

Dear reader,

This is an author-produced version of an article published in Cécile Dogniez / Phillipe Le Moigne (eds.), *Les Douze Prophètes dans la LXX*. It agrees with the manuscript submitted by the author for publication but does not include the final publisher's layout or pagination.

Original publication:

Kreuzer, Siegfried

Stages of the Greek Text of Dodekapropheton Witnessed by the Quotations in the New Testament

in: Cécile Dogniez / Phillipe Le Moigne (eds.), *Les Douze Prophètes dans la LXX*. Protocoles et procédures dans la traduction grecque: stylistique, poétique et histoire, pp. 265–284

Leiden: Brill 2019 (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 180)

URL: [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004407657\\_018](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004407657_018)

Access to the published version may require subscription.

Published in accordance with the policy of Brill: <https://brill.com/page/RightsPermissions/rights-and-permissions#selfarchiving>

Your IxTheo team

---

Liebe\*r Leser\*in,

dies ist eine von dem/der Autor\*in zur Verfügung gestellte Manuskriptversion eines Aufsatzes, der in Cécile Dogniez / Phillipe Le Moigne (Hg.), *Les Douze Prophètes dans la LXX* erschienen ist. Der Text stimmt mit dem Manuskript überein, das der/die Autor\*in zur Veröffentlichung eingereicht hat, enthält jedoch *nicht* das Layout des Verlags oder die endgültige Seitenzählung.

Originalpublikation:

Kreuzer, Siegfried

Stages of the Greek Text of Dodekapropheton Witnessed by the Quotations in the New Testament

in: Cécile Dogniez / Phillipe Le Moigne (Hg.), *Les Douze Prophètes dans la LXX*, Protocoles et procédures dans la traduction grecque: stylistique, poétique et histoire, pp. 265–284

Leiden: Brill 2019 (Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 180)

URL: [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004407657\\_018](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004407657_018)

Die Verlagsversion ist möglicherweise nur gegen Bezahlung zugänglich.

Diese Manuskriptversion wird im Einklang mit der Policy des Verlags Brill publiziert:

<https://brill.com/page/RightsPermissions/rights-and-permissions#selfarchiving>

Ihr IxTheo-Team

**Stages of the Greek Text of *Dodekapropheton* witnessed  
by the Quotations in the New Testament**

Siegfried Kreuzer

Institut für Septuaginta und Biblische Textforschung,  
Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel

## **1. Introduction**

The quotations in the New Testament are an important part of the reception history of the Septuagint. Understandably, they are mainly discussed by New Testament scholars. However, these quotations from the Septuagint are among the oldest textual witnesses of the Septuagint that exist.<sup>1</sup> Regarding *Dodekapropheton*, only the Naḥal Ḥever Scroll is older, all the other manuscripts of *Dodekapropheton* are younger than the quotations in the New Testament. Therefore, the quotations are not only witnesses to the reception history but to the earliest textual history of *Dodekapropheton*. This aspect is the focus of the present article. Yet, there are traditionally some problems with the quotations.

### **1.1. Which text is quoted?**

The quotations in the New Testament often agree with what is known as Septuagint text, but not always. Did some authors make their own translation or adaptation, or did they use other translations? There is an old statistic for this question, e.g. mentioned in the introduction to the Septuagint of Fernández Marcos. He says: “These quotations diverge from the Masoretic text in 212 cases whereas they differ from the Septuagintal text in only 185 cases,” and he continues: “It can therefore be concluded that the LXX is the main source for quotations by the New Testament writers.”<sup>2</sup> – Unfortunately, it is not said, how the Septuagintal text is defined: Is it the Rahlfs-Edition or is it one of the older diplomatic editions, more or less identical with codex Vaticanus? Does any difference to the assumed standard text really mean that it is a non-Septuagint text? - It becomes clear that the statistic statement of 212 to 185 is highly questionable. Neither a single codex nor the upper text of a

---

<sup>1</sup> Certainly, also for the New Testament writings there are only manuscripts and not the original writings. However, if there are no relevant variants, the text may be considered as the original text.

