

CHAPTER IV

THE MOSES STORY (Ac 7:17-43)

1. INTRODUCTION

“Moses, Judaism’s most important and imposing figure, plays a prominent role in early Christian literature ... for Christians claimed to be the authentic heirs of Israel’s history, and in first-century Judaism that meant they had to show themselves to be the rightful children of Moses” (Allison 1997^b:777-778). What is noteworthy here is that the story of Moses is the longest in the speech. Martín-Asensio (1999:246) calculates that the Moses’ story in the speech occupies approximately 35% of the total,⁶² compared with 11.6% for Joseph’s story. So, most of the speech is devoted to Moses’ story.

Richard (1978:76) suggests that the Moses story can be classified into three parts, each of which covers forty years of Moses’ life⁶³ and is compatible with one of the first three chapters of Exodus. Nonetheless, the story here is more minutely grouped into five subsections. According to Richard, this division offers fair proof that “the author is employing the OT text as his direct source.” Furthermore in this section Luke uses the most quotations (six) in the discourse.

Via the quotations he makes his theological points deliberately and skilfully, e.g., God’s omnipresence; the Israelites’ rejection of God’s living oracles including his agent – Moses; further, their rejection of God by means of their idolatry in contrast to God’s faithfulness to his words, and God as the primary subject

⁶² According to Moessner (1983:605), the size of the Moses-Exodus narrative is calculated at 53.8 % of Stephen’s words.

⁶³ This division is mainly based on Dt 34:7a (“Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died”).

within Israel's history. In the end, these motifs serve to disclose the false witnesses of Stephen's accusers, who had accused him of blasphemy against Moses and the law.

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND MOSES' INFANCY (AC 7:17-22)

2.1 Composition

The major section of Stephen's speech centres on the story of Moses, which is divided into five subsections. The first of the five subsections is started by Stephen: (a) "As the time drew near for God to fulfil his promise to Abraham, the number of our people in Egypt greatly increased.⁶⁴ Then another king, who knew nothing about Joseph, became ruler of Egypt" (Καθώς δὲ ἤγγιζεν ὁ χρόνος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἧς ὠμολόγησεν ὁ θεὸς τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ἠύξησεν ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐπληθύνη ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἄχρι οὗ ἀνέστη βασιλεὺς ἕτερος [ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον] ὃς οὐκ ᾔδει τὸν Ἰωσήφ, vv. 17-18).

Regarding the phrase 'another king' (cf. Rowley 1950^a:*passim*; Noth 1962:119), Bruce ([1951]1987:149) says,

it is evident from the early chapters of Exodus that the Egyptian court was not far distant from the place of the Hebrews' residence in Egypt; this fits the nineteenth rather than the eighteenth dynasty. The reference to the building of Rameses in Ex 1:11 probably points to Per-Rameses-Mry-Amun (later Tanis), built by Rameses II (c. 1301-1234 B.C.), chief king of the nineteenth dynasty (c. 1320-1200 B.C.).

⁶⁴ For the original context, see Ex 1:7. See also Josephus, *Ant* 2:201.

Alternatively, Fitzmyer (1998:375), suggests that the king may be Seti I (c. 1308-1290 B.C.), of the nineteenth dynasty, “who moved the royal throne from Thebes in Upper Egypt to the Nile Delta region in the hope of recapturing control over western Asia and there began a vast building continued.”

The subordinate conjunction *καθώς* is infrequently used in a temporal meaning, e.g., ‘as’ or ‘when’. So this meaning of the word only appears here in the NT (see also 2 Macc 1:31; Neh 5:6; contrast Page 1918:122). The noun *χρόνος* means a time for the fulfilment of the promise of vv. 6-7 (see also vv. 20, 23). Barrett (1994:353) states that it is difficult to tell the difference between *χρόνος* and *καιρῶ* in Acts. The word *ὁμολογέω* means rather ‘to make one’s confession’ than ‘to make a promise’ (Neufeld 1963:13-20). On this word, the witnesses P⁴⁵ D E p vg^{mss} have *ἐπαγγείλατο*, whilst Ψ M gig sy^(p) bo have *ὥμοσεν*.

The reading of Ex 1:7 (LXX) has *οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραηλ* instead of *ὁ λαός* in Acts. Interestingly, Luke again employs the two words (*αὐξάνω* and *πληθύνω*) which already occurred in Ac 6:7. Finally, vv. 17-18 are connected with the phrase *ἄχρι οὔ*. With regard to the problem of [*ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον*], Metzger ([1971]1975:345-346) says,

on the one hand, if the shorter reading be regarded as original, it is easy to see how Ex 1:8 in the Septuagint would have influenced scribes to insert the phrase, *ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον*. On the other hand, since the preceding verse in Acts speaks of the people of Israel being *ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ*, it may be that the phrase was deleted as superfluous.

The Committee thus put the phrase in brackets in the final translation.

Stephen quotes almost verbatim from Ex 1:8: ἀνάστη δὲ βασιλεὺς ἕτερος ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον ὃς οὐκ ᾔδει τὸν Ἰωσηφ. According to Barrett (1994:352), the Western text therefore may be the original text in this instance. It has two different elements: the omission of ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον (P^{45vid} D E M gig p sy^h) and the substitution of ἐμνήσθη τοῦ for ᾔδει τὸν (D E gig p).

(b) “He dealt treacherously with our people⁶⁵ and oppressed our forefathers by forcing them to throw out their newborn babies so that they would die”⁶⁶ (οὗτος κατασοφισάμενος τὸ γένος ἡμῶν ἐκάκωσεν τοὺς πατέρας [ἡμῶν] τοῦ ποιεῖν τὰ βρέφη ἔκθετα αὐτῶν εἰς τὸ μὴ ζωογονεῖσθαι, v. 19). According to Ex 1:11, the new king compelled the Israelites to build Pithom and Rameses as store cities for himself. The verb κατασοφισάμενος is found only here in the NT (see also Ex (LXX) 1:10; Jdt 5:11; 10:19; Plutarch and Lucian). The adjective ἔκθετα is also a *hapax legomenon*. The noun βρέφη means ‘a newborn baby’ (see Lk 2:12, 16). Despite the external evidence in the absence of the first personal plural pronoun [ἡμῶν], the text critical Committee put it in brackets to indicate uncertainty as to whether it fits here; this is the first instance of the same pronoun in the same verse (Metzger [1971]1975:346).

(c) “At that time Moses was born” (Ἐν ᾧ καιρῷ ἐγεννήθη Μωϋσῆς, v. 20a). (d) “and he was no ordinary child. For three months he was cared for in his father's house”⁶⁷ (καὶ ἦν ἀστέλιος⁶⁸ τῷ θεῷ ὃς ἀνετρέφη μῆνας τρεῖς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ τοῦ πατρός, v. 20b).

Concerning the name of Moses (see Philo, *VitMos* 1:17), Fitzmyer (1998:375)

⁶⁵ For the detailed depiction of the OT, see Ex 1:9-14.

⁶⁶ For the context of the OT, see Ex 1:22. See also Josephus, *Ant* 2:205-208.

⁶⁷ For the full narrative of the OT, see Ex 2:1-2. See also Josephus, *Ant* 2:210-218; Philo, *VitMos* 1:9; Jub 47:3; BibAnt 9:3-10.

⁶⁸ On the various meanings, cf. Barrett (1994:353-354).

explains as follows:

As given to the child by Pharaoh's daughter, it undoubtedly stands for a shortened form of Egyptian names like Ah-mose ("Ah is born"), Har-mose ("Horus is born"), Thut-mose ("Thut is born"). Exod 2:10de, however, records a Hebrew folk etymology, even ascribing it to the Pharaoh's daughter: "Because I drew him (*měšîtihû*) from the water." The author of Exodus saw divine providence at work in that the very daughter of the Pharaoh, who had ordered the death of male Hebrew infants, became the instrument of the salvation of Moses, drawing him from the waters of the Nile and naming him. His name was written in Greek as *Mōysēs* or *Mōsēs*, whence comes the English spelling. See Josephus, *Ant* 2.9.6 §228, where the name is explained as derived from Egyptian *mōy*, "water," and *esēs*, "those saved," another folk etymology.

In Ex 2 the name of Moses' father is not mentioned, but simply depicted as "a man from the house of Levi". He is called Amram in Ex 6:20. Moulton thinks τῷ θεῷ is the "dative of the person judging" (1908:104) and a "Hebraism" (Moulton & Howard 1929:443; Bruce [1951]1976:167).

(e) "When he was placed outside, Pharaoh's daughter took him"⁶⁹ (ἐκτεθέντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἀνείλατο αὐτὸν ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραῶ, v. 21a). Josephus (*Ant* 2:224-237) calls ἡ θυγάτηρ Φαραῶ Thermutis, while Jub 47:5 calls Pharaoh's daughter Tharmuth, and Artapanus in his work *On the Jews* calls her Meris. The Western text (D E syr^h with * cop^{G67}) adds εἰς (παρὰ D) τὸ ποταμόν after ἐκτεθέντος to accentuate Moses' uncovered place.

⁶⁹ The original portrayal of the OT occurs in Ex 2:3-5.

(f) “and brought him up as her own son”⁷⁰ (καὶ ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν, v. 21b). Perhaps the verb ἀνείλατο may be taken literally, but the word is employed in Koine Greek for acknowledging one’s child or adopting a child as one’s son (Barrett 1994:354-355). According to Horsely (1982:9), “Both the LXX and the NT passages reflect the terminology of these nursing contracts from Egypt.”

(g) “Moses was educated in all the wisdom of the Egyptians” (καὶ ἐπαιδέυθη Μωϋσῆς [ἐν] πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων, v. 22a). Philo (*VitMos* 23) supplies details of all that the Egyptians taught Moses “arithmetic, geometry, the lore of metre, rhythm and harmony, and the whole subject of music as shown by the use of instruments or in textbooks and treatises of a more special character.” B Ψ M d vg have πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, while P^{74vid} Ⲙ A C E g i g p have ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ.

(h) “and was powerful in speech and action” (ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, v. 22b). This sentence looks as though it is in conflict with Ex 4:10 (Moses said to the LORD, “O Lord, I have never been eloquent, neither in the past nor since you have spoken to your servant. I am slow of speech and tongue.”). Barrett (1994:356) states that because of Ex 7:1-2 (...your brother Aaron will be your prophet...), “this is not to be dismissed as mock modesty on Moses’ part or as a way of excusing himself from a difficult and dangerous task”. Fitzmyer (1998:376) also denotes that there is no ancient tradition to show Moses’ fluency.

However, according to Sir 45:3, “By his words he [Moses] caused signs to cease (ἐν λόγοις αὐτοῦ σημεῖα κατέπαυσεν).” Josephus (*Ant* 2:271; 3:13) also speaks of his “extraordinary influence in addressing a crowd” (see also Philo, *VitMos* 1:80). Lake and Cadbury (1933:75), however, argue that the mention of

⁷⁰ For the detailed episode of the OT, see Ex 2:9-10. See also Josephus, *Ant* 2:232.

Moses' power in speech relates to the written word. It is proper that the inconsistency should not be given too much weight, as compared to the later records of the OT above.

The very phrasing δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ resonates with the depiction of Jesus in Lk 24:19 (δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ) and somewhat with that of Stephen in Ac 6:8 (χάριτος καὶ δυνάμεως ἐποίει τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα).⁷¹

2.2 Interpretation of the subsection by Luke

At this point Stephen brings to an end the patriarchs' story and moves on to talk about Moses. Vv. 17-19 are used to form a transition from the Joseph story to the Moses story, as mentioned earlier (cf. Fitzmyer 1998:374). Through Moses' life, above all, Stephen starts responding to the charge that was levelled against him i.e., that he has blasphemed against Moses.

The offspring of Jacob continued to stay in Egypt and to multiply until the dawn of the era when God was to fulfil his covenantal promise to Abraham (see Gl 4:4). It reveals, on the whole, how Luke perceives prophecy. Luke links the noun ἐπαγγελίας in v. 17 to the verb ἐπηγγείλατο in v. 5, showing us that he already sees the events in Egypt as God at work to fulfil his promise. However, that he does not consider the growth of Israel as the promise-fulfilment pattern on this point is clear (contrast Gn 15:5). Barrett (1994:352) finds it interesting that the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham at the Exodus is not a Christian viewpoint, but a Jewish viewpoint.

The population numbers mentioned in this section are a matter of disagreement

⁷¹ For another occurrence of a similar expression, see also Ac 2:22 (δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις).

among scholars. For example, Kistemaker (1990:250) suggests that the total population was about one million five hundred thousand. As “the word of God continued to increase (ἠϋξανεῖν), and the number of the disciples multiplied greatly (ἐπληθύνετο)” in Ac 6:7 (ESV), “the people grew (ἠϋξησεν) and multiplied (ἐπληθύνθη)” in Ac 7:17 (NKJV). Goulder (1964:164) says that “[g]rowth and multiplication are the features of the new people of God in Acts.” The phrase ὁ λαός denotes the Israelites who were descended from Jacob and his sons.

A central thematic issue in the Moses story is that the king of Egypt who came to the throne did not know Joseph. Marshall (1980:139) sees this event as the climax of the Moses story. Under his administration there was a sudden change in the treatment of the Israelites. The new king oppressed them and took advantage of them, even to the extent that Israelites were dying as a result of forced labour. He sought to repress their increasing numbers by putting them to forced labour and by compelling them to exterminate all male Hebrew babies by leaving them exposed to the elements so that they would not survive.

Despite this imperial decree, the Hebrews continued to increase in number. Kee (1997:98) states that Pharaoh’s inhuman decree “had the reverse effect of bringing Moses into a place of unique favor in the center of power.” Haenchen (1971:280) comments that v. 19 “makes freer use of Exod. 1.10f.” so as to convey the fulfilment of God’s promise to Abraham, as occurred in v. 6. Luke’s connection of the verb ἐκάκωσεν in v. 19 to the verb κακώσουσιν in v. 6 also serves to report the motif (cf. Tannehill 1990:91). The reference to “our race” in v. 19 continues to describe Stephen’s shared identity with his hearers.

Two observations can be shown here. Firstly, the killing of the male babies in Egypt is analogous to the infanticide in Bethlehem when Jesus was born. Secondly, by means of Pharaoh’s unceasing brutality to Israel’s people, God

made them get ready for their liberty and exodus and granted them a yearning to go to 'the land'.

At that time Moses was born and was beautiful. Both Philo (*VitMos* 1:9) and Josephus (*Ant* 2:224, 229-331) speak of Moses' beauty. In opposition to the king's proclamation, his parents kept him for three months before abandoning him. The verb ἀνετρέφει in v. 20 with the meaning of 'bring up' seems to be Lukan in the NT (see also Ac 7:21; 22:3). As compared with Ex 2:2, τῷ θεῷ is added after ἀστειός, and it "may be taken in its full sense 'in the sight of God'" (Bruce [1951]1976:167). Here Luke again describes for his hearers the superiority of God's activity over human activity.

The three month old baby, Moses, was finally placed outside by his parents, where he was discovered and raised by Pharaoh's daughter (contrast Josephus, *Ant* 2:217-223). Consequently, it is likely that he had no personal complaint against the Egyptians at this point. Moses is here illustrated as being suggestive of Jesus, e.g., 7:20-22 with the Lukan narrative of the birth and childhood of Jesus through Lk 2.⁷²

Marty (1984:212) provides further detailed parallels between Moses and Jesus. Both are jeopardized in babyhood, but protected (see Ex 1:7; Mt 2:13-18; Heb 11:23). Both are called out of Egypt to save their people (see Mt 2:14-15). In Lk 24:19 the two disciples on the road to Emmaus portray Jesus as being powerful in word and deed (ὃς ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ), while in Acts Stephen uses an analogous set phrase to illustrate Moses in v. 22 (ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ). Marty adds that the set phrase "powerful in

⁷² Daube (1985^a:2329-2331, 2346-2348) describes Jesus as the new Moses. Cf. also Marty (1984). For the interpretation of Jesus as the new Moses, especially in Matthew, cf. Allison (1993:137-290).

speech and action” is related to a prophet in Luke-Acts. However, in his two volumes, Luke perhaps employs the concept of ‘a prophet’ to indicate rather Elijah and Elisha than specifically Moses, as I will discuss later (see Lk 3:16; 7:19 from Mt 3:1-24; Lk 4:25-27 from 1 Ki 17:8-16; 2 Ki 5:1-14; Lk 7:16 from 1 Ki 17:23; Lk 9:54-55 from 1 Ki 18:36-38; 2 Ki 1:9-14;⁷³ Lk 9:61-62 from 1 Ki 19:19-21; cf. also Fitzmyer 1986:213-215).⁷⁴

Luke’s reference to the Egyptian education of Moses and his resultant capabilities is a clue to the motif that God is not confined to any one place. The emphasis here is that God even makes use of the knowledge of Egyptians to prepare his agent. God as the subject of Moses’ life appears seminal at this point. However, it is also clear that the motif of Moses’ rejection already occurs from the beginning of this section of Stephen’s speech.

3. FLIGHT INTO MIDIAN (AC 7:23-29)

3.1 Composition

The second of the five subsections on Moses in Stephen’s speech continues as follows: (a) “When Moses was forty years old, he decided to visit his fellow Israelites” (Ὡς δὲ ἐπληροῦτο αὐτῷ τεσσαρακονταετῆς χρόνος, ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ, v. 23). It is necessary to notice Luke’s manipulation of the expression ἐπληροῦτο which might contain the scheme of God’s timing (see also vv. 17, 30; Ac 2:1).

In spite of Wilcox’s argument on an Aramaic influence (1965:63), the phrase ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν has some prior examples that can be found in the LXX of

⁷³ See also Lk 12:49.

⁷⁴ Besides, Lk 9:51 alludes to 2 Ki 2:11 with the phrase “taken up”.

2 Ki 12:5; Jr 3:16; 28:50; 51:21; Ezk 38:10; Is 65:16 (cf. Fitzmyer 1998:376; Richard 1978:82). According to Barrett (1994:357), the phrase “may be described as a Lucan septuagintalism ..., but here it could well have been drawn from the (equally septuagintalizing) source that Luke was using.” The sense of the verb ἐπισκέψασθαι goes beyond the normal meaning, that is, ‘visit’ (see Lk 1:68, 78; 7:16; Ac 6:3; 15:14, 36). Luke seems to allude to Ex 2:11b (LXX): ἐξήλθεν πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραηλ, with the substitution of ἐπισκέψασθαι for ἐξήλθεν πρὸς.

According to Dt 34:7, Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died. However, Moses’ age, as spoken of by Stephen (age 40), is not mentioned in the OT. Nevertheless, Stephen’s testimony is similar to one rabbinic tradition. The *Midrash Tanhuma* on Ex 2:6 divides all Moses’ life into three equal sections of forty years each: (1) Moses was 40 years of age when he fled Egypt, (2) lived in Midian for 40 years, (3) and led the Israelites for 40 years. Witherington (1998:269) regards this as a Greek threefold scheme “of speaking of his birth, early upbringing, and then education,” which is also applied to the life of Paul in other sources (see Ac 22:3; Plato, *Crito* 50E; 51C; Philo, *Flacc* 158). Marshall (1980:140) says that “forty was the age at which a person had grown up (Ex 2:11).”

(b) “He saw one of them being mistreated by an Egyptian”⁷⁵ (καὶ ἰδὼν τινα ἀδικούμενον ἠμύνατο, v. 24a). (c) “so he went to his defense and avenged him by killing the Egyptian”⁷⁶ (καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν⁷⁷ τῷ καταπονουμένῳ πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον, v. 24b). The verb ἠμύνατο in v. 24a is a *hapax legomenon* and usually means ‘defend’, but once in a while it is translated ‘to help’ (see Is (LXX) 59:16).

⁷⁵ For the original context of the OT, see Ex 2:11c.

⁷⁶ For the detailed narrative of the OT, see Ex 2:12.

⁷⁷ For the occurrence of the noun in Luke-Acts, see Lk 18:7-8. For the other occurrences in the NT, see 2 Cor 7:11; 2 Th 1:8; 1 Pt 2:14.

The Western text, following the OT reading, adds that Moses “hid him in the sand” (see also Philo, *VitMos* 43-44).

(d) “Moses thought that his own people would realize that God was using him to rescue them” (ἐνόμιζεν δὲ συνιέναι τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς [αὐτοῦ] ὅτι ὁ θεὸς διὰ χειρὸς αὐτοῦ δίδωσιν σωτηρίαν⁷⁸ αὐτοῖς, v. 25a). (e) “but they did not” (οἱ δὲ οὐ συνῆκαν, v. 25b). The third person singular pronoun αὐτοῦ in v. 25a occurs in P⁷⁴ & B C pc gig vg, but A D E Ψ 33 do not have it. V. 25 is lacking totally from Exodus. Stephen again introduces the theme of the people’s misunderstanding and their failure to acknowledge the leader dispatched by God (see vv. 9-10).

(f) “The next day Moses came upon two Israelites who were fighting” (τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὤφθη⁷⁹ αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις, v. 26a).⁸⁰ (g) “He tried to reconcile them by saying” (καὶ συνήλλασεν⁸¹ αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην⁸² εἰπών, v. 26b). (h) “Men, you are brothers” (ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε, v. 26c). (i) “why do you want to hurt each other?” (ἵνατί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους; v. 26d).⁸³

(j) “But the man who was mistreating the other pushed Moses aside and said” (ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν⁸⁴ τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπών, v. 27a). The verb ἀπώσατο is often used by the text of the LXX for God’s rejection (see Jdg 6:13; 1 Sm 12:22; Ps 42:2; 43:9, 23; 59:1; Jr 2:37; Ezk 5:11; Hs 4:6; 9:17). (k) “Who made you ruler and judge over us?” (τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ’ ἡμῶν; v. 27b). The noun ἄρχοντα normally means one in authority, such as a ruler, official, or

⁷⁸ The word can be translated into ‘salvation’ (see ESV).

