stephen would not permit that. To mention Shechem was almost the equivalent of calling attention to Samaria.

Similarly, some (Spiro 1967:285-300; Scharlemann 1968:21; Mare 1971:16; Scobie 1972-1973:391; Purvis 1975:174) have maintained that the Lukan use of Shechem was influenced by the Samaritan tradition, although their points are respectively different.

However, Richard (1977:190-208) criticises that as does the MT. The Samaritan Pentateuch represents the burial site of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as Hebron. Luke's real intention in using this place name with his theological motivation is to express the motif of being 'outside the land'. Here one could connect the following narrative of Philip's evangelization in Samaria, and confirm this fact in v. 5: "God gave Abraham no inheritance, not even a foot of ground."

Some scholars such as Lake and Cadbury (1933:73), Kilgallen (1976^a:49-60), and Dupont (1979:135) regard Joseph as a prefiguring of Jesus, Messiah. There are three main reasons: Joseph's deliverance of the patriarchs (Bruce [1951]1987:148; Williams 1957:105-106),⁶¹ his innocent suffering (Conzelmann 1987:53), and Joseph's brothers (patriarchs) second visit to him as a parallel to the time of deliverance (Scharlemann 1968:40).

The Joseph story however suggests that the reasons for thinking Joseph as a prefiguring of Jesus are uncertain at this point (cf. White 1992:170). Firstly, the deliverance of the patriarchs is depicted in a direct manner, exclusive of any salvific appellations bestowed on Joseph. Secondly, the innocence factor in

⁶¹ Kilgallen (1976^a:62) regards it as "christological" allusions in Joseph's story, saying that "Joseph, rejected, but saved by God and glorified, is the means by which Israel is saved ..."

relation to Joseph's affliction is by no means revealed in Ac 7 and there is no comprehensive explanation of Joseph's unreasonable treatment. Thirdly, the purpose of Jesus' second coming is not found in the story. More likely, Joseph seems to be chosen because of the motif of insubordination of the patriarchs that is exposed in the Joseph episode.

4. SUMMARY

In this section, no explicit quotation is found. For this reason, Marshall (1980:137) responds that Joseph's story is "recorded factually, and it is not clear what the theological point of the details is" (cf. Foakes-Jackson 1931:61; Dibelius 1956^c:169; Wilson 1962:171; Haenchen 1971:288). Within Joseph's episode, however, there are still the motifs of God's salvation outside of Judaea (cf. Richard 1979:260) and the disobedience of the Israelite fathers. Luke's uses of the OT in Stephen's speech thus seem the presentation of the author's theological intention. However, the fact should not be ignored that via the explicit quotations in this speech the writer's theological and hermeneutical aim is reinforced even more powerfully.

Prior to the Moses story, the theme of the Israelite rejection of God's servant, in fact, has already been shown in the story of Joseph (7:9-16). Luke has presented an implication of the conflict between brothers that goes through Joseph's story. Since Joseph's brothers (the patriarchs) were jealous of him, they sold him to Egypt as a slave destined to suffer many afflictions. But God was with him and rescued him from all his troubles.

It is proper that, at last, the victimization of Joseph at the hands of his brothers accompanied by an equally powerful assertion of God's attendance and working in his life. Martín-Asensio (1999:246) describes this theme by grouping

Joseph's story into the repeated twofold structure as follows: adversity (9a); blessing (9b-10); adversity (11-12); blessing (13-16).

Keeping in mind that the setting for Joseph's story is predominantly in Egypt, it can also be said that the previous theme of God as transcending the land is reiterated.

In conclusion, the themes of rejection, vindication, God outside of the land, and God as the main actor of history recur in Joseph's story, in spite of no explicit quotation.