<sup>2</sup> Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 324.

specific edition is “the Septuagint”. In this sense, also Fernández Marcos admits that “the problem of the Old Testament quotations in the New has become much more complex than was previously thought,” and he even says that “the most acute problem is to interpret the many quotations that differ from the LXX.” – This sentence still refers to “the LXX” in a too general way. Yet, he continues: “At this point there is no avoiding modern theories about textual pluralism in the period when most of the New Testament was being formed ...” (324). - This leads to the next point:

## **1.2. New aspects of the origin and the transmission of the Septuagint text**

The most important new aspect that needs to be mentioned at least briefly in this context is the discovery of the kaige recension by Dominique Barthélemy.<sup>3</sup> This discovery has become foundational for Septuagint research. The basic result is that there were two phases in the development of the Septuagint: The original Old Greek text and the Hebraizing revision as found in the Naḥal Ḥever *Dodekapropheton* scroll and in other texts. Barthélemy dated the recension to the 1<sup>st</sup> cent. CE; as the scroll is now dated to the second half of the 1<sup>st</sup> cent. BCE, the kaige recension must have existed at this time or somewhat earlier.<sup>4</sup> The textual pluralism of the Hebrew text in early Jewish times had its consequence also for the transmission of the sacred scriptures in their Greek form: In New Testament times there existed at least two main forms of the Greek text: the Old Greek and the kaige-text. Therefore, one may ask which text form was used by the different authors of the New Testament writings. The answer in turn would also be significant for the existence of a specific reading. However two critical questions must be kept in mind: 1) The existence of e.g. text form X only confirms this text form, it does not mean, that text form Y or Z would not have existed at that time. 2) There is always the possibility of some change by the New Testament writers, be it a stylistic adaptation to the context or an adaptation to the intention of the author.<sup>5</sup>

## **1.3 The traditional evaluation of the quotations.**

Agreements and disagreements of the New Testament quotations with the textual traditions of the Septuagint have been noted and discussed for a long time. For the textual history of the Septuagint,

---

<sup>3</sup> Dominique Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du Rabbinate Palestinien* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

<sup>4</sup> For the age of the scroll see: Peter J. Parsons, “The scripts and their date,” in Emanuel Tov, Robert A. Kraft, Peter J. Parsons, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 19-26: “a date in the later i [= 1<sup>st</sup> cent.] B.C.” (26).

<sup>5</sup> And there certainly is the possibility of later changes during the transmission of the New Testament text, as variant readings show. But such observations belong to reception history and are beyond the scope of this paper.

the most important aspect was how the quotations were evaluated as textual witnesses in the critical editions.

In his preliminary studies on the Psalms and on the Lucianic text of Kings Alfred Rahlfs also discussed the cases when readings in the codices or other manuscripts agreed with quotations in the New Testament (or – for quotations in the historical books – also with quotations in Josephus). Such quotations would have indicated that those readings are quite old, especially older than Theodotion and also older than Lucian. In order to avoid such consequences and especially in order to maintain the idea of a late Lucianic redaction, Rahlfs explained them as later cross-influence between the manuscripts. This means that e.g. Lucianic / Antiochene<sup>6</sup> manuscripts would have influenced the transmission of Josephus' *Antiquitates*, or that New Testament quotations would have influenced the Lucianic / Antiochene texts, manuscripts like codex Alexandrinus or translations like the Sahidic.<sup>7</sup>

Consequently, in the apparatus of the Psalms edition, one can many times find a remark like “ex Matthew,” or “ex Luke” or “ex Hebrews” etc. Such readings in manuscripts that agreed with a New Testament quotation were automatically seen as secondary and needed no further discussion, even if such witnesses come from quite different geographic areas as codex Alexandrinus, the Sahidic translation and the Lucianic manuscripts testified to it. This can also be observed in the “Handausgabe” in regard of readings in *Dodekapropheton*: “Mi 5:1 ex Matth 2:6”; “Ioel 3:1 ex Acts 2:17”; “3:2 ex Acts 2:18” (3x); “3:3 ex Acts 2:19”. Sometimes also with “cf.,” like at Mal 3:1 “cf. Matth 11:10 Marc 1:2 Luc. 7:27”; some readings, like e.g. in Am 9:11 are not even mentioned.<sup>8</sup> Similarly Joseph Ziegler<sup>9</sup> in his edition set aside readings that are also found in the New Testament and discarded them as “Beeinflussung aus ntl. Stellen” (“Os. 10:6 ... ex Luc. 23:30”; “Mi. 5:2(1) ex Matth. 2:6” p. 43). Ziegler also notices that esp. in codex Alexandrinus (and its manuscript group), there are several readings that agree with the New Testament but he classifies them as secondary because of “Einfluß von ntl. Stellen” (“Am. 5:26 ... = Act. 7:43”; “Ioel 2:28 (3:1) ... = Act. 2:17; 2:29 (3:2) ... = Act. 2:18”; “Zach. 13:7 ... = Matth. 26:31”; p. 125f.).

---

<sup>6</sup> In older research the designation as Lucianic (and the assumption of a Lucianic recension) was quite common, while Barthélemy in his *Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (see fn. 2) denied the idea of a Lucianic reworking and suggested to use the neutral term Antiochene text. As there are indeed some ancient manuscripts that are evidently identified as Lucianic, and as some scholars still use “Lucianic”, I mention both terms. However, Lucianic is a text form only, and is not considered as a revision.