⁷⁹ For the other occurrences of the verb in Acts, see Ac 2:3; 7:2, 30, 35; 9:17; 13:31; 16:9; 22:16.

⁸⁰ For the original context of the OT, see Ex 2:13a.

⁸¹ For the concept of reconciliation, see Chrysostom, *Or* 22; 38; 77-78; Lucianus, *Demon* 9; Philostratus, *VitAp* 1:15; 6:38.

⁸² For the other occurrences of the noun in Luke-Acts, see Lk 1:79; 2:14, 29; Ac 10:36.

⁸³ For the original question of Moses in the OT, see Ex 2:13b.

⁸⁴ Cf. ἀδικούμενον in v. 24 and ἀδικεῖτε in v. 26.

judge (see Ac 3:17).

(l) “Do you want to kill me as you killed the Egyptian yesterday?”⁸⁵ (μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις ὄν τρόπον ἀνεῖλες ἐχθὲς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον; v. 28). (m) “When Moses heard this,⁸⁶ he fled” (ἔφυγεν δὲ Μωϋσῆς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, v. 29a). Ex 2:15a entails that Moses fled from Pharaoh because Pharaoh had heard of this matter and tried to kill Moses. According to Johnson (1992:127),

the Jewish apologists had various ways of dealing with this embarrassing incident. *The Book of Jubilees* 47:12 is very close to Acts, giving as the motivation for the flight, ‘because of these words’. In sharp contrast, Pseudo-Philo’s *Biblical Antiquities* 9:16-10:1 omits the entire sequence, moving directly from Moses’ childhood to the plagues. Artapanus’ *On the Jews* gives a novelistic account of a rivalry between Moses and the Egyptian king; it was the assassin sent by the king to kill Moses that Moses himself killed, forcing him to flee. Josephus also attributes Moses’ flight to an envious plot against him, but does not have Moses’ killing anyone (*Antiquities of the Jews* 2:254-256). Philo combines these elements, retaining the killing of the Egyptian as in Exodus, but also including a royal plot against Moses (*De Vita Mosis* 1:43-46).

(n) “and became an alien in the land of Midian,⁸⁷ where he became the father of two sons” (καὶ ἐγένετο πάροικος ἐν γῆ Μαδιάμ, οὗ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς δύο, v. 29b). Most scholars locate Midian on the east side of the Gulf of the Aqabah, in modern Saudi Arabia (cf. Barrett 2002:102).⁸⁸ In the land of Midian Moses married Zipporah, one of Jethro’s seven daughters, who bore him two sons,

⁸⁵ For the original question of the Hebrew in the OT, see Ex 2:14b.

⁸⁶ For the detailed narrative of the OT, see Ex 2:14c.

⁸⁷ For the full description of the OT, see Ex 2:15b.

⁸⁸ For various arguments, cf. also Philby (1957).

Gershom and Eliezer (see Ex 2:16-22; 18:3-4). According to Fitzmyer (1998:377), “[t]he Midianites seem to have been a tribal group related to the early Hebrews” (see Gn 25:1-2, 4).

3.2 Moses refuted by a fellow Israelite and the quoted text from Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:27-28

3.2.1 Other occurrences of Ex 2:14

As a matter of interest there is a vague reference to Ex 2:14 in Lk 12:14 which is of course written by Luke, the same author as the book of Acts.

3.2.2 The introductory formula (Ac 7:27a)

The introductory formula is formed by the words: “But the man who was mistreating the other pushed Moses aside and said” (ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπών, v. 27a), as we have seen.

3.2.3 Establishing and describing the textual differences

NT(NA27)	LXX	MT
Ac 7:27b-28	Ex 2:14b ⁸⁹	Ex 2:14b
²⁷ τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν;	¹⁴ τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν	מִי שָׂמַךְ לְאִישׁ שֶׁר וְשֹׁפֵט עָלֵינוּ
²⁸ μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις ὄν τρόπον ἀνεῖλες ἐχθὲς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον;	μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις ὄν τρόπον ἀνεῖλες ἐχθὲς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον	הֲלֹהֶרְגֵנִי אַתָּה אָמַר כְּאִשֶׁר הָרַגְתָּ אֶת־הַמִּצְרִי

3.2.3.1 Textual differences between MT and LXX

In the case of the quotation from Ex 2:14, the LXX reading follows exactly the reading of the MT, except for the addition of the adverb (ἐχθὲς).

3.2.3.2 Textual differences between Acts and LXX

Both the text of Acts and the text of the LXX coincide with each other, despite the one difference between the MT and the LXX. It is thus unnecessary to deal extensively with the textual difference between the two versions. Therefore, it seems clear that Luke used the Greek version as his source for this part of Stephen's speech.

⁸⁹ Unless otherwise referred to, the LXX version edited by Wevers (1991) is used for the Greek translation of Exodus.

3.3 Lukan method used for the quotation

As mentioned earlier, both the LXX and the NT agree with the MT, with the exception of the addition of the adverb (ἐχθές). It is somewhat surprising that a large number of scholars (e.g., Bruce [1951]1976:169; Wilson 1962:178; Lawrence 1964:22-24; Haenchen 1971:281; Kilgallen 1976^a:71-72; Richard 1978:85-86; Conzelmann 1987:53; Johnson 1992:127; Barrett 1994:359; Arnold 1996:313-314) do not take notice of the difference between the MT and the LXX. In fact, some scholars (e.g., Walton 1972:72-73; Fitzmyer 1998:377) speak of the textual agreement between them. On account of the textual agreement between the LXX and the NT, we can be reasonably certain that the quotation originated in a LXX version, which Luke had, and from which he quoted this text from Ex 2:14. A lot of LXX MSS (B* F M 64*-708-*oll*⁷⁰⁷ 56-129 134-370 318 407-630 ClemR 4^{te}) have the reading that includes ἐχθές.

According to the following scholars (e.g., Kilgallen 1976^a:152; Nolland 1993:685), in Lk 12:14 Jesus' answer echoes the words from Ex 2:14. Luke could also have known this quotation well from the Scriptures. Archer and Chirichigno (1983:13), mention that it is possible to infer this addition from its original context (Ex 2:13-14). What is striking is that the full narrative that is illustrated in this subsection is from Ex 2 (Arnold 1996:313).

3.4 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke

The second subsection (Ac 7:23-29), focuses chiefly on Moses' flight into the desert of Midian, so corresponding with the middle forty years of Moses' life. Luke continues to detail his main theological theme of the Israelite rejection of God's messenger in this subsection, especially with his explicit quotation from Ex 2:14.

When Moses is forty years old, he is sent to visit his fellow Israelites. As we have said above, Luke's repeated use of the expressions ἐπληροῦτο in v. 23, and πληρωθέντων in v. 30 shows that God controls the time of the salvation history of his people. The phrase ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ seems to mean "it came into (his) heart" (Conzelmann 1987:53), so implying that the intention of Moses' visit is not his own, rather it comes from God (cf. Marshall 1980:140).

It is confirmed by the following verb ἐπισκέψασθαι, which means more than a social meeting (Barrett 1994:357). Out of the 11 occurrences in the NT, the word is employed 7 times in Luke-Acts, three times in Luke and four in Acts. It is seen to describe God's merciful visit to his people (see Lk 1:68, 78; 7:16; Ac 15:14), the appointment of the seven men under God's supervision (see Ac 6:3), and Paul's and Barnabas' determination to revisit the churches on a second missionary trip. Finally, it seems to point out Moses' action under divine guidance at this point. Ironically however Moses' attempt fails and he escapes.

During his visit Moses kills an Egyptian for his fellow's sake. Here, Luke's emphasises Moses' justice (ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν)⁹⁰ rather than the killing itself. Luke interprets this fact, which is not mentioned in the OT, to make his point. Kilgallen (1976^a:68) states that the verb καταπονέω "lends credence to the justice of Moses' action, indeed, to the accuracy of Moses' moral sense." The word καταπονέω occurs only twice in the NT (see 2 Pt 2:7).

It is interesting to note that Philo (*VitMos* 1:43-44) justifies Moses' killing of the Egyptian because some of the Egyptian overseers were

⁹⁰ For Lukan usage of the word, see Lk 18:7.

very savage and furious men, being, as to their cruelty, not at all different from poisonous serpents or carnivorous beasts--wild beasts in human form--being clothed with the form of a human body so as to give an appearance of gentleness in order to deceive and catch their victim, but in reality being harder than iron or adamant. ... it was a pious action to destroy one who only lived for the destruction of others.

Moses expects his fellow Israelites to accept him as their saviour, but they do not seem to realize that God sent Moses to rescue them, God's own people. Moses soon discovers that he is mistaken. Combrink (1979:13) asserts that in this subsection this verse is the most important. That is why v. 25 is entirely unmatched in Ex 2 "that Moses had this sight of how God would be working through him even before his flight from Egypt" (cf. Witherington 1998:269). The verse reflects Luke's interpretative embellishment of Moses' deed once again.

Luke here depicts the murder as a divine action (cf. Haenchen 1971:281), reflecting back to God's promise in v. 7, of which Moses is God's agent. God is now giving Israel's people salvation (*σωτηρίαν*) through Moses' hand. According to Soards (1994:65), the term *σωτηρίαν* in Acts is "the second of five uses of an important word" (see Ac 4:12; 13:26, 47; 16:17).

Witherington (1998:269) states that the Israelite "misunderstanding is paradoxically understandable in Luke's view because this is only the first period of interaction between Moses and God's people, and their ignorance of who Moses really was is not surprising, as is also later the case with Jesus (Acts 3:17)." It is probable only in the Moses section, but it should be noted that within the context of the Stephen discourse as a whole the motif of the Israelite misunderstanding has already been raised in the Joseph episode (cf. Barrett

1994:357-358), as discussed earlier, *pace* Haenchen (1971:281)⁹¹ and Soards (1994:65).

Johnson (1992:127) also states that v. 26 “has a deeper edge within Luke-Acts as a whole: like the brothers of Joseph ..., and like these contentious Israelites, so do the hearers of Stephen reject Jesus and the apostles and the one speaking to them.” The fact that Moses’ action is God’s action through him for their rescue, therefore, continues to build on the motif of the people’s lack of understanding and their failure to identify the divinely chosen saviour.

The following day serves to be Moses’ turning point. When Moses returns to Israel’s people, two Israelites are fighting. He tries to mediate as reconciler. Wilson (1962:177) - cf. also Barrett (1994:358) - says that:

The verb form used in connection with ordinary sight, ὁρᾶν, is replaced by the form ὠφθῆναι, otherwise reserved by Luke for use with angels (Luke 1:11; 22:43; Acts 16:9 the “man of Macedonia”), the risen Lord (Luke 23:34; Acts 9:17; 13:31; 26:16), or supernatural phenomena (Acts 2:3). Indeed, within Acts 7 is used otherwise to refer to the appearance of God (7:2) or an angel (7:30, 35).

Throughout Luke-Acts, the use of the verb possibly shows Luke’s appreciation of Moses.

Here Luke emphasises the verb συνήλασσειν to illustrate Moses as a reconciler

⁹¹ In his commentary, he says that “[f]or the first time in the speech we hear the theme of the people’s incomprehension and their failure to recognize the savior sent by God.”

among his own people. The verb *συνήλλασσειν* is a *hapax legomenon*.⁹² Johnson (1992:127) explains that the action of Moses for peace is connected with Jesus' ministry. Of interest is that one of the sage's (θεῖος ἀνὴρ) features is described as a peacemaker in Hellenistic works (see Chrysostom, *Or* 22; 38; 77-78; Lucianus, *Demon* 9; Philostratus, *VitAp* 1:15).

Moses' question - "Men, you are brothers; why do you want to hurt each other?" - to both Israelite men differs from the wording of Ex 2:13 (LXX), "but the dialogue nearly agrees and is probably a quotation" (Hatch 1970:169). The original question in the LXX is διὰ τί σὺ τύπτεις τὸν πλησίον. According to Barrett (1994:358), "D, as often, makes the language somewhat more forceful, replacing the first three words with τί ποιεῖτε, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί" (see also NA27).

Instead of πλησίον, the Lukan phrase ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί occurs fourteen times in Acts, but does not occur in any other NT books (Wilson 1962:178). With regard to the use of ἀδελφοί, Kistemaker (1990:255) comments that "Moses stressed the concept brothers not in the sense that these two men belonged to one family but rather that they were members of the Hebrew race. Moses, therefore, called attention to their (and his) shared nationality."

As a result of Moses' question, the one man pushes Moses aside and asks Moses a question in return. The verb ἀπόσατο literally means 'to thrust away'. According to Johnson (1992:127), "the rejection is both verbal and physical." It should be noted that the use of the verb ἀπωθέομαι against Moses is repeated in v. 39.

⁹² The apostle Paul habitually uses καταλλάσσω for the concept of the reconciliation (cf. Büchsel [1964]1981:254-259; Martin 1993:94; Porter 1993^a:695-699; Dunn 1998:228). For the brief survey of the concept by Paul, cf. Joubert (2005:112-122).

The man says, “Who made you ruler and judge over us? Do you want to kill me as you killed the Egyptian yesterday?” Here Luke has placed his quotation in a very similar context to that in which the quoted text originally emerged. The quotation, which follows the LXX exactly, serves to confirm Luke’s interpretation of the Israelite ignorance of Moses’ role as their deliverer. This theme will recur in vv. 35, 39.

One of the two Israelites here condemns Moses for claiming to be a ruler and judge over them, hence not understanding that it was God who had so chosen him. In spiritual blindness, as an Israelite, he closed his eyes to God’s strategy of deliverance. The quotation is an appropriate means of highlighting Luke’s censure of Israel’s people for discarding God’s servant. The determinants to understanding the writer’s intention behind this subsection are often the interpretative expressions and words that he puts in his selective abridgment of Moses’ story which do not appear in the OT.

According to Combrink (1979:13), it is important to note how the contrast between v. 25a and v. 25b is repeated in the contrast between v. 26 and v. 27. Moses hopes that his fellow Israelites understand him as God’s agent, but he is unrecognized by them. Once again, Moses seeks to settle a quarrel between two of Israel’s men, but he is resisted and dismissed. Before Luke presents his quotation in this subsection, the theme of the rejection of Moses has already been foreshadowed. However, the theme reaches its climax at this point by means of Luke’s quotation.

In the end, Moses departs into exile at one man’s word (ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ). According to Ex 2:15 (LXX), Pharaoh sought to kill Moses, and so Moses fled from the presence of Pharaoh (ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν Μωυσῆν ἀνεχώρησεν δὲ Μωυσῆς ἀπὸ προσώπου Φαραῶ), as mentioned earlier. Knowling ([1900]1951:153) interprets

that “[t]he matter would become known to Pharaoh as the words of the Hebrew intimated; it could not be hidden; and in spite of the attempt at concealment on the part of Moses by hiding the body in the sand, his life was no longer safe, and so he fled because he had nothing to hope for from his people.” The two accounts between the OT and the NT thus seem not to be in conflict with each other, but rather to be in harmony.

A further striking feature is that Luke’s explanation of the cause for Moses’ flight differs from the description which is given in the OT. Blass and Debrunner (1961 §219.2) categorize the preposition ἐν into an instrumental, but delineate it as clarifying the reason. It has a temporal purpose, indicating the time of Moses’ flight (Barrett 1994:359).

Here it is likely that Luke is seeking to reinforce the correlation between the fellow Israelites’ rejection of Moses and his flight into Midian, by neglecting Pharaoh’s threat that originally appeared in Ex 2:15. Loisy (1920:332) understands v. 29 allegorically as follows: Moses’ flight into Midian = carrying of the gospel to the Gentiles; the birth of his two sons = the bearing of the fruit of the gospel among the Gentiles.⁹³ However, Luke is describing a historical event and not presenting a symbolic allegory.

V. 29 closes the story about Moses’ second forty years. According to Barrett (1994:359), the words ἐγένετο πάροικος in v. 29 imply that “in Midian Moses was no more than a temporary resident alien” (see Ac 7:6), although the verb ὤκησεν in the LXX does not explicitly suggest this understanding. Through his vocabulary, Luke seems to suggest Moses’ return despite his earlier flight. Concerning Moses’ two sons, Lake and Cadbury (1933:76) affirm that “[t]he

⁹³ Recited from Haenchen (1971:282).

reference to these sons is irrelevant.” For Barrett (1994:360), however, Luke seems to intend that “for the divine call Moses would have good reason to remain in Midian.”

Regarding the Hebrew’s question, Krodel (1986:145) interprets it as follows: “The answer to this question, namely that God made him a ruler and a judge (cf. v. 35), never occurred to this Israelite, a paradigm of ignorance encountered in the Jesus story (cf. 2:36; 3:17; 13:27).” The point which Luke will advance in the process of Stephen’s speech is that just as Moses was rejected by his fellows, so Jesus was rejected by his people (see v. 52). There has been no change in attitude over the years. This quotation is part of the crescendo of Stephen’s dispute, which culminates in v. 37, despite the repetition of the same quotation.

Of further importance is the fact that Moses was born at the time when the fulfilment of the promises to Abraham was approaching. It reveals that vv. 6-7 served as a foreshadowing of the discussion of Moses and the exodus. The motif of God’s faithfulness to his people, is consistently repeated in the speech. Furthermore, according to Squires (1983:66), even in the Moses story God is still seen as the subject of Israelite history through Luke’s use of the following verbs: δίδωσιν (v. 25), ὤφθη (v. 30),⁹⁴ εἶπεν (v. 33), εἶδον, ἤκουσα, ἀποστείλω (v. 34), ἀπέσταλκεν (v. 35), ἀναστήσει (v. 37).⁹⁵

⁹⁴ In particular, ἄγγελος here is the subject of the verb.

⁹⁵ Dahl (1966:144) indicates that v. 36 fulfils the promise of v. 7b (ἐξελεύσονται) and v. 35 fulfils the promise of v. 34 (ἀποστείλω).

4. GOD'S CALLING (AC 7:30-34)

4.1 Composition

Stephen's speech now reaches the third story of the five sections regarding Moses: (a) "After forty years had passed, an angel appeared to Moses in the flames of a burning bush⁹⁶ in the desert near Mount Sinai" (Καὶ πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὤφθη αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους Σινᾶ ἄγγελος ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάτου, v. 30). The verb πληρόω is used once more in Stephen's speech (see v. 23; Ac 2:1). D^(c) reads μετὰ ταῦτα πλησθέντων αὐτῷ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα at this point. D H P S 614 have κυρίου instead of ἄγγελος.⁹⁷ Strack and Billerbeck (1961:680) explain that the rabbis have identified the angel as Michael or Gabriel. ⋈ B D Ψ M gig p sy^h read ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς, while P⁷⁴ A C E 36 323 945 1739 *al* vg sy^p read ἐν πυρὶ φλογός. It is, however, difficult to find any dissimilarity between the two versions.

Now Moses' second epoch of forty years passes (see v. 23; Ex 7:7). The OT names the mountain where God appeared to Moses, not as Sinai but as Horeb (see Ex 3:1). Wilson (1962:178) points out that the name of Mount Sinai is used in the J and P sources, while Horeb is used in the E and D sources. However, both of them are used interchangeably in the OT. Nonetheless, it is true that Sinai occurs more frequently than Horeb. Sinai occurs four times in the NT (see Ac 7:30, 38; Gl 4:24, 25), while Horeb never occurs. For Kilgallen (1976^a:74), the reason for the changed name by Luke is because "in the later tradition this mountain was associated with both the giving of the commandments and with the appearance of the angel."

⁹⁶ For the detailed narrative of the OT, see Ex 3:2.

⁹⁷ For more on the mention of the angel in this speech, see also vv. 35, 38, 53.

According to Strack and Billerbeck (1961:680), the rabbis speculated about why God would have elected to address Moses from a burning bush. A fascinating reply was “to teach men that there is no place, however desolate, not even a thornbush, without the Shekinah.”

(b) “When he saw this, he was amazed at the sight”⁹⁸ (ὁ δὲ Μωϋσῆς ἰδὼν ἐθαύμαζεν τὸ ὄραμα, v. 31a). (c) “As he went over to look more closely, he heard the Lord's voice”⁹⁹ (προσερχομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ κατανοῆσαι ἐγένετο φωνὴ κυρίου, v. 31b). The verb κατανοέω means to ‘consider, detect, or notice’ (Lk 6:41; 12:24, 27; 20:23; Ac 11:6; 27:39). Moulton (1908:117) says that the compound verb κατανοῆσαι

should describe the *completion* of a mental process. In some passages, as Lk. 20.23 (‘he *detected* their craftiness’), or Acts 7.31 (‘to *master* the mystery’), this will do very well; but the durative action is most certainly represented in the present κατανοεῖν, except in Acts 27.39 (? ‘noticed one after another’).

Instead of Yahweh, κυρίου is used in v. 31b (see Ex 3:4). According to Fitzmyer (1998:260), “‘Lord’ was used by Palestinian Jews in the last pre-Christian centuries as a title for Yaweh: either mārê’ or māryā’ in Aramaic, or ’ādôn in Hebrew, or Kyrios in Greek. All these forms are now attested in important contemporary extrabiblical texts” (cf. also idem. 1979:115-142; 1989:200-204). D (sy^p) replaces the words ἐγένετο φωνὴ κυρίου with ὁ κύριος εἶπεν αὐτῷ λέγων.