<sup>7</sup> Alfred Rahlfs, *Der Text des Septuaginta-Psalters*, Septuaginta-Studien 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1907); Alfred Rahlfs, *Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*, Septuaginta-Studien 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck 1911), 251.

<sup>8</sup> Alfred Rahlfs (and Robert Hanhart), *Septuaginta. Editio altera* (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelgesellschaft, 1935, 2006<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>9</sup> Joseph Ziegler ed., *Duodecim prophetae*, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984<sup>3</sup>).

Ziegler in his edition of *Dodekapropheton* also observes some agreements with the Recentiores (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion). They are also considered as late secondary influences (p. 126; and not, as e.g. also would at least be possible, as common heritage, be it from the Old Greek or an early).

#### **1.4. New perspectives and methodical procedure**

All this is understandable for Rahlfs' and Ziegler's time, but since Qumran and Naḥal Ḥever we know that the Recentiores had their precursors<sup>10</sup> and we especially know that Qumran (biblical) texts testify to readings that so far had been known from Septuagint manuscripts only and that agreed e.g. with quotations by Josephus or in the New Testament. As the Qumran manuscripts rested in the caves, a cross influence between such quotations and Septuagint manuscripts is impossible. This observation also contradicts the general assumption of cross-influence. This simply means that we can no longer automatically discard readings in Septuagint manuscripts that agree with quotations or the quotations in the New Testament as such.

The readings must be evaluated on text critical grounds and with text critical reasoning only. For this, the main rule is to look for the oldest text form and to explain the genesis of the variants, which in turn confirms or disproves the assumed oldest reading.<sup>11</sup>

Text critical and historical studies in some way can be compared with archaeological work: there are many sherds that are not very indicative, but there are also diagnostic sherds, that allow firm conclusions. Therefore, one has to sift all sherds and also all readings, and in most cases there are some diagnostics elements.

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. the title of Barthélemy's, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*.

<sup>11</sup> In New Testament text critical studies this basically old rule is now called the "coherence based genealogical method."

## 2. Text critical evaluation of quotations from *Dodekapropheton*

For the following evaluation the texts from the Rahlfs and from the Ziegler edition and their textual witnesses are quoted, similarly the Nestle-Aland edition for the New Testament.<sup>12</sup> Further readings from the apparatus have been checked, but are mentioned only where relevant. For the texts from Qumran, Naḥal Ḥever, and Wadi Murabba‘at, *Biblia Qumranica*, DJD, and BHQ are used.<sup>13</sup>

There are some more quotations from *Dodekapropheton*, and also a survey of the allusions may lead to some additional observations, however the following ten passages suffice to show the fruitfulness of the inquiry for the textual history of the Septuagint.

### 2.1. Hos 2:1 and 2:25 in Rom 9:25f. and Hos 1f. in 1 Pet 2:10

In this case, Paul quotes two similar passages from Hosea. Both announce future salvation for Israel. The textual tradition is complex, which also can be seen by the fact that Rahlfs and Ziegler have reconstructed it differently.<sup>14</sup>

Hos 2:1b: MT: וְהָיָה בְּמִקְוֵי אֲשֶׁר־רָשָׁא אֲנִי אֶל־עַמִּי אֲשֶׁר מֵאֲמַר לְהָבִי אֶל־יְהוָה

Ra: καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.

Gö: καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.

4QXII<sup>d</sup>: ....הם[ל יומר, אתם, יעמי, לא, עמי, להם, שר, יאמר, א, במקום, ו, יהיה, (2:1),

Rom 9:26: καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.

Hos 2:25: MT: וְהָיָה אֲשֶׁר־אֶל־עַמִּי אֲשֶׁר מֵאֲמַר לְהָבִי אֶל־יְהוָה

Ra and Gö: καὶ ἐλεήσω τὴν Οὐκ ἠλεημένην καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ λαῶ μου Λαός μου εἶ σύ,

καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρεῖ Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἶ σύ.

B-V-407 et al.: αγαπησω την ουκ ηγαπημεην

4QXII<sup>g</sup>: (2,25): , [יוי, א, יהיה, ,

---

<sup>12</sup> Rahlfs, Hanhart, *Septuaginta* (= Ra) and Ziegler, *Duodecim prophetae* (= Gö). Unfortunately, the announced revised edition of *Dodekapropheton* by Felix Albrecht is not yet available. Eberhard Nestle, Kurt Aland eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2013<sup>28</sup> [= NA<sup>28</sup>]).