(d) “I am the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob” (ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ, v. 32a). (e) “Moses trembled with fear and did not dare to look” (ἐντρομος δὲ γινόμενος Μωϋσῆς οὐκ

⁹⁸ For the original description of the OT, see Ex 3:3.

⁹⁹ For the dialogue between God and Moses in the OT, see Ex 3:4.

ἐτόλμα κατανοῆσαι, v. 32b).¹⁰⁰ Luke might drop the verb εἶμι after ἐγώ from Ex 3:6 (LXX). In the uncommon instances of this absence, Blass and Debrunner (1961:71) suggest that “[ε]ἰμί, ἐσμέν and εἶ are not often omitted, and when they are, the personal pronoun is usually present.”

It is necessary to notice that the LXX has a singular noun πατρός. Wilcox (1965:29-30) suggests that this plural noun πατέρων is from Samaritan sources. However, Kahle (1947:144-145) indicates that the plural noun is sustained by the strong OT versions: the Samaritan sources, LXX witnesses k and m, the Bohairic and Ethiopic sources, as well as affirmation from Eusebius, Cyprian, and Justin Martyr. The plural noun πατέρων, furthermore, remains in the Hebrew and all versions in Ex 3:15. Consequently, Wilcox himself must acknowledge this fact to be true.

Concerning ὁ θεός, Metzger ([1971]1975:348-349) explains, “the fluctuation of the text here ... reflects the uncertainty of scribes. ... A majority of the Committee judged that the combination of P⁷⁴ & A B Ψ 81 614 syr^{p,h} cop^{sa} was superior to the several witnesses which attest the other readings.” The adjective ἑντρομος seems to be an element of Luke’s vocabulary (cf. Barrett 1994:361). It occurs only three times in the NT (see also Ac 16:29; Heb 12:21). In spite of some scholars’ opinion (Haenchen 1971:282; Soards 1994:65; Fitzmyer 1998:378), we cannot consider this verse as an explicit quotation since there is no introductory formula.

(f) “Then the Lord said to him” (εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος, v. 33a). (g) “Take off your sandals” (λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου, v. 33b). (h) “the place where you are standing is holy ground” (ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐφ’ ᾧ ἕστηκας γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν, v. 33c). D has

¹⁰⁰ For the original context of the OT, see Ex 3:6.

the phrase *καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ πρὸς αὐτόν* in v. 33a. It is important to remember that D is lacking the words *ἐγένετο φωνή* in v. 31. Luke reverses the arrangement that the narrative of Exodus gives. In the story of Ex 3:5-6, God first told Moses to take off his sandals and then revealed himself as the God of the patriarchs.

(i) “I have indeed seen the oppression of my people in Egypt” (*ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ*, v. 34a). Bruce ([1951]1976:170) remarks that the words *ἰδὼν εἶδον* are “a Semitism, representing the Heb. construction of the absolute infin. with the finite verb for emphasis, ‘I have certainly seen.’”

(j) “I have heard their groaning” (*καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα*, v. 34b). (k) “and have come down to set them free” (*καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτούς*, v. 34c). (l) “Now come” (*καὶ νῦν δεῦρο*, v. 34d). B D have *αὐτοῦ* instead of *αὐτούς*. It is likely that this is done in order to harmonize with *λαός* in v. 34a. According to Soards (1994:65), the words *καὶ νῦν* contain a rhetorical element throughout the speeches in Acts (see Ac 3:17).

(m) “I will send you back to Egypt” (*ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον*, v. 34e). Ψ M changed the aorist subjunctive *ἀποστείλω* to the future *ἀποστελῶ* (cf. Moule [1953]1977:22). The LXX text reads *ἀποστείλω*, as I will discuss later. This must not be thought of just as a misprint, because “it is a matter of syntax, not orthography” (Moulton & Howard 1929:70). Moulton (1908:185) suggests that the futuristic application of the aorist subjunctive “reappears in the *κοινή*, where in the later papyri the subjunctive may be seen for the simple future. ... So Acts 7:34 (LXX).” On the exchangeability, Thackeray (1909:91) asserts that “the Pentateuch translators were fond of using a fut. ind. in the first clause of a sentence, followed by a deliberative conjunctive in the later clauses.” According to Blass and Debrunner (1961 §364.1), for the translation of v. 34e it is appropriate to use “let me send you” rather than “I will send you” (cf. Barrett

1994:362).

4.2 Moses is commissioned by God on holy ground and the quoted text from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 in Ac 7:33-34

4.2.1 Pre-Lukan occurrences of Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 in Ac 7:33-34

Luke has skillfully coalesced several pieces from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 (LXX) in Stephen's speech in order to produce a compacted version. This expression λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐφ' ᾧ ἔστηκας γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτούς καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον is found nowhere else in the NT where a pre-Lukan combination as well as each piece from Ex is quoted. This quotation occurs for the first time in the NT. And so, it must have originated with Luke.

4.2.2 The introductory formula (Ac 7:33a)

The introductory formula is framed by the phrase: "Then the Lord said to him" (εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος, v. 33a), as has been revealed earlier in this thesis.

4.2.3 Establishing and describing the textual differences

NT(NA27)	LXX	MT
Ac 7:33b-34	Ex 3:5b	Ex 3:5b
^{33b} λυσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου, ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐφ' ὧ ἔστηκες γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν.	... λυσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐν ὧ σὺ ἔστηκες γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν	שֶׁל־נְעָלַיִךְ מֵעַל הַגְּלִיף כִּי הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עוֹמֵד עָלָיו אֲדַמְתָּ-קֶרֶשׁ הוּא:
	LXX	MT
	Ex 3:7b-8	Ex 3:7b-8
³⁴ ιδῶν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα, καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτούς	^{7b} ιδῶν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα ... ⁸ καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι αὐτούς ...	רָאָה רְאִיתִי אֶת־עַנְי עַמִּי אֲשֶׁר בְּמִצְרַיִם וְאֶת־צַעֲקָתָם שָׁמַעְתִּי וְאָרַד לְהַצִּילֹו
	LXX	MT
	Ex 3:10	Ex 3:10
καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον.	καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε πρὸς <u>Φαραῶ βασιλέα</u> <u>Αἰγύπτου</u>	וְעַתָּה לֵךְ וְאֶשְׁלַחְךָ אֶל־פְּרֹעַה

4.2.3.1 Textual differences between MT and LXX

In the instance of the quotation from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10, the reading of the LXX has 2 minor changes, as compared with that of the MT in this section: (1) a mood

change of the imperative (לִּשְׁ) to the infinitive mood (λῦσαι); and (2) a number change of the singular suffix (לְהַצִּילֹ) to the plural pronoun (αὐτούς) in the LXX.

(a) Mood change:

[1] לִּשְׁ → λῦσαι

The imperative mood (לִּשְׁ) in the MT, as it is found in the NT, is replaced by the infinitive mood (λῦσαι) in the LXX.

(b) Number change:

[2] לְהַצִּילֹ → αὐτούς

The singular suffix (לְהַצִּילֹ) in the MT is substituted by the plural pronoun (αὐτούς) in the LXX.

4.2.3.2 Textual differences between Acts and LXX

There are six major changes to be disclosed between the two versions of Ac 7:33-34 and Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 (LXX): (1) Four substitutions in Acts, λῦσον for λῦσαι; (2) ἐφ' ᾧ for ἐν ᾧ; (3) τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα for τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα; (4) and εἰς Αἴγυπτον for πρὸς Φαραῶ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου; and (5) two omissions of ἐκ before τῶν ποδῶν σου; (6) and σύ before ἔστηκας in the NT.

(a) Substitutions:

[1] The substitution of λῦσον for λῦσαι (Ac 7:33)

From Ex 3:5 the verb λῦσαι (imperative infinitive) is substituted by λῦσον (simple imperative) in Ac 7:33, which occurs in the same mood in the MT as well. Acts merely has 'the sandals of your feet' (τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου), as opposed to 'from your feet' (ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου) as it is in the LXX.

[2] The substitution of ἐφ' ᾧ for ἐν ᾧ (Ac 7:33)

In Ex 3:5 (LXX) ἐν ᾧ is substituted by ἐφ' ᾧ in Ac 7:33.

[3] The replacement of τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα with τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα (Ac 7:34)

Stephen has replaced τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα, which the LXX text has taken from the Hebrew text, with τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα.

[4] The replacement of εἰς Αἴγυπτον with πρὸς Φαραῶ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου (Ac 7:34)

Luke changed εἰς Αἴγυπτον in the reading of the LXX to πρὸς Φαραῶ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου in Ac 7:34. The LXX reads 'to Pharaoh, king of Egypt', while the NT simply reads 'to Egypt'.

(b) Omissions:

[5] The omission of ἐκ before τῶν ποδῶν σου (Ac 7:33)

The preposition ἐκ ('from') is omitted before τῶν ποδῶν σου in Ac 7:33, as shown above.

[6] The omission of σύ before ἔστηκας (Ac 7:33)

In the NT the pronoun σύ ('you') is omitted before the verb ἔστηκας.

4.3 Lukan method used for the quotation

There are 2 minor differences between the MT and the LXX. Concerning the mood, an infinitive might have an imperative (לְשׂוּ) force (Dona & Mantey 1955:216). Concerning the number change, the plural, because it is in regular use in the LXX, is to indicate עַמּ here (Archer & Chirichigno 1983:15). Accordingly, the Greek version of the OT (LXX) seems to be an acceptable

translation of the Hebrew.

There are 6 changes between the LXX and the NT, as discussed earlier. When Luke relates the quoted text from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 (LXX) to his context, grammatical, as well as stylistic changes, were made by Luke, or another *Vorlage* was used by him as follows:

(a) Substitutions (λῦσαι → λῦσον; ἐν ᾧ → ἐφ' ᾧ; τῆς κραυγῆς αὐτῶν ἀκήκοα → τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα; πρὸς Φαραῶ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου → εἰς Αἴγυπτον).

[1-2] On two substitutions of λῦσον and ἐφ' ᾧ, Emerton (1968:289-290) suggests that these may have stemmed from a lapse in the writer's memory. However, Wilcox (1965:42) suggests this stems from "a Greek version other than the LXX, which has here preserved the form of the Hebrew more literally than our LXX" or perhaps a straight relation to the Hebrew text. The textual variants (72-618 b 121-527 z 55 Carl 49) show us that Luke might have used a *Textvorlage* which is different from the reconstructed LXX. Otherwise, both substitutions could merely be considered as improvements (Blass & Debrunner § 310.1).

[3] The tense of two verbs (ἀκήκοα; perfect and ἤκουσα; aorist) that change in **יְהִי־וַיִּשְׁמַע** is not important, according to Barrett (1986:59), "and the LXX's κραυγή is as near to the Hebrew (מְקַרְעֵב) as στεναγμός." He thus thinks that it might be an alternative reading. Lastly, the two versions are not the same in wording, but have the same meaning.

[4] In the case of the replacement of εἰς Αἴγυπτον with πρὸς Φαραῶ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου, all three versions differ. The MT has 'to Pharaoh', and the LXX has 'to Pharaoh, king of Egypt', while the NT reads 'to Egypt'. The three phrases differ in wording, but have a common meaning.

Thus, it can be suggested that two substitutions above [3-4] are attributed simply to Lukan stylistic preference.

(b) Omissions (ἐκ before τῶν ποδῶν σου; σύ before ἔστηκας).

[5-6] The omission of the preposition (ἐκ) seems to be due to the mood change of the verb (λύσον). Hence it is not necessary to insert the pronoun σύ in this sentence because of the second singular person verb ἔστηκας.

Therefore, in conclusion, Luke's omissions seem to be largely grammatical changes at this stage.

4.4 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke

The third and final forty years of Moses' life starts with God's calling in the midst of the burning bush. Luke here omits the narratives of Moses' pasturing the sheep of his father-in-law, Jethro, and his marriage with Zipporah between vv. 29-30. Luke regularly leaves out certain OT stories as irrelevant and provides only sufficient information to assist the narrative. His emphasis thus often falls somewhere else.

Luke makes use of a time formula (πληρωθέντων) once more. This is a Lukan interpretive employment that is not found in the OT. Thus, forty years had to pass once again, just as in v. 23. Moses had to undergo forty years of training in Pharaoh's household and forty years of preparing in the desert before God called him to achieve God's command. Parenthetically, many other biblical characters spent time in the desert to ready themselves for a sacred commission (e.g., David, Elijah, John the Baptist, and Jesus).

Of interest is also the fact that the forty-unit time duration evokes the period of

Jesus' appearances after his suffering (Ac 1:3) and the age of the man crippled from birth, who is healed at the temple gate called Beautiful (Ac 4:22). The time formula *πληρωθέντων* might imply the plan of God taking action at the proper moment (cf. Marshall 1980:141). It consequently underscores the hand of God that leads Moses all through his life (cf. Williams 1990:137).

Moses, who was rejected by his fellow Hebrew, is met by God in the desert near Mount Sinai. God's deliverance forms a striking contrast to human resistance in this subsection. God accomplishes his delivering effort regardless of human mistakes and opposition to God's agents. Strictly speaking, it is an angel who appears (*ἄφθῆ*) to Moses and God who speaks of him. Luke continues to mentioning the angel throughout the rest of Stephen's speech (see vv. 35, 38, 53). Combrink (1979:14) explains that the repeated use of the verb *ἄφθῆ* highlights the fact that God is at work through Moses (see v. 2). Furthermore it makes the connection between God's calling to Abraham and his calling to Moses.

Johnson (1992:128) states that the use of the angel as "originally probably a euphemism to avoid mention of the divine name, derived from the Hebrew *malak Yahweh* is sporadic enough to justify Luke's practice." Calvin (1965:190) regards the angel as Christ, but this is not a widely accepted view. In his commentary, Alford ([1877]1976:75) interprets that "the angel bears the authority and presence of God himself."

The sight is said to amaze Moses because the bush does not burn up though it is on fire. Watson (1996:51) observes that Moses' encounter with the burning bush has a parallel in the event of Jesus' baptism by John (Mt 3:11; Mk 1:7; Lk 3:16; Jn 1:33). "In both these experiences that foretell rescue, God appears and speaks, but only of Jesus does he declare, 'This is my Son, the Beloved with

whom I am well pleased” (Mt 3:17; Mk 1:11; Lk 3:22). It is true that Jesus is always described as a figure greater than Moses in all NT books, despite a parallelism between two characters.

As he approaches the bush to have a closer look at this strange spectacle, he hears the voice of God. God introduces himself to Moses as the God of the Israelite fathers to him there. In spite of the retention of a singular noun πατρός in both the MT and the LXX, Luke here has a plural noun πατέρων, “as if it were in apposition to ‘Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,’ not Moses’ own father” (Wilson 1962:179).

The method of naming God is echoed in Peter’s third speech (3:13) and fifth speech (5:30) respectively. It shows that God is the God of promise, the God who appeared in the land and said that his people would go through not only oppression, but also liberation. Barrett (1994:361) says that “[t]he same God was at work through the whole of the OT tradition ... Luke will extend this thought; the Christians ... also worship the same God.”

When Jesus argues about the Resurrection with the Sadducees, he uses the same term referring to ‘the bush’, quoting explicitly from Ex 3:6 (see Mk 12:26; Mt 22:32; Lk 20:37; Ac 3:13; Heb 11:16). The rabbinic term ‘the Bush’ was the standard reference for this portion of the scroll of Moses (Daube 1985^b:53-55, 65). That is “because the Bible had not yet been divided into chapters and verses” (Keener 1993:169).

Jesus’ quotation of a text from the books of Moses, which was accepted by the Sadducees,¹⁰¹ “showed them that the idea of resurrection could be proved from

¹⁰¹ A similar response which depends on the Torah, occurs also in the rabbinic literature: “Sectarians [or heretics] asked Rabban Gamaliel: ‘When do we know that the Holy One,

the patriarchs' relationship with the living God" (Cole [1953]2000:969). Wessel (1984:736) comments that "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had long since died when God made the statement to Moses. Nevertheless God said, I am, not I was."¹⁰² Therefore, the regular employment of "[t]his well known and often used formula" by the NT writers (Steyn 1995:133) seems to mean that God is faithful to his promise and words.

Through this description Stephen associates himself with the shared inheritance of the Israelites, displays reverence to the God whom they confess to worship, and circuitously replies in opposition to the charge against him i.e., that he used blasphemous language against God. From this viewpoint the Stephen speech seems to be a kind of self-defence (cf. Bruce [1951]1987:160-161; Kilgallen 1976^a:107-119; Sylva 1987:263; Sterling 1992:373).¹⁰³ For this part of the Moses story, the LXE translates Ex 3:6c as follows: "Moses turned his face away, for he was afraid to gaze before God." Witherington (1998:270) states that at this point Moses "is portrayed as a pious man who knows the tradition that no one can look on God and live."

It is important to note that Luke reverses the order of Ex 3, as mentioned earlier. Kilgallen (1976^a:74) clearly shows the differences in the narratives' order between the LXX and the NT as follows:

blessed be He, will resurrect the dead?' He answered them from the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings" (B *Sanh* 90b).

¹⁰² For Mk 12:26, Evans (2001:256) interprets that "[t]he growing eschatological speculations regarding the role of the patriarchs in protecting and comforting the elect who enjoy life in the world to come accommodate the point that Jesus makes in appealing to Exod 3:6."

¹⁰³ For the opposite position, cf. Foakes Jackson (1931:61); Haenchen (1971:288). With a somewhat median stance, Barrett (1994:335) thinks that the speech is "a qualified kind of answer" against the charges.

Exodus		Acts	
a	God calls Moses	--	
b	Moses responds	--	
c	God tells him to remove his shoes		
d	God reveals himself	God reveals himself	d
e	Moses reacts	Moses reacts	e
		God tells him to remove his shoes	c
f	God commissions Moses	God commissions Moses	f

Luke thus seems to intend that the emphasis is primarily on the fact that the God of the Israelite ancestors reveals himself to Moses. He without delay presents God's self-revelation, while in Exodus the author gradually identifies God to Moses (Kilgallen 1976^a:74). As this confessional formula functions as "[t]he starting point for the argument in substantiation of the miracle" in Ac 3:12-16 (Steyn 1995:132), so is it used here as the root for God's commissioning of Moses by Luke. Luke also connects the Moses story to the Abraham story through God's self-revelation.

When Moses trembles and does not dare to look, God instructs Moses to remove his sandals because he is standing on holy ground. The place is holy because God manifests himself there.¹⁰⁴ The presence of God serves to sanctify the ground. According to Combrink (1979:14), the term τόπος is significant throughout the Stephen discourse (see Ac 6:13; 7:7). He adds that God's promise in v. 7 that his people shall worship him 'in this place' "must be read in the light of the fact that wherever God chose to reveal Himself, is a holy

¹⁰⁴ According to Johnson (1992:128), "[h]oly ... is where the presence of God is." Cf. also Calvin (1965:194).

place.” It is thus clear that any land becomes holy when God is with his people who worship him.

Spencer (1997:75) points out that God’s self-revelation in the desert near Mount Sinai has made the place “the religiopolitical center of Israelite society, namely, Mt *Zion* in the *city* of Jerusalem.” Moses does not build a shrine or a temple there, and this has a bearing on Stephen’s argument to come (cf. Bruce 1987^b:43; Fitzmyer 1998:378).

It should be noted that the most important self-revelation of God in the OT occurs in Sinai, far removed from the promised land. The theme ‘God outside the land’ is repeated here. In Stephen’s defence Luke keeps on intermingling the motif which started from God’s calling to Abraham in v. 3, i.e., the vital episodes in Israel’s early history happened outside ‘the land’. V. 33 thus is significant for this part of the Moses story, although it is seen as a delay of God’s commission by the ostensibly worthless command to take off his sandals (Kilgallen 1976^a:75).

God’s epiphany at Sinai leads Moses into “a missionary journey” (Spencer 1997:75). God became visible to Moses not simply for his own edification, but with the object of authorizing him to revisit Egypt to release his people.

God has seen the oppression (κάκωσιν) of the Israelites and will deliver (ἐξέλθει) them. God will send Moses to be the agent for his deliverance of Israel from the bondage of Egypt. According to Johnson (1992:128), Luke’s use of the verb ἀποστέλλω in v. 34 regularly serves to build up the motif of prophets sent by God (see Lk 1:19; 4:18; 7:27; 9:2; 10:1; 11:49; Ac 3:20, 26). Tannehill (1990:91) shows that v. 34 aims to attain the peak of expectancy of the Stephen speech. Moreover Combrink (1979:13) suggests that in this subsection the

emphasis “falls heavily on God’s legitimation of Moses,” when it takes into consideration the motif of Moses’ rejection.

Three significant links should be observed between v. 34 and the remainder of Stephen’ speech. Firstly, God’s commissioning of Moses is seen in God’s reaction to the situation of ἐκάκωσεν in v. 19 and the promise of κακώσουσιν in v. 6, accordingly stresses the fact that God is faithful to his word. Secondly, God’s rescue (ἐξέλεσθαι) through Moses recalls God’s promise that his people shall come out (ἐξέλουσονται) of that country in v. 7. Thirdly, the fact of God’s sending of Moses back to Egypt is also understood in view of Luke’s reflection in v. 25 that Israel’s people did not realize that it was God who had used Moses to rescue them.

One thus is left with the impression that Moses is hardly in control of the events of his life (Martín-Asensio 1999:247). According to Soards (1994:65), the “story being told emphasizes God’s initiative, which produces revelation to Moses, direction to Moses, and deliverance through Moses.”

Luke shows another thrust in the parallel that he is building up between Moses and Jesus, in that, even though Moses was refused by the Hebrews, he was accepted by God. Munck (1967:221) states that throughout Stephen’s speech one finds “the highest appreciation of Moses that we meet in the New Testament” (cf. Barrett 1994:338; Martín-Asensio 1999:247). Above all, it should be noted that the key point of this subsection is an answer to the Israelite’s one question in v. 27. Is it God who sent Moses?

5. GOD'S SENDING (AC 7:35-37)¹⁰⁵

5.1 Composition

At this point, Stephen commences explaining the importance of the episode by illustrating that Moses came back to the same Israelites who forty years before had discarded him with the inquiry of “Who made you ruler and judge?”: (a) “This is the same Moses whom they had rejected with the words” (Τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες, v. 35a). (b) “Who made you ruler and judge?” (τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν; v. 35b).

In order to portray Moses the demonstrative pronoun *τοῦτον* occurs twice in v. 35. Schubert (1968^b:241) states that by means of “the exegetical, demonstrative, and relative pronouns of the section [vv. 35-40], the prophecy as quoted in Acts 3:22-23 is interpreted in great detail.” The verb *ἀρνέομαι* is used often in Lukan writings (see Lk 12:9; 22:57; Ac 3:13-14). After the phrase *ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν*, \aleph C D Ψ 36 81 453 1175 *pc* co have *ἐφ’ ἡμῶν*, while E 33 945 1739 *pm* have *ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς*.

(c) “He was sent to be their ruler and deliverer by God himself, through the angel who appeared to him in the bush”¹⁰⁶ (*τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς [καὶ] ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν σὺν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάτῳ*, v. 35c). The dissimilarity of the various MSS between the presence (B D) and the omission ($P^{45,74}$ \aleph^* A C) of *καὶ* lead to the conjunction being put in brackets in some

¹⁰⁵ As I mentioned earlier, I do agree here with Bihler’s division (1963:vii) for this subsection (cf. also Bacon 1901:248; Willink 1935:106; Dibelius 1956^c:167; Goulder 1964:166; Via 1979:190-207) rather than Combrink’s opinion, which includes everything up to v. 38 into this colon cluster (1979:14-15; cf. also Fitzmyer 1998:365). Vv. 38 and 39 can never be separated here because the relative pronoun *ὃ* clearly connects v. 39 with the preceding verse grammatically.

¹⁰⁶ For the previous appearance of the angel, see v. 30.

translations. Instead of δικαστήν, λυτρωτήν occurs in v. 35c. The word here means not a price that is paid, but deliverance or liberation. In the NT, this noun appears only at this point.¹⁰⁷ It is interesting to note that the word λυτρωτήν in the LXX is applied to the Lord in Ps 18:15 (κύριε βοηθέ μου καὶ λυτρωτά μου) and to God in Ps 77:35 (ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὑψιστος λυτρωτῆς αὐτῶν ἐστίν).

Moulton (1908:144) states,

in Acts 7:35, ἀπέσταλκεν, with the forest of aorists all round, is more plausibly conformed to them [than the perfect in James 1:24], and it happens that this word is alleged to have aoristic force elsewhere. But, after all, the abiding results of Moses' mission formed a thought never absent from a Jew's mind.

The verb ἀποστέλλω had already occurred in v. 34, and is repeated here with a Lukan emphatic intention. This idiomatic phrase σὺν χειρί is uncommon, but the meaning seems to be 'through' in comparison with ἐν χειρί or διὰ χειρός (cf. Lake & Cadbury 1933:77).

(d) "He led them out of Egypt and did wonders and miraculous signs in Egypt, at the Red Sea¹⁰⁸ and for forty years in the desert"¹⁰⁹ (οὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν Ἐρυθρᾷ Θαλάσσει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαεράκοντα, v. 36). Knox (1944:70) sets the repeated pronoun οὗτος against the ἐγώ εἰμι in John and the Hellenistic aretalogies. Bruce ([1951]1976:171) asserts that ποιήσας could be taken as concurrent:

¹⁰⁷ For this group of words in the NT, see Mt 20:28; Mk 10:45; Lk 1:68; 24:21; Tt 2:14; 1 Pt 1:18; Heb 9:12.

¹⁰⁸ For the mention of the Red Sea, see Wis 10:18; 1 Macc 4:9; Heb 11:29; Philo, *VitMos* 1:165; 2:1; Clement(Rm), *1 Clem* 51:5.

¹⁰⁹ For the original context of the OT, see Nm 14:33.

making ἐξήγαγεν refer to the 40 years' leadership of Moses from the Exodus onwards; but it is better to take it with the ordinary force of an aorist participle, and suppose that the words after ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ were added without strict regard to the grammar of the preceding words.

The participle ποιήσας is thus regarded as preceding the main verb ἐξήγαγεν, limiting the wonders and signs to those which Moses did in Egypt before the exodus. This fits better with the context of the OT where the wonders and signs are to be performed with a view to hardening Pharaoh's heart.

The Sea is not named in Ex 14, but the name occurs in Ex 13:18 and 15:4. According to Fitzmyer (1998:379), the Red Sea

was the ancient name for the Persian Gulf, as is evident from 1Gap Gen 21:17-18, where yammā' šimmōqā', 'Red Sea' (the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean), is distinguished from liššān yam sūp, 'the tongue of the Reed Sea' (the tongue-shaped Gulf of Suez emerging from the body of water usually called today the Red Sea)¹¹⁰

V. 36 restructures the narrative of Moses in Exodus. According to Lake and Cadbury (1933:77-78), it resembles AsMos 3:11.¹¹¹

(e) "This is that Moses who told the Israelites" (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἶπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, v. 37a). (f) "God will send you a prophet like me from your own people" (Προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ, v. 37b). C

¹¹⁰ Cf. also Copisarow (1962:1-13); Snaith (1965:395-398); Fitzmyer ([1966]1971:68, 153-154); Batto (1983:27-35; 1984:57-63).

¹¹¹ "Moses, who suffered many things in Egypt and at the Red Sea and in the wilderness for forty years (qui multa passus est in Aegypto et in mari rubro et in heremo annis quadraginta)," recited from Conzelmann (1987:54). See also Ex 7:3, 8-11:10; Ps 105:27; Josephus, *Ant* 2:276.

E H P have κύριος before ὁ θεός and either ὑμῶν or ἡμῶν after ὁ θεός. It is noteworthy that C D(*) 33 36 323 614 945 (1175) 1241 1739 al gig vg^{cl.wv} sy mae bo have αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε after ὡς ἐμέ, corresponding to Dt 18:15 (LXX) and Ac 3:22.

5.2 Moses rejected by the Israelites and the quotation

5.2.1 The quoted text from Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:35

5.2.1.1 Pre-Lukan occurrences of Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:35

The same explicit quotation was already found once in Ac 7:27, where Luke adds to ἐφ' ἡμῶν, as shown earlier.

5.2.1.2 The introductory formula (Ac 7:35a)

The introductory formula consists of the words: “This is the same Moses whom they had rejected with the words” (Τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες, v. 35a).

5.2.1.3 Establishing and describing the textual differences

NT(NA27)	LXX	MT
Ac 7:35b	Ex 2:14b	Ex 2:14b
τίς σε κατέστησεν	τίς σε κατέστησεν	מִי שָׂמָךְ
ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν;	ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν	לְאִישׁ שֶׁר וְשֹׁפֵט

5.2.1.3.1 Textual differences between MT and LXX (and their relation with Acts)

The LXX text agrees with the MT text, and then the Acts text follows the LXX quite accurately in the instance of the quotation from Ex 2:14. Luke probably employed either the Greek or the Hebrew for this part of Stephen's speech.

5.2.2 Lukan method used for the quotation

Since the same quotation has already been discussed earlier, nothing further will be added here. Nonetheless, it is notable that the longer quoted text from the LXX reading in Ac 7:27-28 has an addition against the MT reading. Even though the quoted text from Ex 2:14 does not have textual differences here between the three versions (MT, LXX, and NT), it is likely to be a *crux interpretum*. First of all, the repeated use of the same quotation - in spite of the difference in the length of the quoted text - is to show that Luke pays special attention to these words in order to present his theological intention on the Israelite rejection theme.

Against the words "over us", the short text is that of P^{45,74} A B P 6 104 614 1241 2495 *pm* *vg*, while ⋈ C D Ψ 1175 *pc* *co* have ἐφ' ἡμῶν, and E 33 945 1505 1739 *pm* have ἐφ' ἡμᾶς. Luke was possibly able to use either the LXX or the MT which accounts for the lack of textual discrepancy here. On the basis of the discussed fact that in Ac 7:27-28 Luke quoted it from the LXX, it would however be injudicious to say that one of two almost identical quotations could have been derived from another source.

5.2.3 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke

Luke's treatment of early Israelite history becomes much more direct at this point, and he begins to hone his theological themes more acutely. Haenchen (1971:282) observes that "the placid flow of historical narrative gives way to passionate, rhetorically heightened indictment" (cf. Marshall 1980:141; Conzelmann 1987:54). Even Dibelius (1949:168), who supposes that so far the speech had not been appropriate, accepts that it now changes its direction and starts to become quite intelligible and worthwhile. Haenchen (1971:282) thinks that Luke uses the style of the "encomium" on this point (see also Philo, *LegGai* 145-147). Moses is thus emphasized by the five-fold occurrence of οὗτος in Ac 7:35-38¹¹² as follows:

- ^{35a} Τουτου τον Μωϋσην ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν;¹¹³
- ^{35b} τουτου ὁ θεὸς [καὶ] ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν σὺν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάτῳ.
- ³⁶ οὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα.
- ³⁷ οὗτός ἐστὶν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἶπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ.
- ³⁸ οὗτός ἐστὶν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν,
- [³⁹ ᾧ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ὑπήκοοι γενέσθαι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ ἀπόσαντο καὶ

¹¹² It appears twice in the form of τουτου and three times in the form of οὗτος in this subsection.

¹¹³ V. 35a remains here, not separated, in order to make a comparison of the narrative in vv. 35-39, although v. 35a was again divided into two cola, viz., v. 35a and v. 35b in the composition section because v. 35a functions as the introductory formula and v. 35b as the explicit quotation there.

ἐστράφησαν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον]¹¹⁴

Via the reiterative uses of the pronoun, “the author both concentrates on particular details through repetition and selection and summarises the historical and thematic elements of the biblical account which he considers important” (Richard 1978:103). Furthermore the employment of the pronoun functions as an instrument of pointing to the discrepancy between what the Israelites think about Moses and who God sees him to be (cf. Bruce [1951]1976:171). Luke also replies indirectly to the accusation of Stephen’s “words of blasphemy against Moses” (Ac 6:11), by showing Stephen’s honour toward Moses (cf. Gloag 1870:247).

Moreover, this subsection reaches the peak of the promise-fulfilment motif in v. 34 as discussed earlier. Stephen, however, alters his speech suddenly by setting the divine character of Moses’ commission against the Israelites’ refusal of him. Just as the fulfilment of God’s promise is drawing near, Israel’s people are keeping the appointed deliverer at a distance. Tannehill (1990:91) says that “the story turns on a fateful decision in a moment of great opportunity. The great opportunity and the negative response combine to create dramatic and fateful events.” The suggestion of Israel’s unawareness here is related to the motif of blindness shown in speeches elsewhere in Ac 3:17; 13:27; 14:16; 17:30 (Soards 1994:65).

The quotation from Ex 2:14 reminds the audience of Stephen’s previous quotation about Israel’s denial of Moses as ruler and judge over them. This quotation is thus a repetition of v. 27, but the rejection here is attributed to all Israel, not only to a fellow Hebrew - as in the earlier context. Hence it reveals

¹¹⁴ V. 39 will be dealt with vv. 35-38 below.

the attitude of the nation towards God's deliverer.

It is also important to note that Luke employs the verb ἠρνῆσαντο for his description of Moses' rejection instead of the verb ἀπώσατο in v. 27. In Ac 3:13-14 it is said by Peter that the men of Israel disowned (ἠρνῆσασθε) Jesus. At Lk 22:57 Peter denied (ἠρνῆσατο) that he knew Jesus. What is more, in Lk 12:9 Jesus says that "he who disowns (ἄρνησάμενός) me before men will be disowned before the angels of God." The parallelism between Moses and Jesus seems to be deliberate by means of the same verb at this point.

Luke here illustrates the importance of the event by means of the fact that Moses returns to the same Israelites who forty years before rejected him with this question, "Who made you ruler and judge?" The motif of the Israelites' refusal of Moses will be repeated again in v. 39 with the word (ἀπώσαντο) that has a similar meaning to the verb (ἠρνῆσαντο) in v. 35a. Thus, by means of the contrasted description between the Israelites and Moses found in this section, vv. 35a and 39 make a bracket around vv. 35b-38, that convey dissimilar aspects of Moses' mission with Israel's people.¹¹⁵

However, the stress of this quotation lays not on God's judgement, but on God's deliverance (Spencer 1997:76). Moses is now sent by God with power and authority as a ruler and deliverer. According to Page ([1886]1918:125), "The object is to place the personality of Moses as the divinely appointed savior of Israel in marked contrast with the treatment he received." It makes clear that Moses is God's man for God's plan. God is behind all this and Moses' commission comes by way of the mediation of the angel who appeared to him

¹¹⁵ Soards (1994:65) believes that vv. 35 and 39 serve as a bracket around vv. 36-38. However, Luke already reveals the positive aspect of Moses' mission in v. 35b against his rejection of the Israelite fathers in vv. 35a and 38.

in the bush. The reappearance of the angel occurs in v. 35.

Moses is finally called ἄρχον,¹¹⁶ serving as an echoing variation of Jesus' title of ἀρχηγός in Ac 3:15¹¹⁷ and 5:31, and λυτρωτής, which is a *hapax legomenon*, being compatible with Jesus' commission to redeem (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel in Lk 24:21 (see also Lk 1:68; 2:38).¹¹⁸ The similarities between Moses and Jesus become more and more clear (cf. Haenchen 1971:282; Kistemaker 1990:260; Brown 1978:199). Fitzmyer (1998:378) here observes that two titles (ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν) would not be allowed for Moses in Hebrew cultural and religious tradition, but God grants him two others (ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν).

It is interesting to notice the various alternative descriptions concerning Moses' role in the Jewish writings. Johnson (1992:129) explains that:

Artapanus, *On the Jews*, says the voice 'bade him campaign against Egypt,' and understands Moses to be a general leading an army (frag. three). Josephus likewise has him sent as 'commander and leader' (*stratēgos kai hēgemōn*) in *Antiquities of the Jews* 2:268. Philo also designates him as 'leader' (*hēgemōn*) in *Life of Moses* 1:71.

In spite of many academic opinions (cf. Combrink 1979:14; Marshall 1980:141-142; Conzelmann 1987:54; Kilgallen 1989:186; Fitzmyer 1998:379-380), including the scholars who were mentioned above, it should be noted that the Lukan connection between Moses and Jesus is commonly regarded as parallelism (cf. Tannehill 1990:91-92; Dunn 1996:90-91, 94; Kee

¹¹⁶ Neudorfer (1998:287) here finds that "Stephen's speech is a contribution to the discussion with Jews or Judaizers."

¹¹⁷ Scobie (1978-1979:418), who follows Fuller (1965:48), asserts that the term has its origin in Moses.

¹¹⁸ Bruce (1987^b:43) argues that the phrase ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν used to be synonymous with ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα in Ac 5:31.

1997:99-100; Witherington 1998:271) rather than typology.

According to Hay (1990:242), the prophet Jesus does not remind us excessively of Moses in relation to some other characters such as Elijah and Elisha in Luke-Acts (cf. also Fitzmyer 1986:213-215). Moessner's argument (1986:226) is also helpful that Jesus' "death for the sinful nation and raising up from the dead ushers in the *final* salvation, promised by the prophets for the eschatological remnant of Israel. In this fulfilment, Jesus as the prophet like Moses stands unique." It thus is clear that Moses' story serves to make Jesus' story clearer and vice versa (cf. Tannehill 1990:91).

It is interesting to note Barrett's depiction (1994:362-363) in his commentary, citing Stählin's words, as follows:

At this point there begins ... a sort of Moses hymn, related to the Christ hymn of Col. 1.13-20. (1) The man rejected by the people becomes ruler and lord; (2) he becomes deliverer through signs and wonders given by God; (3) he is both prophet and prototype of the Coming One; (4) he is mediator between God and people; (5) he is the receiver and giver of words of life; (6) his people reject him. ... Questions however arise, ... Section (1) and (6) seem virtually the same. They fit the story of Moses but do not fit so well into the praise of Moses. A second question is: If this is a hymn, where did it originate, among Jews or Christians? The latter is not an impossible supposition; cf. 1 Cor. 10.2, ... If on the other hand this is originally Hellenistic Jewish material we have a further example of a post-biblical development in Jewish thought about Moses as the founder of a religion.

V. 36 tells of the exodus from Egypt by means of the verb ἐξήγαγεν, which is repeated in v. 40 (see also Ac 13:17), but in the negative sense. It also alludes

to God's miraculous signs and wonders through Moses and Aaron in Ex 7:3. However, Moses' function as God's agent is focused here, albeit slightly differently from its original context.

The phrase *τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα* clearly confirms that Moses is appointed by God (see Jub 48:4; Philo, *VitMos* 1:77, 90, 91), although he is rejected by the Israelites. The expression *τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα* is exploited in the Petrine speech (2:22) as well as the foregoing part of Acts (2:43; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8)¹¹⁹ in order to describe Jesus' and the apostles' miracles. The use of the same words seems to imply a parallel between Moses and Jesus and his followers, namely the distinctive feature of God's chosen servants.

Notwithstanding, the differences between Moses and Jesus, Stier (1869:124) states as follows: “[b]y quitting the subject of the wilderness (vs. 36), in mentioning the forty years which Israel were to pass in it for the punishment of their disobedience, Stephen forcibly calls attention to the limit of Moses' office as deliverer...” The detailed information that God brings in a verdict of forty years because of unbelief at Kadesh-Barnea is drawn from Nm 13-14, especially 14:33.

¹¹⁹ For the description of Jesus' miracles in Petrine speech, see also Conzelmann ([1954]1964:178).

5.3 Moses as a prophet like me and the quotation

5.3.1 The quoted text from Dt 18:15 in Ac 7:37

5.3.1.1 Intra-textual occurrence in Ac 3:22

A clear reference to Dt 18:15 is implicitly found in Mk 9:4, 7 (par. Mt 17:5; Lk 9:35); Lk 7:39; 24:25; and Jn 1:21; 5:46 (Steyn 1995:142). It is also noticeable that Philo points out the prophecy in *SpecLeg* 1:11, but it does not indicate the coming of the prophet (Hay 1990:241). Thus, except for the quoted text from Dt 18:15 in Ac 7:37, the only other occurrence is found once again in Ac 3:22 – this is a slightly longer quotation.

Besides, some scholars (e.g., Simon 1958:61-62) try to connect the Samaritan Taheb to this christological text, but it differs entirely from the Mosaic prophet (cf. Conzelmann 1987:54; Fitzmyer 1998:380). As I will discuss later, it is noteworthy that the idea of “a prophet like Moses” appears in 4QTest 5-8 and 1QS 9:11 as well as 1 Macc 4:46; 14:41.

5.3.1.2 The introductory formula (Ac 7:37a)

The introductory formula of the quotation from Dt 18:15 is the line: “This is that Moses who told the Israelites” (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἶπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ, v. 37a).

5.3.1.3 Establishing and describing the textual differences

NT(NA27)	LXX	MT
Ac 7:37b	Dt 18:15 ¹²⁰	Dt 18:15
προφήτην	προφήτην	נְבִיא
ὕμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεός	ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμέ	מִקִּרְבְּךָ מֵאֲחֵיךָ כְּמֹנִי
ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ. ἀναστήσει σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου		יְקִים לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ

5.3.1.3.1 Textual differences between MT and LXX (and their relation with Acts)

There is one major change in the reading of the LXX, against that of the MT. Here the NT follows exactly the LXX in relation to the omission of the phrase מִקִּרְבְּךָ ‘from among you’ in the MT. Both the LXX and the NT omit מִקִּרְבְּךָ.

5.3.1.3.2 Textual differences between Acts and LXX

There are six major changes to consider between the narrative in Ac 7:37 and Dt 18:15 (LXX): (1) Two transpositions of ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεός ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ; (2) and ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει; (3) two number changes of the singular pronoun (σοι) to the plural pronoun (ὕμῖν); (4) and σου to ὑμῶν; and (5) two omissions of κύριος before ὁ θεός; (6) and σου after ὁ θεός in Ac 7:37.

(a) Transposition:

[1] ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεός and ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ

This phrase is found in the LXX as well, but with the exchanged arrangement (ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμέ ἀναστήσει σοι [κύριος] ὁ θεός [σου]), corresponding to

¹²⁰ Unless otherwise referred to, the LXX version edited by Wevers (1977) is used for the Greek translation of Deuteronomy.

the reading of the MT.

[2] ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει

In spite of the discrepancy in the case of the pronoun, the transposition between the two words concurs with that of the longer phrase, as shown above. The discrepancy of the pronoun will be discussed below. In the LXX the order is replaced with ἀναστήσει σοι.

(b) Number change:

[3] σοι → ὑμῖν

[4] σου → ὑμῶν (Ac 7:37)

The second person singular pronouns of the LXX text (σοι-σου) are changed twice in the quoted text to the second person plural pronouns (ὑμῖν-ὑμῶν) in Ac 7:37. Similar changes are made once more in Ac 3:22. However, in Ac 3:22 there is also a change after ὁ θεός (σου → ὑμῶν).

(c) Omissions:

[5] The omission of κύριος before ὁ θεός

[6] The omission of σου after ὁ θεός

The word κύριος before ὁ θεός is omitted in Ac 7:37. Also, the NT reading omits the pronoun σου after ὁ θεός.

5.3.2 Luke's method used for the quotation

Both the LXX and the NT omit מִקִּרְבְּךָ 'from your midst' in the MT. But, this omission does not cause any damage to the meaning of the text, in view of the fact that a prophet 'from among your own brothers' (ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν) would also be 'from your midst'.

There are six major changes between Ac 7:37 and Dt 18:15 (LXX):

(a) Transpositions (ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει σοι [κύριος] ὁ θεός → ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεός ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ).

[1] The word order of the LXX follows strictly that of the MT, while there are two transpositions between the LXX and the NT. In the LXX reading the phrasal placement, ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμέ is relocated from the beginning of the verse to the middle of the verse in the NT reading. No other NT textual witness offers any other reading.

The transposition is found in the quotations of several Church Fathers, e.g., Chr *passim*; Cyr II 596, III 33, VIII 1316, IX 888, X 980; Epiph II 136; Eus IV 17; Isid 797; Nil 137; Or III 285; Procop 1844; Tht II 545, IV 1393; Titus 1225. It is, however, not to be found in major LXX witnesses. The transposition may therefore be confidently attributed to the work of Luke. This transposition is explained by reason of the function of the stylistic change¹²¹ within the new context, and that is that the word “prophet” is placed in an emphatic position.

[2] The transposition of ὑμῖν (ἀναστήσει σοι → ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει) is assigned to Luke himself with the emphatic trend (O’Reilly 1987:115).

(b) Number changes (σοι → ὑμῖν; σου → ὑμῶν).

[3-4] In the LXX reading the second person singular pronouns (σου, σοι) are substituted by the second person plural pronouns (ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν) in Ac 7:37, as outlined above. The *first* dative plural ὑμῖν in the NT is a substitution as well as a transposition of the second dative singular σοι in the LXX. There is no other NT textual witness to support another reading. The NT change is also not found

¹²¹ For the stylistic parallel with Ac 3:21 (object, verb, subject, and prepositional phrase), see Richard (1980^p:336).

anywhere else in the LXX, except for the later modification of the reading of the NT by Origen (VI 622).

The first genitive singular σου in Dt 18:15 is exchanged by the *second* genitive plural ὑμῶν in the NT. Both first and second examples are alike in that they have no other NT textual witness. The second example also appears in some minor LXX witnesses of a later date, which could have been altered by the reading of the NT (Eus IV 100; Or VI 622 = Tar^p). The changes are however vindicated within the context of this speech itself, since Stephen's hearers are the individuals in question and not the nation of Israel as a unit.

(c) Omissions (κύριος; σου).

[5-6] Both omissions have no substantial effect on the meaning of the quoted text. According to Metzger ([1971]1975:350), “[t]he original text, ὁ θεός (P⁷⁴ & A B D 81 vg cop^{sa,bo} eth), has undergone various expansions. Since the Septuagint reads κύριος before ὁ θεός (Dt 18.15), it was natural for scribes to insert the word here (C E H P a/).”

Besides, Luke's deliberate connection between Jesus and the κύριος in Acts seems most likely to omit it (see Ac 2:14-41, especially vv. 34-36; cf. also Kerrigan 1959:296-297; Juel 1981:544; Haenchen 1971:183; Steyn 1995:122-124). The latter (1995:123) states that “[t]he Jewish Scriptures, in their Greek form, are thus used here to help in the identification and substantiation of Jesus of Nazareth as the κύριος (Lord) and the χριστός (Messiah)” (cf. also Kilgallen 1976^b:652). Furthermore O'Reilly (1987:98) says that “[t]his identification of Jesus with the name of Yahweh may have played an important role in the expression of the faith of the early Christians in Jesus' divinity.”

5.3.3 Lukan interpretation of the quotation

In the original context Moses foretold that God would raise up “a prophet like me” from among Israel. According to Allison (1993:73-75), there have been four possible interpretations of Dt 18:15, 18, they are:

(1) Driver’s interpretation ([1895]1996:229; cf. also Kraus 1966:105-112):

The “prophet” contemplated is not a simple individual, belonging to a distant future, but *Moses’ representative for the time being*, whose office it would be to supply Israel, whenever in its history occasion should arise, with needful guidance and advice: in other words... the reference is not to an individual but to a prophetic order.

(2) For Meeks (1967:189), “in some circles of Judaism there was a persistent notion of a *succession of prophetic rulers* of Israel, beginning with Moses, passed on to Joshua, continuing in Samuel and, presumably, also found in the remaining great prophets of Israel, especially Jeremiah.”¹²²

(3) According to the DSS,¹²³ especially 1QS 9:11 (cf. Braun 1966:311-312; De Waard 1966:22) and 4QTest 5-8 (cf. De Waard 1966:21-24; 1971:537-540), Allison (1993:74) states that it refers respectively to “a prophet like Moses, a Davidic Messiah, and a priestly Messiah” (see individually Dt 18:18-20; Nm 24:15-17; Dt 33:8-11).

¹²² In *PE* 9:30:1-3, Eusebius states the following: “Moses prophesied forty years; then Joshua, the son of Nun, prophesied thirty years. Joshua lived one hundred and ten years and pitched the holy tabernacle in Shiloh. After that, Samuel became a prophet. Then, by the will of God, Saul was chosen by Samuel to be king, and he died after ruling twenty one years. Then David his son ruled ... “

¹²³ For the hypothesis that the Teacher of the Righteousness was recognized as the prophet like Moses, cf. Wieder (1953:158-175); Brownlee (1956-1957:17); Vermes (1961:59-66); Fuller (1965:50-53); Leaney (1966:228); Davies (1988:313-317). Contrast Brown (1957:73-75).

(4) In the first century Christians thought the prophets like Moses had announced the coming of Christ as the Messiah in this rich prophetic tradition and lineage (see Ac 3:17-26).

This quotation seems to carry a messianic message that the people of Jesus' day eagerly expected an eschatological prophet¹²⁴ like Moses or Elijah (cf. Bruce [1951]1987:92-93; Jeremias [1967]1977:859-863; Guthrie 1981:269; Longenecker 1981:139; Hay 1990:241). It must without doubt be understood as Lukan reference to Jesus, as is obvious from Ac 3:17-26 in the third Petrine speech (cf. Marty 1984:198-199; O'Reilly 1987:119; Steyn 1995:136-153).¹²⁵ The parallelism between Moses and Jesus here reaches its climax.¹²⁶ As to the parallels Feiler (1986:111-113) states in detail as follows:¹²⁷

1. Moses and Jesus follow a figure named Joseph in Luke's historical scheme (Moses=Acts 7:9-16, 18| Jesus=Luke 1:27; 4:23).
2. Moses' career begins "as the time of the promise drew near" (Acts 7:17); Jesus' career begins "as the people were in expectation" (Luke 3:15).
3. Moses and Jesus increase in wisdom during their childhoods (Acts 7:22| Luke 2:40, 52).
4. Moses is in the wilderness for forty years (Acts 7:36); Jesus is in the wilderness for forty days (Luke 4:2).

¹²⁴ For the argument of Jesus as the eschatological prophet, compare especially two authors' opinions: Cullmann (1959:13-50) and Hahn (1969:352-406). Cf. also Dodd (1930:53-66); Filson (1956:137ff.).

¹²⁵ According to Steyn (1995:152), it is interesting that Luke continues to use quotations as prophetic material though there is not the expression of "the Prophets" as such. In the first Petrine speech, he cited from Ps, but used the quotation as it was "spoken long ago" through the mouth of David (Ac 1:16). In the second Petrine speech, he says that David was "a prophet" (Ac 2:30).

¹²⁶ However, we can also easily find Luke's comparison between other prophets and Jesus, for example, Elijah and Elisha (Lk 4:25-27; 12:49), John the Baptist (Lk 7:31-34; 12:50), and Jonah (Lk 11:29-32).

¹²⁷ Feiler (1986:111) concludes that "Luke is here paralleling Moses to Jesus (the 'Jesufication' of Moses) rather than paralleling Jesus to Moses (the 'Mosification' of Jesus)."

5. Moses and Jesus are “mighty in word and deed” (Acts 7:22| Luke 24:19).
6. God sends Moses as a deliverer (λυτρωτής, Acts 7:35) of the oppressed (Acts 7:24, 34-35); God sends Jesus at a time when the people look for deliverance (λύτρωσις, Luke 2:38). He is known as one who comes to deliver Israel (λυτρόω, Luke 24:21). Moreover, his mission is directed to the oppressed (Luke 4:18).
7. Moses is sent as a ruler and a judge (Acts 7:27; 35); Jesus comes as king (Luke 1:32-33; 19:38; 23:2-3, 37-38), appointed by God to judge the world (Acts 17:30-31; cf. Luke 12:14).
8. Moses leads the Israelites out of Egypt (ἐξάγω, Acts 7:36). On the mount of transfiguration Jesus speaks with Moses about his upcoming ἐξοδος (Luke 9:31).
9. Moses performs wonders and signs (Acts 7:36); Jesus’ ministry is attested by wonders and signs (Acts 2:22); and after the ascension, the apostles perform signs and wonders in Jesus’ name (Acts 2:43; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 14:3; 15:12).
10. Moses promises the coming of a prophet like him (Acts 7:37); Jesus is the prophet like Moses who must be obeyed (Acts 3:22-23).
11. Moses and Jesus are denied (ἀρνέομαι) by their own people (Acts 7:35| Acts 3:13,14).
12. The sons of Israel do not understand that God is giving deliverance through Moses (Acts 7:25). The Jews acted in ignorance when they killed Jesus (Acts 3:17).
13. When the people refuse Moses, God turns from them (Acts 7:42). Those who refuse Jesus, the prophet like Moses, will be severed from the people (Acts 3:22-23).

Finally, most scholars hold the view that Luke clearly applies v. 37 to Jesus, as is the case with Ac 3:22 (Cullmann 1959:37; Kilgallen 1976^a:82; Johnson

1977:74; Combrink 1979:15; Via 1979:190-207; Marshall 1980:142; Tannehill 1990:91-92; Witherington 1998:271). Nonetheless, Hahn (1969:373) rightly indicates that “Jesus is indeed not expressly named as the fulfiller of this promise, but without doubt this whole passage has been drafted in view of His activity.” Barrett (1994:365) also describes that “[n]either in this verse nor in the speech as a whole (until v. 52) is it claimed or implied that the prophecy was fulfilled in Jesus” (cf. also Haenchen 1971:282).

Furthermore the event at which the lame man was raised up (ἤγειρεν) by Peter in Ac 3:7, implies the fact that Christ was raised up (ἤγειρεν) in Ac 3:15 (cf. also Hamm 1984:203; Steyn 1995:135). In the end the prophecy has been fulfilled, and is validated as being the words of God. It is noteworthy that in the context of Dt 18:15-22, the Israelites are cautioned to oppose the false prophets.

Throughout the context of Ac 3, it also shows that the use of the verb ἀνίστημι makes an important case for the motif of ‘Jesus as the prophet.’ According to Steyn (1995:139-140), there are three different interpretations to the verb ἀνίστημι: “(a) It refers to the first coming of the Messiah, being Jesus of Nazareth,¹²⁸ in his ‘vocation as prophet’ or (b) it refers to the resurrection and exaltation of Christ,¹²⁹ or (c) it refers to both.”¹³⁰ However, it is important to note that the resurrection of Jesus is not described in this part of Stephen’s speech, despite the occurrence of the verb ἀναστήσει (contrast Via 1979:190-207).

Moreover, Steyn (1995:130) argues that there are some parallels between the

¹²⁸ On the interpretation of the first messianic coming, cf. Bruce ([1951]1987:86-87); Haenchen (1971:282).

¹²⁹ For an explanation of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, cf. Kurz (1977:311-312); Marty (1984:215); O’Reilly (1987:113, 117-119). See also Mt 17:9; Mk 8:31; Lk 18:33; Jn 20:9; Ac 17:3; 1 Cor 15:4; 1 Th 4:14.

¹³⁰ On the understanding of both above, cf. Hamm (1984:213-214).

third speech of Peter (3:11-26) and Stephen's speech in Acts. "Some of the similarities between these two include the explicit reference to the covenantal God of Israel, 'the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob' (Ac 3:13; 7:32), the quoted phrase of Dt 18:15,18-19 in Ac 3:22-23 which is to be found again in a brief explicit quotation in Ac 7:37." There is also the term δίκαιος a messianic designation found in Ac 3:14 and 7:52 (cf. Schrenk [1964]1981:188-189),¹³¹ and the only two occurrences of προκαταγγέλλειν¹³² in the NT, which are used by the writer himself in Ac 3:18 and 7:52 (cf. Schniewind [1964]1981:73; Scobie 1978-1979:418). Regarding "the exegetical, demonstrative, and relative pronouns of the section [vv. 35-40]" Schubert (1968^a:241) mentions that "the prophecy as quoted in Acts 3:22-23 is interpreted in great detail."

However, according to Longenecker (1981:139-140), the difference between Peter and Stephen is also noteworthy that "[f]or Peter, his hearers are the sons of the prophets who should hear the new Moses (cf. 3:22-26); whereas for Stephen, his hearers are the sons of those who rejected Moses and killed the prophets (cf. 7:35-40, 51-53)."

There is an interesting question among the scholars as to whether the motif of 'the Mosaic eschatological prophet' is derived from a pre-Lukan concept (cf. Conzelmann 1960:166-167; Robinson 1962:150-151) or his theology (cf. Feiler 1986; Tannehill 1986:286-287; Moessner 1989:56-70, 259-284). On the one hand, in the NT Jesus is not directly given a title of a 'the prophet like Moses,' except for these instances in the Acts of the Apostles (cf. Hay 1990:242). On the

¹³¹ Once again Scobie (1978-1979:412), who follows Fuller (1965:47-48), maintains a Mosaic understanding of the term.

¹³² O'Reilly (1987:117), who follows O'Toole (1979:88), suggests that the verb "is a post-resurrection word in the Lukan vocabulary and indicates that the days which are announced refer to the time of the church."

other hand, it is true that there are lots of allusions to Moses to be found in the NT writings. More importantly, as Steyn (1995:153) indicates, it can be explained “in terms of the development in the theology which was based on concepts from the Scriptures.”

It should also be noted that the qualification for being a prophet was some likeness to Moses, especially as it related to his function as mediator. Luke is thus preparing to identify Jesus as that “prophet like me”. That is the reason why Jesus is like Moses in that he mediates a covenant and completely fulfils God’s promise (cf. Keil & Delitzsch 1959:396).

According to Marshall (1980:142), vv. 36-37 and v. 38 accentuate the significant facts which Moses spoke of and acted out. Thus, Stephen once again accentuates the fact that it was this Moses whom Israel’s people rejected, and neglected to follow (vv. 39-41). Hultgren (1976:98) indicates rightly that “it is precisely Moses and the Law which are given a positive emphasis in Stephen’s speech.” For Luke’s quotation from Dt 18:15, first of all, Teeple’s conclusion (1957:87) here is quite fitting that “[t]he theme of Stephen’s speech is not Jesus’ resurrection but the rejection of prophets ... the author cites this Scripture as proof that Jesus’ rejection is according to prophecy” (cf. also Marty 1984:215).

6. ISRAEL’S IDOLATRY AND GOD’S JUDGEMENT (AC 7:38-43)

6.1 Composition

The last of the five sections on Moses, again accentuates the Israelite rejection of Moses. Stephen points this out by saying that: (a) “He was in the assembly in the desert, with the angel who spoke to him on Mount Sinai, and with our

fathers; and he received living words to pass on to us” (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινᾶ καὶ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ὃς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν, v. 38). The term ἐκκλησία seems to be from the LXX of the MT’s לְהַקָּדְשׁ. According to Barrett (1994:365), the first reference appears in Dt 23:1, which means ‘a body of people, the Lord’s people’. It does however appear in the form of a formula (e.g., τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας) earlier in Dt 4:10; 9:10; 18:16.

Lake and Cadbury (1933:78) suggest that the phrase μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου ... καὶ τῶν πατέρων, points to Moses as the mediator between the angel and the Israelite fathers. However, this is not an entirely convincing argument. In the NT the word λόγιον occurs four times. The expression λόγια ζῶντα does refer to the whole of Torah as well as the Decalogue (see Dt 30:15-20; 32:47; Mt 19:17). At the end of v. 38, A C D E Ψ M lat sy have ἡμῖν, while ὑμῖν is read by the witnesses of P⁷⁴ Ξ B 36 453 2495 a/ p co. According to Barrett (1994:366), “[t]here would probably be a tendency on the part of copyists to differentiate Stephen from Jews and ἡμῖν should probably be accepted, though the evidence against it is strong.”

(b) “But our fathers refused to obey him” (ὧ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν ὑπήκοοι γενέσθαι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, v. 39a). For Newman and Nida (1972:158-159), the conjunction ‘but’ is very significant since it would emphasise the disobedience of the people to the command of God’s word. In lieu of the οὗτός in vv. 36-38, ὧ stands in the present verse. Barrett (1994:366) states that the “use of the relative to continue a narrative is characteristic of Luke’s style.” In the place of ὧ, D has ὅτι. According to Black ([1946]1967:74), it might have happened as a mistake in an Aramaic phase of the tradition. Instead of ‘our fathers’, ‘your fathers’ is read by 36 81 242 2401 cop^{G67} geo Irenaeus (Metzger [1971]1975:351).

(c) “Instead, they rejected him” (ἀλλὰ ἀπώσαντο¹³³, v. 39b). (d) “and in their hearts turned back to Egypt. They told Aaron” (καὶ ἐστράφησαν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον εἰπόντες τῷ Ἀαρών, vv. 39c-40a). Wendt (1913:146) points out that v. 39 is influenced by Ezk 20. This is why the word ἀπώσαντο occurs in vv. 13, 16, and 24. However, it seems that the phrase ἐστράφησαν ... εἰς Αἴγυπτον replicates Nm 14:3 (Haenchen 1971:283). It is necessary to notice that D *pc* read ἀπεστράφησαν, which is similar to Nm 14:3 (LXX). The aorist participle verb εἰπόντες means ‘follow through, or following along a preset course’. In other words, their decision to go back to Egypt concurs with their seeming disobedience, expressed in their suggestion to Aaron of making false gods.

(e) “Make us gods who will go before us” (Ποίησον ἡμῖν θεοὺς οἱ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν, v. 40b). (f) “As for this fellow Moses who led us out of Egypt - we don’t know what has happened to him!” (ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος, ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί ἐγένετο αὐτῷ, v. 40c). The *nominativus pendens* αὐτῷ is not un-Greek (Moulton 1908:69).

(g) “That was the time they made an idol in the form of a calf” (καὶ ἐμοσχοποίησαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, v. 41a).¹³⁴ A Greek word ἐμοσχοποίησαν, which is a *hapax legomenon*, replaces ἐποίησεν (ἐποίησαν) ... μόσχον in Ex 32:4, 8 (LXX). According to Barrett (1994:367), the reason for the substitution is not obvious. The verb does not “mean to make an idol but to form a (mental) image (e.g., Plato, Republic 605c), but could have suggested to a Jewish or Christian reader the making of an idol and thus have constituted an analogy on the basis of which a suitable new word could have been formed.” Plato’s term was probably quite commonly employed with an unusual meaning, although there is

¹³³ For more on this expression as used by Luke in Acts, see ἀπώσατο in v. 27 and ἀπωθεῖσθε in Ac 13:46.

¹³⁴ For the detailed narrative of the OT, see Ex 32:4, 8.

insufficient evidence.

Bruce ([1951]1976:173) adds that “Great as was the classical Gk facility for composition, it was even greater in later Gk.” Of interest is that according to Philo (*VitMos* 2:165) the Israelites have made an idol “in the form of a bull”, rather than with a calf (cf. Cole 1973:214-215). The phrase ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις reminds us of Luke’s same expression in Ac 2:18.

(h) “They brought sacrifices to it” (καὶ ἀνήγαγον θυσίαν τῷ εἰδώλῳ, v. 41b). The word εἰδώλω is often associated with Gentile worship (see Gn 31:19; 1 Ki 11:2; 2 Chr 11:15; Ps 113:12; Wis 14:11 (LXX)). Barrett (1994:367) mentions that Luke uses the terms without restraint at this point, although “not uninfluenced by LXX usage”, such as ἀνήγαγον and εὐφραίνοντο.

(i) “and held a celebration in honour of what their hands had made” (καὶ εὐφραίνοντο ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, v. 41c).¹³⁵ The NEB and NIV translate the verb εὐφραίνοντο into ‘had (held) a feast (celebration) in honour of’, this seems like a much stronger term than the simple word ‘rejoice’. This expression ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν often resonates with the denunciation of Israel’s idolatry (see Dt 4:28; Ps 113:12; 134:15; Wis 13:10; Jr 1:16 (LXX)). Moreover, it is also applied to the temple made by hand in v. 48.

(j) “But God turned away” (ἔστρεψεν δὲ ὁ θεός, v. 42a). The verb ἔστρεψεν could be either transitive or intransitive (Barrett 2002:104). As in the form of the omission of a direct object it can be meant that God turned Israel to the worship of the hosts of heaven (cf. Arndt & Gingrich 1957:771 s.v. στρέφω, 1a), while in this case it could also be interpreted that God turned from Israel (cf. also idem.

¹³⁵ For a detailed description of the OT, see Ex 32:6.

1957:771 s.v. στρέφω, 1b; see Ac 5:23; 15:16). The same verb ἐστράφησαν occurs again in v. 39.

(k) “and gave them over to the worship of the heavenly bodies. This agrees with what is written in the book of the prophets” (καὶ παρέδωκεν¹³⁶ αὐτοὺς λατρεύειν τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν, v. 42b). The words στρατιᾷ(άν) τοῦ οὐρανοῦ appear in 1 Ki 22:19; Neh 9:6; Jr 7:18; 8:2; 19:13 (LXX). According to Marshall (1980:144), they mean to “the sun, moon, and stars (Dt. 4:19) which were regarded as deities or as the dwelling places of spiritual beings.” The noun στρατιά occurs elsewhere in the NT as well. It refers to the heavenly hosts who appeared with the angel when the Christ was born in Lk 2:13.

According to Barrett (1994:368), the use of the verb λατρεύειν occasionally occurs to depict the worship of divine beings.¹³⁷ However, the word does not appear in the LXX with ‘the host of heaven’. Rather, other verbs - προσκυνέω¹³⁸ or θυμιάω¹³⁹ - are used to illustrate the Israelite apostasy. In ancient times the Twelve Minor Prophets were by and large regarded as a volume (Fitzmyer 1998:381).

(l) “Did you bring me sacrifices and offerings forty years in the desert, O house of Israel?” (Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ; v. 42c). (m) “You have lifted up the shrine of Molech and the star of your god Rephan, the idols you made to worship” (καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ [ὑμῶν] Ῥαιφάν, τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς, v. 43a). In B D 453pc gig sy^p sa Ir^{lat} Or, the pronoun

¹³⁶ Paul uses the same term παρέδωκεν in Rm 1:24, 26, 28.

¹³⁷ For example, Plato, *Ap* 23c “τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ λατρείαν.”

¹³⁸ See 2 Chr 33:3 “...προσεκύνησεν πάση τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.”

¹³⁹ See Jr 19:13 “...ἐθυμιάσαν ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων αὐτῶν πάση τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.”

ὑμῶν is omitted. Concerning it, Haenchen (1971:284) thinks that God can never be portrayed as the idol. P⁷⁴ א³ A C E Ψ M h v g sy^h mae bo Cyr, read ὑμῶν. For Richard (1982:40-41), these Gk verbs προσκυνεῖν / λατρεύω are commonly used LXX combinations. The use of λατρεύω in the Abraham story (see Ac 7:7) already employed the combination προσκυνεῖν / λατρεύω in vv. 42b-43a.

(n) “Therefore I will send you into exile beyond Babylon” (καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος, v. 43b). The preposition ἐπέκεινα is a *hapax legomenon*. Codex Bezae reads ἐπὶ [τὰ μέ]ρη Βαβυλῶνος “into the parts of Babylon”. Some scholars (Metzger [1971]1975:351; Barrett 1994:371; Bruce [1951]1987:140) explain that this reading brings the statement into better agreement with historical facts. The reading accords Luke’s version with that of Amos (cf. Bruce [1951]1987:156).

6.2 Israelite rejection of Moses again and the quotation

6.2.1 The quoted text from Ex 32:1, 23 in Ac 7:40

6.2.1.1 Other occasions of Ex 32:1, 23

No support is established in other areas within the NT where this passage is cited. It seems to be the first time that this quotation appears in the NT. Consequently, there is no biblical evidence to support the possibility that Luke could have pulled this citation from the tradition for this part of Stephen’s speech. Therefore, it can rightly be assigned to Luke.

6.2.1.2 The introductory formula (Ac 7:40a)

The introductory formula is made up of the words: “They told Aaron” (εἰπόντες τῷ

Ἐαρώων, v. 40a).

6.2.1.3 Establishing and describing the textual differences

NT(NA27)	LXX	LXX	MT	MT
Ac 7:40b	Ex 32:1	Ex 32:23	Ex 32:1	Ex 32:23
ποίησον ἡμῖν	ποίησον ἡμῖν	ποίησον ἡμῖν	עֲשֵׂה־לָנוּ	עֲשֵׂה־לָנוּ
θεοῦς	θεοῦς	θεοῦς	אֱלֹהִים	אֱלֹהִים
οἱ	οἱ	οἱ	אֲשֶׁר	אֲשֶׁר
προπορεύσονται	προπορεύσονται	προπορεύσονται	יֵלְכוּ	יֵלְכוּ
ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν	ἡμῶν	לְפָנֵינוּ	לְפָנֵינוּ
ὁ γὰρ	ὁ γὰρ	ὁ γὰρ	כִּי־זֶה	כִּי־זֶה
Μωϋσῆς οὗτος,	Μωϋσῆς οὗτος	Μωϋσῆς οὗτος	מֹשֶׁה	מֹשֶׁה
	ὁ ἄνθρωπος	ὁ ἄνθρωπος	הָאִישׁ	הָאִישׁ
ὃς	ὃς	ὃς	אֲשֶׁר	אֲשֶׁר
ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς	ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς	ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς	הֶעֱלָנוּ	הֶעֱלָנוּ
ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου,	ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου,	ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου,	מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם	מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם
οὐκ οἶδαμεν	οὐκ οἶδαμεν	οὐκ οἶδαμεν	לֹא יָדַעְנוּ	לֹא יָדַעְנוּ
τί ἐγένετο	τί γέγονεν	τί γέγονεν	מָה־הָיָה	מָה־הָיָה
αὐτῷ.	αὐτῷ	αὐτῷ	לוֹ:	לוֹ:

6.2.1.3.1 Textual differences between MT and LXX (and their relation with Acts)

First of all, both texts of Ex 32:1 and Ex 32:23 are the same in both MT and the LXX. Therefore, Luke could have employed here the LXX and not the MT, or *vice versa* for this part of Stephen's speech.

6.2.1.3.2 Textual differences between Acts and LXX

There are 2 major changes to be displayed between the versions of Ac 7:40 and Ex 32:1, 23 (LXX): (1) An omission of ὁ ἄνθρωπος after Μωϋσῆς οὗτος; and (2) one substitution in Acts, ἐγένετο for γέγονεν.

(a) Omission:

[1] The omission of ὁ ἄνθρωπος after Μωϋσῆς οὗτος

The words ὁ ἄνθρωπος are omitted after Μωϋσῆς οὗτος in the NT. According to Barrett (1994:367), the inclusion in the reading of the LXX makes Moses much more disdainful.

(b) Substitution:

[2] γέγονεν → ἐγένετο (Ac 7:40)

Luke replaces γίνομαι from the perfect (γέγονεν) in Ex 32:1, 23 to the aorist tense (ἐγένετο) in Ac 7:40. One interesting thing is that D E Ψ M read γέγονεν.

6.2.2 Lukan method used for the quotation

There are two changes between Acts and the LXX. As compared with Ac 7:40, the LXX qualifies Μωϋσῆς οὗτος with ὁ ἄνθρωπος. For this difference, Turpie (1868:44) suggested that within the OT context the expression ὁ ἄνθρωπος

seems to be contrasted with “the gods”, which Aaron was requested to make.

There appears to be an antithetic parallelism in the verse ... It was not necessary for Stephen to keep up the contrast, but he still retains the expression of contempt which they uttered: “for Moses, this (fellow) ...

Interestingly, Rahlfs' text of the Septuagint (1935) has ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, it agrees with

the following textual variants: B F M O⁷⁰⁸ C⁷ d n s t Cyp Quir | 1; Arm Syh = Sixt Ra. For the substitution of ἐγένετο, it can be attributed to Luke's "frequent use of this form, no less than six times within the Stephen material" (Richard 1978:177).

In conclusion, these changes are likely to reflect the writer's stylistic preference and grammatical changes within the new context.

6.2.3 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke

In v. 38 Moses is the one who in the wilderness received living words to give to the Israelites, i.e., God's law. At that time he was in the assembly (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ) as well. In Acts the word ἐκκλησία occurs nineteen times out of twenty three times in reference to the church. But in this case the meaning of the noun is applied to the assembly, being similar to Ac 19:32, 39-40.

The term is translated variously as: "the assembly" (NAB, NIV, NJB, NLT), "der Versammlung" (ELO), "the congregation" (ESV, NASB, NKJV, NRSV, RSV), "der Gemeinde" (LUT, SCH), "the church" (ASV, KJV). The TEV, in the end, translates it as, "the people of Israel assembled in the desert", as opposed to the translation of the PMV - "in that church in the desert" (Newman and Nida 1972:157-158).¹⁴⁰ Moreover in Dt 18:16 the Greek ἐκκλησία translates the Hebrew לְקָרְבָּן, pointing out the gathering of the people to obtain the law at Horeb (see also Dt 4:10; 9:10).

Barrett (1994:365) states that "it is doubtful whether Luke wrote, or any early Christian read, this verse without thinking of the Christian ἐκκλησία, of which he

¹⁴⁰ Dunn (1996:95) thinks of it as "the congregation or church".

would see a foreshadowing in the ancient people of God.” Furthermore the term ἐκκλησία “could be that Christians would see a certain parallelism between the presence of Moses with the Israelites on their pilgrimage through the desert and the presence of Jesus with the new people of God on their earthly pilgrimage” (Marshall 1980:143).¹⁴¹ However, Marshall concludes that this is unlikely to be the main point for Stephen’s hearers. Rather, the primary message is that Moses receives the living oracles of God for Israel.

Moses would thus be the mediator between God and his people (cf. Fitzmyer 1998:380). Regarding Moses, Philo also says that: “[b]y the providence of God he became king, lawgiver, high priest, and prophet; and in each role he achieved the first mark” (*VitMos* 2:3). Notwithstanding, Stephen says that Moses was with the angel who spoke to him on Mount Sinai. According to Ex 19, Yahweh gives Moses the law directly without the appearance of the angel.

Later, the tradition that the angel (μετὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου) participated in the giving of the law became common among Jewish and Christian writers (cf. Oepke [1967]1977:617-618; see also Ac 7:53; Gl 3:19; Heb 2:2; Dt 33:2 (LXX); Philo, *VitMos* 2:166; Jub 1:27-2:1; ApMos 2:138). For instance, Josephus (*Ant* 15:136) points out that “we have learned from God the most excellent of our doctrines, and the most holy part of our law, by angels” (cf. also Davies 1954:135-140).

According to Barrett (1994:366), Luke’s mention of the angel here is because “[r]everence puts God at a further remove from earthly affairs” (cf. also Newman & Nida 1972:158). It is not clear whether the angel in v. 38 is identical with the

¹⁴¹ Similarly Bruce ([1951]1976:172) says that “[a]s Moses was with the old Ecclesia, so Christ is with the new, and it is still a pilgrim Church, ‘the Church in the desert.’” Cf. also Witherington (1998:271).

angel who appeared in the burning bush in v. 35.¹⁴² The fact should be noted that Stephen's hearers disobey the law that has been given through angels again in v. 53. It is also noticeable that the Sinai setting associates God's calling to Moses with God's delivery of the law to Moses.

Regarding the Israelite acceptance of the living oracles, Marshall (1980:143) states that "[t]his was the mark of the high privilege of Israel. The giving of the law was the sign of the covenant which God had made with them, and it was by obedience to the law that they would continue to be God's covenant people." Furthermore, in the phrase τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ὃς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ἡμῖν, Stephen shares the heritage of Israel with his audience and thus implicitly replies once more the accusation about speaking words of blasphemy against the law (Fitzmyer 1998:380).¹⁴³

According to Johnson (1992:130), the words λόγια ζῶντα are lacking in the LXX, "but the connection between the Law and life is constantly drawn" (see Dt 4:1, 33; 5:26; 16:20; 30:15; 32:45; Ps 118:25, 50, 154 (LXX)).¹⁴⁴ Alford ([1877]1976:77) warns us not to interpret that God speaks the words in a living voice or that the oracles themselves give life to people.

In the end, Luke's employment of the expression λόγια ζῶντα rather than ὁ νόμος may reflect "a degree of openness to new, updated ('living'), varied perspectives ('words') on the law in conflict with a more rigid, 'official' system of interpreting the law advocated by the chief priests and scribes" (Spencer 1997:76).

¹⁴² For the difference between the angels, cf. Barrett (1994:366).

¹⁴³ Similarly, Spencer (1997:76) says that "Stephen seems to counter this charge by affirming the supernatural origin of the law and its continuing validity for the people of Israel." Contrast Dunn's argument (1996:95): "the speaker is in closer continuity with Moses than his hearers."

¹⁴⁴ Haenchen (1971:283) notes that the words may show evidence of Dt 32:45-47.

A turning point takes place once more in v. 39, as implied earlier. The Israelites would not listen to Moses, in spite of Moses' role as the leader and law-giver for Israel so far. Stephen calls them 'our fathers' again and again. In spite of the difference between the NT witnesses, according to Johnson (1992:130), the choice of the pronoun 'our' in vv. 38 and 39 "makes the desert generation the forerunner of the present generation", which also refuses to follow the prophet (Dt 18:15-18). Luke here explains how the first receivers of the law had been unsuccessful in keeping it. It is necessarily related to the motif of 'the rejection of God's servant'.

Israel's people thrust Moses aside and wish themselves back in Egypt. Stephen here seems to remind his audience of the episode of spying out Canaan. According to the OT, after the twelve spies returned from exploring the land, they reported to the whole assembly at Kadesh in the Desert of Paran. On the one hand, the spies gave the shocking reports that the people who lived in Canaan were strong and the land was inhabited by descendants of Anak as well. On the other hand, Caleb encouraged Israel's people to occupy the land.

Finally, the ten spies so terrified them that they said to Moses and Aaron it would be better for them to go back to Egypt and make another leader. Certainly, the Israelites did not return to Egypt, but, save Caleb the son of Jephunneh and Joshua the son of Nun, all those who were twenty years old and upward, took their last breath in the wilderness.

Luke makes use of the same verb (*ἀπώσαντο*) again, as in the first denunciation of Moses (*ἀπώσατο*) in v. 27. It is likely to be a literary device, meant to accentuate the second explicit rejection of Moses. Haenchen (1971:283) interprets v. 39 as follows: "they became once more Egyptian in their hearts." He adds that three Lukan verbs – [*οὐκ*] *ἠθέλησαν* [*ὑπήκοοι*], *ἀπώσαντο*, and

ἐστράφησαν –¹⁴⁵emphasises the theme of the Israelite’s disobedience. In the end, servitude in Egypt was better for Israel than the liberty attached with the worship of God and the severe life in the wilderness (Barrett 1994:366). Fitzmyer (1998:380) states that unfortunately Egypt “had become home to them”. It should be noted again that v. 39 refers back to v. 35a.

V. 40 plays an important role between vv. 39 and 41. Firstly, the reason for the Israelite desire to return to Egypt that is stated in v. 39, is disclosed in v. 40. This shows why they did not know what had become of Moses. Secondly, as a further result of their rejection of Moses, the Israelites make gods who will go before them. Lastly, their rebellious action is concretized by them making an offering sacrifice to the calf idol with their own hands, which is described in v. 41. Their rejection of Moses, after a while, ends up in their rejection of God. The rebuff of God now leads to the failure of God’s promise to Abraham (Tannehill 1990:89). Luke also develops the theme of God’s rejection into the theme of the Israelite apostasy against their God.

However, they know that Moses has ascended to Mount Sinai to receive God’s law. The Israelites’ treachery is thus caused by their intolerance, not by Moses as they said. It is worth noticing “[t]he contrast between Moses receiving the Ten Commandments on top of Mount Sinai and Israel worshipping a golden calf at the foot of that mountain” (Kistemaker 1990:264).

Furthermore it is interesting to note the comparisons between the Israelites’ praise for the idol in Ex 32:4 (“these are your gods, O Israel, who brought you up out of Egypt”), their complaint against Moses in Ex 32:1 (“this fellow Moses who brought us up out of Egypt”), and God’s words in Ex 20:2 (“I am the Lord

¹⁴⁵ Haenchen does not exactly point them out in his commentary, but they must be the above verbs in the context of v. 39.

your God, who brought you out of Egypt”).

With the quotation from Ex 32, Luke underlines the Israelite refusal of Moses in the desert again by drawing his audience’s attention to the golden calf. According to the OT, Moses stayed on Mount Sinai with God forty days and forty nights (Ex 24:18). Moses did not come down until he had received the Decalogue and clear instructions with reference to the tabernacle and its furnishings.

During Moses’ absence the people of Israel demanded of Aaron that he should make gods to lead them because they did not know what had happened to Moses. They made an idol in the form of a calf and brought a sacrifice to the idol, and were rejoicing in the works of their hands. The expression ἐπολήσατε is often used to denounce Israel’s idolatry (see Dt 4:28; Ps 115:4; 135:15; Jr 1:16; Is 31:7). Later on, however, it is similarly applied to the temple that was made by hand (Ac 7:48).

The high point of Israel’s attitude was to turn from the worship of the true God to the golden calf since the invisible presence of God was not enough for them. The distinction between true and false worship will be examined at a later stage. In fact, God did everything for his people in the desert, for example, all the miracles performed in Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the daily manna and the provision of drinking water, the cloud shielding them from the hot desert sun, the pillar of fire protecting them at night. Yet, even while Moses is on Mount Sinai receiving the law, his people are building an idol. It is necessary to note that they ask for gods, even though the only idol they make is a golden calf.

Conzelmann (1987:54) points out that Josephus skipped the event of the golden calf. According to Longenecker (1981:140), “[t]he Talmud ... views it as

Israel's first, ultimate, and most heinous sin" (see B Šabb 17a; B Meg 25b; B 'Abod Zar 5a; B Sop 35a; 'Abot R Nat 18b, 21b, 30a; Ex R 48:2; Lv R 2:15; 5:3; 9:49; 27:3; Dt R 3:10, 12). He adds that there is a difference between the standpoints of the rabbis and Luke over the story of the golden calf.

The rabbis stress Moses' successful intercession for Israel's people, whereas Luke focuses on the Israelites' repudiation of God's messenger. Kilgallen (1988:57) says that Israel turned down Moses as the intermediary between God and human beings. Bruce ([1951]1987:153) explains that through this event Stephen strongly points to the repudiation of Jesus, not just their sin of idolatry.

Conversely, according to Williams (1957:109), Luke seems to imply that if the Israelites had obeyed God's living words given to them by Moses, they would not have turned to the worship of idols, furthermore Stephen's hearers would have accepted Jesus (cf. Hanson 1967:100; Combrink 1979:15). This is presented as true because the present generation was following the precedent of the wilderness generation. Sylva (1987:269) pays attention to Stephen's mention of the law as 'living words' in 7:38. "This is a high valuation of the law, which demonstrates that Stephen has not spoken against the law" (cf. also Kistemaker 1990:262). Once again, it is also a high honour to Moses, the law's deliverer.

6.3 Israel's idolatry and the quotation

6.3.1 The quoted text from Am 5:25-27 in Ac 7:42-43

6.3.1.1 Other occurrences of Am 5:25-27

Although this quotation is not found anywhere else in the NT, it occurs in the DSS (CD 7:14-15) with the abridged form.¹⁴⁶ Some Qumran specialists rightly identify the occurrence (Bruce 1956:183; Braun 1966:156; Fitzmyer 1998:382; Albl 1999:92). So it is noteworthy to trace from where the text is quoted. According to Ådna (2000:141), “[u]nfortunately, in the Greek scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr [8Ḥev 1]) all columns of Amos have disappeared.”

6.3.1.2 The introductory formula (Ac 7:42b)

The introductory formula is shaped by the phrase: “as it is written in the book of the prophets” (καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν, v. 42b). ‘Amos the prophet’ is read by cop^{G67} (Metzger [1971]1975:351). The phrase καθὼς γέγραπται as the introductory formula appears only again in Ac 15:15 within James’ speech. Therefore, it is noteworthy that the same introductory formula appears twice in Acts, since both are the only explicit quotations from Amos in Acts. According to Fitzmyer (1998:381), the introductory formula could also have been from elsewhere in the OT, such as Dn 9:13 (Theodotion) or 2 Ki 14:6 (LXX).

¹⁴⁶ According to Haenchen (1971:284), CD freely cites Am 5:25-27. Cf. also Braun (1966:319).

6.3.1.3 Establishing and describing the textual differences

NT(NA27)	LXX	MT	CD
Ac 7:42c-43	Am 5:25-27a ¹⁴⁷	Am 5:25-27a	7:14-15
^{42c} μὴ σφάγια	²⁵ μὴ σφάγια	הַזְבָּחִים	
καὶ θυσίας	καὶ θυσίας	וּמִנְחָה	
προσηνέγκατέ μοι	προσηνέγκατέ μοι	הֲגַ שְׁתֵּם־לִי	
<u>ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα</u>		בְּמִדְבָּר	
<u>ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,</u>	<u>τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη</u>	אַרְבַּעַיִם שָׁנָה	
οἶκος Ἰσραήλ;	οἶκος Ἰσραήλ	בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל:	
⁴³ καὶ ἀνελάβετε	²⁶ καὶ ἀνελάβετε	וּנְשֹׂאתֶם	וְהַגְלִיתִי
τὴν σκηνὴν	τὴν σκηנὴν	אֶת סִכּוֹת	אֶת סִכּוֹת
τοῦ Μόλοχ	τοῦ Μόλοχ	מִלְכָּכֶם	מִלְכָּכֶם
καὶ τὸ ἄστρον	καὶ τὸ ἄστρον	וְאֶת כִּיּוֹן	וְאֶת כִּיּוֹן
τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν	τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν	צִלְמֵיכֶם	צִלְמֵיכֶם
Ῥαιφάν,	Ῥαιφάν	כּוֹכַב	
τοὺς τύπους	τοὺς τύπους <u>αὐτῶν</u>	אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	
οὓς ἐποίησατε	οὓς ἐποίησατε	אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתֶם	
<u>προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς,</u>	<u>ἑαυτοῖς</u>	לְכֶם:	
καὶ μετοικιδῶ ὑμᾶς	^{27a} καὶ μετοικιδῶ ὑμᾶς	וְהַגְלִיתִי אֶתְכֶם	
ἐπέκεινα <u>Βαβυλώνας.</u>	ἐπέκεινα <u>Δαμασκού</u>	מִהַלְאָה לְדַמָּשֶׁק	מִמְּאֵהָ לִי דַמָּשֶׁק

¹⁴⁷ Unless otherwise referred to, the LXX version edited by Ziegler ([1943]1984) is used for the Greek translation of Amos.

6.3.1.3.1 Textual differences between CD and MT (and their relation with LXX and Acts)

It is fascinating to notice that CD 7:14-15a is consistent with the MT on several points. There are, however, 3 differences between the two versions of CD 7:14-15a and Am 5:25-27 (MT): (1) One transposition of וְהִגְלִיתִי; (2) an omission of כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם; and (3) a replacement of מְהִלָּא לְדַמְשֶׁק with מֵאֲהָלֵי דַמְשֶׁק in CD.

(a) Transposition:

[1] וְהִגְלִיתִי

In CD it appears before אֵת סְבוֹת, while the MT reads after לְכֶם. The order of the LXX and Acts correspond to that of the MT.

(b) Omission:

[2] The omission of כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם after צְלִמְיֶכֶם

CD omits the phrase of the MT reading כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם after צְלִמְיֶכֶם. The reading of the LXX and Acts, however, includes the Greek words τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν translated from the Hebrew words כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם.

(c) Replacement:

[3] מֵאֲהָלֵי דַמְשֶׁק → מְהִלָּא לְדַמְשֶׁק (CD)

The phrase מְהִלָּא לְדַמְשֶׁק in the text of the MT is replaced by מֵאֲהָלֵי דַמְשֶׁק in CD.

6.3.1.3.2 Textual differences between MT and LXX (and their relation with Acts)

There are 4 major variations to be identified between the versions of the MT

and the LXX: (1) One number change of the singular noun (מְנַחָה) to the plural noun (θυσίας); (2) one omission of בְּמִדְבָּר; and (3) two substitutions of τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ for מִלְכָּם סִכּוּת; (4) and καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥαιφάν τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν for וְאֵת כִּיּוּן צִלְמֵיכֶם כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם in the LXX.

(a) Number change:

[1] מְנַחָה (singular) → θυσίας (plural)

The singular word מְנַחָה after the conjunction ו in the MT is substituted by the plural word θυσίας in the LXX, while Ac 7:42 adheres to θυσίας. According to Arieti (1974:346), “מְנַחָה is twice translated θυσία (5:22, 25 (i.e. Am 5:22, 25, *J-W Kim*)), the usual translation in the LXX.”

(b) Omission:

[2] The omission of בְּמִדְבָּר

The phrase בְּמִדְבָּר of the MT, which means ‘in the desert’, is omitted in the LXX. However, the reading of Ac 7:42 (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) follows the MT on this point.

(c) Substitution:

[3] מִלְכָּם סִכּוּת → τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ

To put it more concretely, the LXX, which remains in accordance with the reading of Ac 7:43, holds a very different viewpoint from the MT, replacing ‘Sikkuth’ with ‘tent’, ‘your king’ with ‘of Molech’.

[4] וְאֵת כִּיּוּן צִלְמֵיכֶם כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם → καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥαιφάν τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν

The reading of the LXX, which is followed again by Ac 7:43, is quite different from that of the MT, substituting ‘the star of your god Rephan’ for ‘Kiyyun your images, the star of your god’. It can be represented most clearly by use of a chart in which the coupling of the lexical items between the MT and the LXX are

illustrated (cf. Isbel 1978:98):

	LXX	MT	
a	τὸ ἄστρον	כִּיּוֹן	c
b	τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν	צְלִמְיָכֶם	d
c	Ῥαιφάν	בּוֹכֵב	a
d	τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν	אֱלֹהֵיכֶם	b

Interestingly, similar phenomena to this occur frequently in the NT.¹⁴⁸ For example, Heb 7:1-2a alludes to Gn 14:17-20 as follows (cf. Steyn 2002:213-215):¹⁴⁹

NT		LXX
a Melchizedek: king of Salem and priest of God (v. 1a)	↗ ↘	The victorious return of Abraham (v. 17)
b The victorious return of Abraham (v. 1b)	↖ ↙	Melchizedek: king of Salem and priest of God (v. 18)
c Melchizedek's blessing (vv. 1c-2a)	↔	Melchizedek's blessing (vv. 19-20)

¹⁴⁸ See Mk 10:19 (par. Mt 19:18-19; Lk 18:20; Rm 13:9; Ja 2:11) and Ex 20:16-20 (par. Dt 5:16-20) (LXX); 1 Pt 2:2-3 and Ps 33:9 (LXX).

¹⁴⁹ Melchizedek appears only twice in the OT (see also Ps 110). It is truly strange that most commentators (e.g., Demarest 1976:10-136; Peterson 1982:106-108; Kistemaker 1984:183-186; Attridge 1989:187-195; De Silva 2000:265-267; Fitzmyer 2000:63-69) do not observe this free quotation from Gn 14:17-20. At most, some (e.g., Reid 1964:85; Lane 1991:159) regard the passage of Heb 7:1-3 as an example of a *gezerah shawa*.

6.3.1.3.3 Textual differences between Acts and LXX (and their relation with MT and CD)

There are 6 major variations to be highlighted between the versions of Ac 7:42-43 and Am 5:25-27 (LXX): (1) Two additions of ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ after ἕτη τεσσαράκοντα; (2) προσκυνεῖν before αὐτοῖς; (3) an omission of αὐτῶν after τύπους; (4) a transposition of ἕτη τεσσαράκοντα, with a change of the vowel α to ε; and (5) two substitutions of αὐτοῖς for ἑαυτοῖς; (6) and Βαβυλῶνος for Δαμασκού in Acts.

(a) Additions:

[1] The addition of ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ after ἕτη τεσσαράκοντα

Here Stephen adds ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ before οἶκος Ἰσραήλ in the reading of LXX.

[2] The addition of προσκυνεῖν before αὐτοῖς

The reading of the NT adds προσκυνεῖν before αὐτοῖς. Both the MT and the LXX, however, do not have this word.

(b) Omission:

[3] The omission of αὐτῶν after τύπους

The word αὐτῶν after τύπους is omitted in Ac 7:43. Both the MT and the LXX, however, have this word.

(c) Transposition with the change:

[4] τεσσαράκοντα ἕτη → ἕτη τεσσαράκοντα

In the LXX the phrase replaces this sequence with τεσσαράκοντα ἕτη, corresponding to the MT. Codex A, however, has the same order of the words, namely ἕτη τεσσαράκοντα in Ac 7:42, but with the transposition of οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, as mentioned earlier. Moreover, it has a change of the second vowel α to ε in the word τεσσαράκοντα.

(d) Substitutions:

[5] ἑαυτοῖς → αὐτοῖς

The third person plural reflexive pronoun (ἑαυτοῖς) in the LXX is replaced by the third person plural personal pronoun (αὐτοῖς) in Ac 7:43.

[6] Δαμασκου → Βαβυλῶνος

In the LXX Δαμασκου is replaced by Βαβυλῶνος in Ac 7:43. Here Luke alone has Βαβυλῶνος, others have Δαμασκου, except Codex D. However, as I will discuss later, the exile means a strong condemnation of the Israelite within the context of Amos and Luke, whereas “it is the saving deed of God to the Qumran community” within the context of CD (Steyn 2004:69).

6.3.2 Luke’s method used for the quotation

Luke’s method of quotation will be dealt with according to three points of comparison (CD, MT, LXX) and the NT. *Firstly*, there are three changes between CD 7:14-15a and Am 5:25-27 (MT). Before investigating Luke’s method here, it is necessary to take a glance at the passage of CD. CD 7:10-21 which constitutes the broader context, cites from Isaiah, Amos, and Numbers (Martínez [1994]1996:37-38):

¹⁰ when there comes the word which is written in the words of Isaiah, son of Amoz, the prophet, ¹¹ which says: *Isa 7:17* «There shall come upon you, upon your people and upon your father’s house, days such as ¹² have <not> come since the day Ephraim departed from Judah». When the two houses of Israel separated, ¹³ Ephraim detached itself from Judah, and all the renegades were delivered up to the sword; but those who remained steadfast ¹⁴ escaped to the land of the north. *Blank* As he said: *Am 5:26-27* «I will

deport the Sikkut of your King ¹⁵ and the Kiyyun of your images away from my tent to Damascus». The books of the law are the Sukkat ¹⁶ of the King, as he said *Am 9:11* «I will lift up the fallen Sukkat of David». The King ¹⁷ is the assembly; and the plinths of the images <and Kiyyun of the images> are the books of the prophets, ¹⁸ whose words Israel despised. *Blank* And the star is the Interpreter of the law, ¹⁹ who will come to Damascus, as is written: *Num 24:13* «A star moves out of Jacob, and a sceptre arises ²⁰ out of Israel». The sceptre is the prince of the whole congregation and when he rises he will destroy ²¹ all the sons of Seth. *Blank* These escaped at the time of the first one's visitation.

The transposition and omission, the verb וְהִגַּלְתִּי ('and I will deport') occurs in *Am 5:27*, while it appears at the beginning of *CD 7:14*. Then, the author of *CD* left out the mention of the star (בְּכֹכַב אֱלֹהֵיכֶם). Rather, the author connects this paragraph with a sceptre as well as the star of Jacob in *CD 7:19*. The quotation of *CD*, thus differs quite significantly from the original meaning of the *MT*.

For the replacement (מִהֶלְאָה לְדִמְשֶׁק) (*MT*) → מִזֶּמְרָה לְדִמְשֶׁק (*CD*)), Steyn (2004:62-63) explains that the reading of *CD* "was probably understood as the tent (אֹהֶל) of the Lord's presence that could have been indicated by the term אֹהֶל (Ps 15:1; 27:5; 61:5; 78:60)." According to De Waard (1966:43-44),

Among the recensions Σ shows most similarities with the *CD* text by his reading τὴν σκηνὴν (σκηνήν, sic!) and τοῦ βασιλέως ὑμῶν and transcription Χιῶν, and we may suppose that his recension is based on a Hebrew original like *CD*. The same also applies to the *LXX* in virtue of its reading τὴν σκηνὴν (σκηνήν, sic!), and on the grounds of its very remarkable translation of צְלַמֵיכֶם by τοὺς τύπους (αὐτῶν)...

Secondly, there are four changes between the MT and the LXX:

(a) Number change (מְנַחֵה (singular) → θυσίας (plural)).

[1] Barrett says (1994:368) that there is barely a discrepancy, because the Hebrew word is mostly recognized in its plural form (cf. also Archer & Chirichigno 1983:151).

(b) Omission (בְּמִדְבָּר).

[2] Steyn (2004:63) rightly points out that according to some scholars (e.g., Archer & Chirichigno 1983:151; Barrett 1994:369), “its inclusion in the LXX ... is doubtful and probably based on the non-critical LXX version of Rahlfs.”

(c) Substitutions (סִכּוּת מִלְכָּכִם → τὴν σκητὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ; כּוֹכַב אֱלֹהִיכֶם וְאֵת כִּיּוֹן צְלִמִיכֶם → καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ῥαιφάν τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν).

[3] Before discussing each change and method individually, the terms need to be investigated. Sikkuth or the Akkadian *Sakkut* is associated with Ninurta in Ugaritic sources and particularly with the star Saturn, that is the Assyrian god Nin-lb, enunciated with the vowels of Hebrew *shiqqutz* (cf. Bruce [1951]1987:155; Walton, Matthews & Chavalas 2000:770). For Barrett (1994:369), *Sakkut* seems to be a god of the war for the Assyrians. And Molech was the god that accepted child sacrifices (see Lv 20:1-5; 2 Ki 23:10; Jr 32:35). Steyn (2004:64) says that “Moloch was the Canaanite-Phoenecian Heaven-and-Sun-god.”

In fact, there is no suitable word for ‘booth’ or ‘tent’ in the MT. The LXX, finally, translated the Hebrew consonants סִכּת as σκητὴν (see Gn 33:17; Lv 23:34, 42-43; Dt 16:13; 2 Sm 11:11; 22:12; 1 Ki 21:12; 2 Chr 8:13; Ezr 3:4; Neh 8:14-17; Job 36:30; Ps 17:11; 26:5; 30:20; 107:8; Is 1:8; Am 9:11; Jnh 4:5). Steyn (2004:64) suggests that “[a]lternatively, though, the LXX translator might not have misread the consonants, but might already have had a different

Hebrew *Vorlage* in this case, one which probably read סִכַּת מֶלֶךְ (from סִכָּה = “Hütte”), and not סִכּוֹת מֶלֶכְכֶם.” The reading of Ac 7:43 here has the same reading as that of the LXX.

Then, the Hebrew consonants מֶלֶךְ seem here to be taken not as מֶלֶךְ (‘king’), but as מֶלֶךְ (‘Molech’) (Stuart 1987:352). Archer and Chirichigno (1983:151) mention that “it is highly probable that this refers not to any human being (since Israel had no king in Mosaic times) but to a divine king, such as the מֶלֶךְ of the Canaanites.” According to Haenchen (1971:284), “LXX extracts ‘Moloch’, its rendering of מֶלֶךְ in II Kings 23.10 and Jer. 32.35.”

Secondly, the reading of the LXX σακηνην must be a misreading of the Hebrew consonants as סִכָּה which means ‘booth’ or ‘tent’ (cf. Haenchen 1971:284; Isbel 1978:98; Archer & Chirichigno 1983:151; Conzelmann 1987:55; Fitzmyer 1998:382; Moyise 2001:55; Steyn 2004:63). The reading of Ac 7:43 also follows the reading of the LXX on this point.

[4] Meinhold and Budde argue that Kiyyun is almost certainly the Akkadian *kayyamānu* that is the Assyrian name for Saturn (Anderson & Freedman 1989:533). According to Walton, Matthews, and Chavalas (2000:770-771), “[i]t has the meaning ‘the steady one,’ an apt title for the slow-moving orbit of the planet Saturn.”

However, it is hard to say where this name of a god comes from. The one feasible description, according to Archer and Chirichigno (1983:151), “is found in a careful examination of the form of the Aramaic alphabet used by the Jews of the Elephantine colony in the 5th century B.C. This shows that *kaph* was very similar to *resh* in appearance, and *pe* was much like *waw*.” Fitzmyer (1998:382), however, indicates that “[w]hether the two names, Hebrew *sikkût* and *kiyyûn* in

Amos and Sakkud and Kaywan in Akkadian, refer to the same star-god, Saturn, is debatable.”

The alternative is advocated by Stuart (1987:352): “G[LXX] ραιφάν¹⁵⁰ must surely be an inner-Greek corruption of καιφάν.” Whatever tradition Luke may have employed, it is more important that the reading of Acts is the same as that of the LXX. Ringgren (1986:234) asserts that these two substitutions prove that the source of Luke’s quotation from Am 5:25-27 is thus the LXX.

Thirdly, in comparing the readings of the LXX and NT, six changes are found:

(a) Additions (έν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; προσκυνεῖν).

[1] Three LXX variants (A, B, and Lucianic group) have the same words έν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, despite the small differences on several points regarding the whole reading of each witness (cf. Steyn 2004:65). That is to say, A has έν τῇ ἐρήμῳ οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ἕτη τεσσαράκοντα, B V Q have έν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἕτη, and the Lucianic group and Theodotion read τεσσαράκοντα ἕτη έν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Steyn (2004:66) concludes that “[i]t is unlikely that Luke in this instance used the text as that found in the MT today. There are too many other agreements between Acts and the LXX versions.”

[2] The addition of προσκυνεῖν¹⁵¹ results in the alteration ἑαυτοῖς into αὐτοῖς. ‘Worship them’ is a natural change in the light of Israel’s purpose in making the images. In the original context the omission is trifling as well, since these modifications have little effect on the line of thought. It seems probable that it

¹⁵⁰ ‘Ραιφάν is read by P⁷⁴ N^c A 453 1175 pc sy; C E Ψ 33 36 pm, ‘Ρεφάν, while ‘Ρομφάν is read by N*; ‘Ρομφά is read by B Or. Furthermore 323 945 1739, ‘Ρεμφάν; 1241 2495, ‘Ρεμφφάν; D has ‘Ρεμφάμ.

¹⁵¹ For Richard (1982:40-41), it can be described in accordance to the common LXX twosome προσκυνεῖν / λατρεύω. So the employment of λατρεύω in the Abraham story (see Ac 7:7) “anticipates the λατρεύω/προσκυνέω pair in vv. 42-43”.

should be attributed to Luke's hand later, because this word is not found anywhere else in either the MT or the LXX. According to Kilpatrick (1979:83), however, Luke alone

has the old construction of προσκυνεῖν with accusative against other New Testament writers who construe it with the dative; ... this suggests that our rephrasing does not derive from the author of Luke-Acts and on the other side the phrase is not in the LXX or the Hebrew; we may accordingly infer a middle stage between our author and the LXX.

(b) Omission (αὐτῶν).

[3] It might be a deliberate omission of Luke in relation to the addition-cum-substitution of προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς. For Barrett (1994:370), Luke probably considers not that "their images could mean the images of Moloch and Raiphan", but that "your images would be better". According to Steyn (2004:67), Holtz claims that "if the text critical support of the A-group and recensional reasons are considered, there might be a possibility that Luke's *Vorlage* also lacked this reading" (cf. also Holtz 1968:17).

(c) Transposition with the change (τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη → ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα; α → ε).

[4] Richard (1982:38, 40) maintains that this order 'year/cardinal' is always found in Acts and 9 times of 11 times in Luke (see Lk 8:43 = Mk 5:25; Ac 7:6 = Gn 15:13). In earlier works Ziegler does not deal with the variant in his critical apparatus for Amos and the word order as it appeared in Acts.¹⁵² However, the two latest volumes of the Göttingen LXX (*Genesis*, 1974 and *Deuteronomium*, 1977) by J. Wevers, contain numerous proofs to sustain a pervasive propensity

¹⁵² In spite of this fact, Codex A reads ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη.

within a huge fragment of the MSS to choose the order 'year/cardinal'. This is against the older and the more universal LXX translation - 'cardinal/year', which follows the reading of the MT.

The modification of this kind - the change of the second vowel α to ϵ in the word τεσσαράκοντα - is fairly frequent in Hellenistic Greek (cf. Blass & Debrunner 1961 §29.1). Although it is likely that Luke's *Vorlage* had these changes, he seems most likely to follow his own preference and so has the transposition-cum-substitution.

(d) Substitutions (ἐαυτοῖς → αὐτοῖς; Δαμασκου → Βαβυλῶνος).

[5] For the substitution of αὐτοῖς for ἐαυτοῖς, no support is located within the LXX witnesses. In relation to the addition of προσκυνεῖν, it seems to be Luke's stylistic preference.

[6] First of all, CD is connected with Am 9:11. In its broader context we hear that when the two houses of Israel - Ephraim and Judah – were separated, Ephraim who detached itself from Judah were put to the sword, but those who remained steadfast escaped to the land of the north. The author of CD here quotes freely from Am 5:26 as well. In this body of literature Sikkuth means the books of the Torah, the king means the assembly, Kiyun the books of the prophets, and the star the true teacher of the Torah.

Now this adapted quotation of Amos provides for the historical origin of the Qumran community in the land of Damascus. As it were, in light of the context it refers to the neglected books of the law which were reestablished in Damascus. Thus, it is possible that the Qumran community understood Damascus as a figure for the Babylonian exile when they spoke of the new covenant made in

the land of Damascus.¹⁵³

Even though CD is seemingly similar to the LXX reading as well as the MT reading, it is clear that Acts which quotes from the same text - Am 5:26-27 - has no relationship of any kind with CD. Regarding the text of CD, Roberts (1951-1952:373) has correctly indicated as follows:

The source is Amos v. 26f., but the context of the original is wholly disregarded, and terms with offensive associations are correlated to personalities with the highest possible prestige. Thus, Torah is represented by Sikkuth, a pagan astral deity-king, and-even if this happened through ignorance and the connection with the festival par excellence of all Jews was made by false etymology and a change of vocalization-there is still greater incongruity in the subsequent correlation of obnoxious idols with the spurned prophets and their ignored oracles, and again, of an astral deity with the Messianic 'Star of Jacob'. ... The significance in each instance lies in the 'key-words': they are symbols of historical events, but these are only intimated as fulfillments of the uttered oracle, and do not of themselves offer the means of reconstructing a historical account. Such a reconstruction is rendered still more difficult by the obvious dissociation of the interpretation from the context of the original oracle.

Predicting the Assyrian exile of the northern kingdom, Amos depicted the area of Israel's imprisonment as 'beyond Damascus'. Their iterated unfaithfulness to God, however, led to a comparable sentence on the southern kingdom more than one hundred years later, in the Babylonian exile. For this part of Stephen's speech, Luke consequently substitutes 'beyond Babylon' for 'beyond

¹⁵³ For the comment of CD, see Main (1998:127), Schniedewind (1999:533-534), Davies (2000:35).

Damascus’.

Here we see Luke’s manipulation of this quotation in Ac 7:42-43, where he makes use of it in his historical summary of Israel’s faithlessness, drawing it as a model of what occurred to Israel because of her idolatry. As a consequence, he uses the passage in a manner which is much more reliable in relation to the primary context than does the author of CD (cf. Braun 1966:156; Fitzmyer 1971:41). Witherington (1998:272) concludes that “here it has been modified to suit a Judean audience for whom the Babylonian exile was a remembered experience.”¹⁵⁴

What is clear is the fact that Luke here quotes from the LXX text of Amos in order to represent his theological intention (cf. Wilson 1962:183; Lawrence 1964:40-41; Haenchen 1971:284; Marshall 1980:144; Ringgren 1986:234; Conzelmann 1987:55; Johnson 1992:131-132; Barrett 1994:368-371; Fitzmyer 1998:381-382; Witherington 1998:272).

6.3.3 Lukan interpretation of the quotation

In v. 41 Luke gives a full account of the Israelite idolatry that was stated in only a few words in the previous verse. Israel made an idol in the form of a calf to go before her, but that god to whom she brought sacrifices and in whom she rejoiced was merely a ‘thing’ made by her hands. According to Kistemaker (1990:264), scholars presume “that the Israelites made it from wood and overlaid it with gold, for Moses burned the idol with fire and ground it to powder” (see Ex 32:20). It should be noted that a chain of similar expressions occurs repeatedly in v. 40 (ποίησον ... θεούς), v. 41 (ἔμωσχοποίησαν), v. 48 (χειροποίητοις),

¹⁵⁴ For the detailed argument, cf. Steyn (2004:68-69).

and v. 50 (χείρ μου ἐποίησεν).

The golden calf is not called an idol in the context of Ex 32, but this is a proper explanation by Luke. Keener (1993:341) suggests that the offence of the golden calf was the most dishonorable episode within Israel's history, which was acknowledged as the same as the sin of Adam (cf. Kilgallen 1989:176; Dunn 1996:95). Idolatry in this form "was a persistent temptation to Israel (1 Ki. 12:28) and Stephen's condemnation of it was in line with the denunciations already made by Old Testament writers (2 Ki. 10:29; Hos. 8:4-6)" (Marshall 1980:144).

The Israelites' making of an idol in the form of a calf contrasts piercingly with the living oracles, received from angels in vv. 38, 53. Israel's people are to violate the Decalogue that declares the following: "You shall have no other gods before me; You shall not make for yourself an idol in the form of anything in heaven above or on the earth beneath or in the waters below; You shall not bow down to them or worship them" (see Ex 20:3-5; Dt 5:7-9). Furthermore the Israelite idolatry can be inextricably associated with deplorable sexual immoderation, although here Luke does not describe it in these terms (Dunn 1996:95; see also Wis 14:12-27; Rm 1:24-25; 1 Cor 10:8-8).

According to Witherington (1998:271), "[t]he issue here is not whether this object was handmade or not, but that it was a deity of human devising and therefore an idol as opposed to the true God." Luke is now drawing the sharp line between true and false worship. It is interesting that Aaron's involvement is diminished and Israel's sin is named as such by Luke (Haenchen 1971:283; Conzelmann 1987:54-55). The Greek verb εὐφραίνοντο in v. 41 suggests that Israel's celebration lasted for some time (Kistemaker 1990:264). It is also noteworthy that the term occurs continuously in the LXX for describing the Israelite rejoicings before Yahweh (see Lv 23:40; Dt 12:7, 12, 18).

In v. 42 Luke shows that God's reaction to Israel is God's turning away (ἐστρεψεν) from her, much like her turning (ἐστράφησαν) back to Egypt in her heart, which is stated in v. 39. As a result, God gives her over to the worship of the heavenly bodies. The Israelites worshipped the heavenly bodies as well as the calf. In the original context Amos rebuked Israel for her abandonment and admonished her expulsion as a consequence. Here Luke quotes from the prophet's proclamation within the OT in order to support Stephen's words. Luke's explicit quotation from Am 5:25-27 makes Israel's idolatry much clearer.

As Paul does in Rm 1:24, 26, 28, Luke describes the Israelites' indulgence in their sin (see Dt 4:16; Hs 13:2-4).¹⁵⁵ According to Johnson (1992:131), "God allowed the people to become captive to the consequences of their own evil choices" (see Ex 21:13; Lv 26:25; Nm 21:3; Dt 1:27; Ps 9:35; 26:12; 40:2; 62:10 (LXX)). The Israelite worship of the heavenly bodies itself aims to connote God's punishment as well as the outcome of their service of the golden calf.

The quotation from Amos occurs in the context of a pronouncement of exile. Amos said that God would give his verdict upon his adulterous, rebellious, covenant-breaking people. Although God chose Israel to be his people and treated her with his kindness during the exodus and conquest, and at the time of David and Solomon, the Israelites were incessantly unsuccessful in venerating and following him. There were days of idolatry, spiritual and ethical depravity, and oppression of the poor. Amos describes the shame and depravity of Israel's customs and religion within Israel's community.

Before investigating the quoted text, it is necessary to cast a glance at Am

¹⁵⁵ See also Wis 11:16 "...they might learn that one is punished by the very things by which he sins."

5:21-24:¹⁵⁶

I hate, I despise your religious feasts; I cannot stand your assemblies. Even though you bring me burnt offerings and grain offerings, I will not accept them. Though you bring choice fellowship offerings, I will have no regard for them. Away with the noise of your songs! I will not listen to the music of your harps. But let justice roll on like a river, righteousness like a never-failing stream! (NIV).

Then, Am 5:25 starts with the following rhetorical question - “Did you bring me sacrifices and offerings forty years in the desert, O house of Israel?” In the original context of Amos, various interpretations of it have been offered (Harper 1973:136):

(1) idolatrous sacrifice to Yahweh; (2) sacrifice acceptable in form, but not continuous because of lack of animals; (3) required sacrifices, but no freewill-offerings; (4) sacrifices to idols, but not to Yahweh; (5) sacrifice accompanied by idol-worship; (6) few sacrifices compared with their many rebellions; (7) no sacrifices at all; (8) sacrifices to be sure, but also something else, viz. ‘true worship of the heart and righteousness, public and private.’

Concerning the text of Am 5:25, Stuart (1987:355) explains that (cf. also Craigie 1976:218; see Ex 34:23–24; Nm 15:2; 18:24–27):

The forty years in the wilderness ... did at least provide for a true closeness between Yahweh and his people. During the desert experience, neither slaughtered sacrifices (זבחים) nor grain offerings (מנחות) were usually given.

¹⁵⁶ According to McComiskey (1993:328), Am 5:21-27 forms the section of “Indictment and Judgment of False Religiosity and Idolatry”.

The sacrificial system was essentially predesigned for a coming era of normal food production ... in a landed, settled situation.

For Fitzmyer (1998:381), it seems to imply that Amos regarded sacrifices as unnecessary things in the ideal wilderness period.

McComiskey (1985:316) asserts that Stuart's explanation "does not do justice to the continuity of vv. 25-26 called for by the Hebrew particle *waw* (untr. in NIV) that begins v. 26;¹⁵⁷ nor does it adequately explain why a statement denying the efficacy of sacrifice was placed in the judgement section of the oracle." According to Marshall (1980:145), it therefore could mean that "Amos was suggesting that the people did not offer merely sacrifices but also heart-obedience to God" (cf. also Macdonald 1899:214-215; Rowley 1946:340-342; 1946-1947:69-71, 305-307; 1950^b:79-80; Harper 1973:136-137; Bruce [1951]1987:154; Anderson & Freedman 1989:532).

For Anderson and Freedman (1989:532), it is an example of the Hebrew idiom, "not this but that' means 'that is more important than this'" (cf. also Mays 1969:110-111). Amos' declaration means that the true relationship between God and Israel in the desert is not dependent on sacrifices but on the obedient life (cf. Ryou 1999:305; see also 1 Sm 15:22).

What then does Luke intend in employing this quotation? The proper interpretation of the NT writer concerning the quotation from Amos is likely to be influenced by where the weight of the first sentence is laid on, namely 'Did' or '(to) me'. First of all, it is clear that both have been expected to answer 'No!'

¹⁵⁷ Afterwards, he adds that "[v]erse 26 begins with a *waw* that is best understood as adversative: 'But you have lifted.' Israel disobeyed God and by her neglect of sacrifice turned to idolatry."

because of the Greek word $\mu\eta$.

In spite of two opposing interpretations on the OT text, here it seems right that God had demanded sacrifices and offerings, but that Israel had turned their oblations and holiness into idolatrous aims (cf. Bruce [1951]1987:154-155; Manson 1951:30; Hanson 1967:100; Newman & Nida 1972:160; Marshall 1980:144-145; Johnson 1992:131-132; Barrett 1994:368-369).¹⁵⁸ The text itself, makes clear that sacrifices were offered in the wilderness, but to a pagan deity.

In the context of Stephen's speech, Simon (1951:127-142) says that in the desert Israel had not been expected to offer religious sacrifices. This is why the offering of a sacrifice was fundamentally an idolatry (cf. idem. 1958:49). Whilst this is an approach, it is not regarded as plausible. Teicher (1950-1951:67-99) advocated that the Qumran community became Ebionite (cf. Wright 1997:316).¹⁵⁹ Many scholars (Bammel [1964]1978:913; Daniélou 1964:63) have regarded the conversion of Essene Jews as the foundation of the Ebionites, before and after A.D. 70 (cf. also Fitzmyer 1957:208-231). However, Bruce ([1951]1987:154) criticises that the assertion "would associate Stephen more closely with the Ebionites."

Although it is not certain what Sikkuth and Kiyyun are in Amos, they seem to mean the worship of the star gods which was prevalent in the days of Amos (Anderson & Freedman 1989:533), as alluded to by the phrase, 'the worship of the heavenly bodies' in Ac 7:42a. Furthermore the reference to Molech and Rephan in Ac 7:43 directly links the veneration of the golden calf with the astral worship to which Amos and Jeremiah refer as the reason for Israel's exile after

¹⁵⁸ Conzelmann (1987:55) claims that basically the two interpretations above are not different.

¹⁵⁹ According to Ferguson (1987:492), the Ebionites were prohibited from eating meat and servicing the temple cult.

the time of Moses.

In conclusion, the quotation from Am 5:25-27 proclaims that in the wilderness the Israelites did not worship the true God, but the host of heaven¹⁶⁰ as the climax of their idolatry. Just as Israel wished to turn back to Egypt, so now God turns away from her.

The last important alteration is that Babylon replaces Damascus in v. 43. Richard (1982:42-44) suggests that it is a literary device of Luke, i.e., “the art of composing finales”.¹⁶¹ In reference to Dibelius’ thinking (1956^a:7) it could be described as “stagemanaging”. In order to prove it, he produces structural evidence (the threefold emergence of *καθώς* in vv. 42, 44, 48), and thematic evidence (loyalty and offering to God in v. 42b in contrast to Israel’s idolatry in vv. 40-41, and the tent of witness in v. 44 as opposed to the shrine of Molech in v. 43). Similarly, Knox (1944:14) justified the conversion on the strength of rhetorical practice.

It seems to be most appropriate that Luke adjusted these elements in order to express Israel’s history of betrayal, as is discussed in some length above. The statement of Amos was to the northern kingdom only, but Luke shows that this attitude of rejection and rebellion has been characteristic of the entire nation. Moreover Barrett (1994:371) argues that Luke may have supposed to bestow a more perfect testimony of the banishment to Assyria in B.C. 722, or of the expatriation to Babylon in B.C. 597 and 586, namely later than Amos’ time. Luke’s re-explanation is thus comprehensible at this point (Wilson 1962:183).

¹⁶⁰ The term *στρατιά* only occurs one other time in the NT. In Lk 2:13, *στρατιά* is used in reference to the angels who appeared at the announcement of the birth of Christ to the shepherds.

¹⁶¹ Richard (1980^a:272) presents that by and large Luke’s final element of a quotation acquires enormous significance functionally and thematically.

Just as Amos is talking about God's judgement on Israel because of idolatry, so also is Luke doing so via the mouth of Stephen.

The comment of Walton, Matthews, and Chavalas (2000:771) is also noteworthy:

Since the Assyrians are never directly mentioned in Amos, it is unclear that this is what he meant when he spoke of the coming exile of the people of Israel. Using such an imprecise phrase as 'beyond Damascus' is reminiscent of Jeremiah's threat 'from the north' (Jer 1:14), and both simply indicate the direction of Mesopotamia as the source of the coming destruction.

Israel was cast away to Babylon in Luke's judgement, implying a clear link to the Babylonian captivity. Luke here describes Israel's disobedience and links the prophesied sentence of the prophets to her lengthy history of disloyalty to God.

7. SUMMARY

7.1 Summary of Ac 7:17-22

The first subsection (Ac 7:17-22) mainly describes the historical background for Moses' appearance and his infancy in Pharaoh's house. To begin with, there are no explicit quotations. As with Joseph's story, Luke seems to be intent upon describing historical facts about Moses rather than entering into polemical or ideological discussion at this stage of Stephen's speech. Luke focuses chiefly on Moses' foreign birth and upbringing.

Nonetheless, Moses is illustrated as the one who would lead God's people out

of Egypt to ‘this place’, this is implied in v. 7. He is protected by God, even though he is rejected by his family. It is also noticeable that human activities are maximized while God’s activities are minimized in appearance here. However, God is still controlling the time and fulfilling his promise.

In conclusion, it is true that Luke makes his theological motifs at this point despite not having any direct quotations, just as in the Joseph narrative which precedes this one.

7.2 The quoted text from Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:27-28

In the second subsection (Ac 7:23-29), there is one explicit quotation. The highlighted phrase *τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ’ ἡμῶν; μὴ ἀνελεῖν με σὺ θέλεις ὄν τρόπον ἀνείλες ἐχθὲς τὸν Αἰγύπτιον;* in vv. 27-28 is the explicit quotation from Ex 2:14 (LXX), that is identified by my underlined introductory formula *ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπὼν* which I derived from Ac 7:27a. Owing to the textual agreement between the LXX reading and the NT reading, we can assume that Luke made use here of a LXX version for this quotation.

Through the verbatim quotation from Ex 2:14, Luke describes predominantly the Israelites’ unawareness of Moses’ role as their deliverer within the context of Moses’ life in Egypt. It finally results in the rejection of God’s servant even by family, but it has already been announced from the first subsection what the baby Moses’ story would be. In spite of Israel’s rejection, God’s faithfulness to his words and God’s looking after his people are the dominant themes behind this subsection.

In conclusion, the NT text follows the LXX version of Ex 2:14 accurately without

any change. Luke's use of a LXX source seems to become clear from the evidence that the two texts of the LXX and Acts insert a word (ἐχθές), against that of the MT. Luke here illustrates Israel's incomprehension and rejection of Moses, through his quotation with his theological intention for Moses' section.

7.3 The quoted text from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 in Ac 7:33-34

In the third subsection (Ac 7:30-34), there is also one explicit quotation. The highlighted phrase λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου, ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐφ' ᾧ ἔστηκας γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα, καὶ κατέβην ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτούς, καὶ νῦν δεῦρο, ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον in vv. 33-34 is an explicit quotation from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 (LXX) that is identified by my underlined introductory formula εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος which I derived from v. 33a.

The discrepancies between the versions are largely formal, and the content is quite similar, namely that Luke made the grammatical and stylistic changes, but that the meaning was not altered by these changes, although it should not be excluded that Luke might have used another *Textvorlage*.

The quoted text from Ex 3:5 expresses God's commandment to Moses to remove his sandals because he is standing on holy ground. Another quoted text from Ex 3:7b-8 demonstrates the truth that God is faithful to his promise. The other quoted text from Ex 3:10 expresses that it was Moses who was sent by God. The next verse (v. 35) however displays the rejection of Moses by the Israelites. The implied meanings of one quotation which is composed of a combination of three quoted texts, shows the following: God's self revelation is not limited to Jewish territory, just as God's calling of Abraham took place outside of the land; God is true to his words toward his people; and, the Israelite

rejection of Moses whom God had sent.

In conclusion, Luke draws the quoted text from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 in order to formulate his theological motifs, for example, God's calling of Moses, God outside of the land, God's faithfulness to his promise. Through two substitutions of $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\phi' \omega$, it could imply that another *Vorlage* was used by him, or simply that he sought to improve the expressions for his context. However, it is necessary to note that the meaning is not significantly altered by these changes.

7.4 The quoted text from Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:35

In the fourth subsection (Ac 7:35-37), there are two explicit quotations, one from Ex 2:14 and another from Dt 18:15. One explicit quotation $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \sigma\epsilon \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$; from Ex 2:14 (LXX) appears in v. 35, which is indicated by my underlined introductory formula Τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες which I derived from the text. The Lukan repetitive treatment of the same quotation reveals the fact that he deliberately makes clear his hermeneutical intention, especially through the very quotation within the context of the Moses story.

The quotation upholds Luke's theme of the disbelief of Israel against Moses whom God had sent. This motif is strengthened progressively by the quotations, including a repetition of the same quotation in vv. 27-28. Stephen's statement after the quotation serves to elucidate the meaning of the quotation.

In conclusion, Luke's quotation agrees exactly with both the MT version and the LXX version of Ex 2:14. It is likely that Luke might have used either the LXX or the MT at this point. Through the repeated use of the same quotation by the writer, the theme of the Israelites' rejection of Moses is reinforced progressively

in the Moses story.

7.5 The quoted text from Dt 18:15 in Ac 7:37

Another explicit quotation Προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ from Dt 18:15 appears in v. 37. It is also indicated by my underlined introductory formula οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἶπας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ which I derived from v. 37a.

It is evident that it is quoted from the LXX, though there are several changes which Luke made. According to the context of the speech, some grammatical and stylistic changes are seen to occur here. The transpositions are understandable in view of Luke's intent.

The quotation suggests clearly that Moses, who the people of Israel are rejecting, was appointed by God. It is also important that along with the quotation from Dt 18:15-16 in Ac 3:22, this quotation serves as a christological text within Acts (Scobie 1978-1979:418). However, the indication that Jesus is the prophet like Moses in this part of Stephen's speech is not given until v. 52.

In conclusion, Luke describes God's legitimation of Moses by quoting from Dt 18:15. When Luke deals with the text, the changes that were made to a LXX version by him are probably attributable to his stylistic preference and emphatic intention within the new context. In spite of the alterations, the meaning is not noticeably changed.

7.6 The quoted text from Ex 32:1, 23 in Ac 7:40

In the fifth subsection (Ac 7:38-43), there are two explicit quotations each from

Ex 32:1, 23 and Am 5:25-27. One explicit quotation Ποίησον ἡμῖν θεοὺς οἱ προπορεύονται ἡμῶν ὁ γὰρ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος, ὃς ἐξήγαγεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, οὐκ οἶδαμεν τί ἐγένετο αὐτῷ from Ex 32:1, 23 (LXX) appears in v. 40, it is also indicated by my underlined introductory formula εἰπόντες τῷ Ἀαρῶν which I derived from the text. Luke's changes of the text seem to be due to his stylistic preference and grammatical changes within the new context.

This quote further strengthens the theme of Moses, God's chosen one, who is rejected by Israel. This motif is reinforced more and more within the context of Stephen's speech. It could thus mean that to refuse God's herald is to refuse God himself. The first quotation here may be connected with the second quotation which illustrates the Israelite idolatry with the golden calf in this subsection.

In conclusion, Luke's quotation agrees exactly with both the MT version and the LXX version of Ex 32:1, 23. Thus Luke could have used either the LXX or the MT for this part of Stephen's speech. The changes that were made by Luke, might be ascribed to his grammatical and stylistic preferences. Here he depicts the rejection of Moses once again.

7.7 The quoted text from Am 5:25-27 in Ac 7:42-43

Another explicit quotation from Am 5:25-27 (LXX) appears in vv. 42-43, that is also indicated by my underlined introductory formula καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ τῶν προφητῶν which I derived from v. 42b: Μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ; καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκητὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ [ὑμῶν] Ῥαιφάν, τοὺς τύπους οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς, καὶ μετοικιῶ ὑμᾶς ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος.

Although it might have been possible that Luke used another *Textvorlage*, most of the changes that were made by Luke, show us his stylistic preference and hermeneutical intention. Especially, the substitution of Βαβυλῶνος is likely to be Luke's key textual adaptation and reflects the retrospection on the historical experience of the community.

The quotation announces at length that in the desert the Israelite worship was offered to the heavenly bodies, not to God. The motif of Israel's rejection that begins with Joseph and then moves on to the rejection of Moses, may culminate in Israel's idolatry against God. It is interesting to note that all of the quotations of this subsection – two quotations from Ex 32:1, 23 and Am 5:25-27 - seem to build up Stephen's statement of the previous verse of each quotation.

In conclusion, Luke here uses the quotation from Am 5:25-27, making his ideological and hermeneutical motifs, such as the Israelite's idolatry, clear. It is particularly noticeable that his theological point is made in the replacement of Βαβυλῶνος. In the process of Luke's employment of a LXX version, the changes that are made by him, seem to be required within the new context. However, Luke's alterations are not far from the original meaning. It should be noted that the quotation of CD differs completely from the meaning of the original context. At last, it was probably Luke who made these changes and it is unlikely here that they should be ascribed to another *Vorlage*.