<sup>13</sup> Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger and Kristin De Troyer, *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3B; Leiden: Brill, 2005); Emanuel Tov, Robert A. Kraft, Peter J. Parsons, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever*; Anthony Gelston, *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (Biblia Hebraica Quinta 13; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2010 (= BHQ)).

<sup>14</sup> For the following discussion, at first the editions are quoted: For the Septuagint this is the Rahlfs and the Ziegler edition, because these are the texts that are widely accepted as the oldest text (that can be reached). For the New Testament I refer to the text of *Nestle-Aland*<sup>28</sup> in order to avoid the criticism that I would select a text that fits my intentions. However, where relevant, the manuscripts and their readings are mentioned and discussed as well.

Rom 9:25: καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην·

1 Pet 2:10: οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες .

For Hos 2:25 Ziegler in the Göttingen edition (= Gō) followed the manuscript group around Codex Vaticanus (B-Q-C), Rahlfs (= Ra) followed Codex Venetus, Codex Alexandrinus and the Lucianic/Antiochene Text (together with the Old Latin and the Armenian text).

It is striking that both text forms of 2:1b change in their translation of רָמַזְ from ἐρρέθη to κληθήσονται, which does not allow using αὐτοῖς for הֵל. Consequently it is missing in Ra and the A-V-Ant group, while in Gō and the B-Q-C group, הֵל is taken up by καὶ αὐτοῖ. The unexpected καὶ could go back to ו instead of ה (in 4QXII<sup>d</sup> the ה is not sure).<sup>15</sup> In any case, this text form very closely follows the Hebrew text (as we know it).

Rahlfs on the other hand accepted the text of the A-V-Ant group, evidently following the rule, already formulated by Paul Anton de Lagarde,<sup>16</sup> that the oldest text is the one, which is most distant from MT, which in our case also includes Paul's quotation. Strangely, there is an additional ἐκεῖ, which has no equivalent in the Hebrew text (at least as we know it). Evidently, this takes up בְּמִקְוֵה from the first half of the verse. While probably the Hebrew expression indicated the contrast, i.e. "instead of ...", in the Greek text it is understood locally (ἐν τῷ τόπῳ), which is taken up by ἐκεῖ. Even if this ἐκεῖ would go back to some Hebrew *Vorlage* reading an additional וּשׁ, ἐκεῖ represents a text form, which is different from MT and – as not revised towards MT – most likely also older.

This means that Paul at this place quotes a reading which is older and closer to the Old Greek if not the Old Greek itself. Evidently, the other reading of Hos 2:1b is younger and adapted to the Hebrew/proto-Masoretic text (deletion of ἐκεῖ and addition of the personal pronoun).

Of interest not yet at this point but for the next passage is the variant to the second לְהִמָּן, רָמַזְ in 4QXII<sup>d</sup>, namely יוֹמַר. This reading evidences an active form of the verb: "he speaks".

We move on to Hos 2:25, the second quotation from this context: Both, the text of Ra and the text of Gō are very close to the Hebrew text. הִמָּן is rendered by ἐρῶ, i.e. by the same verb as at the beginning of 2:1b. This again allows the dative. Different from that, Paul uses καλέσω as *verbum dicendi* and so brings together the renaming of the children under one verb. In this way, also the promise of mercy is expressed by renaming.

As the Pauline reading and the readings in the Septuagint manuscripts are different, we also observe that the New Testament reading has not influenced the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint.

---

<sup>15</sup> This would be difficult in Hebrew syntax, but it may be the misreading of a translator/reviser who wanted to closely follow the words.

<sup>16</sup> Paul Anton de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863), 3.

Considering the three different readings, one observes that the readings accepted in Ra and Gö are the ones that are closest to MT. Contrary to them, the B-V-407 group reads ἀγαπήσω. For V-407 and (in the same sense) also in the Old Latin, this can be found in 1:6.8.9 (cf. the apparatus in Gö). Evidently, this is a distinct and also older translation with a freer rendering, while on the other hand ἐλεήσω exactly renders the Hebrew Verb.

Rom 9:25 apparently is the rendering most different from the Hebrew text. However, in Hos 1:4,6,9 each time (and without variants) κάλεσον is used. Therefore, Paul's καλέσω can be understood as taking up that verb, while the designation as (οὐκ) ἠγαπημένη (contrary to ἠλεημένη) takes up the above mentioned older textual tradition.

For Rom 9:25, probably one should not assume an otherwise unknown textual form of Hos 2:25. It rather is Paul's own wording by which he takes up the context and leads it to the actual quotation from Hos 2:1b in the next verse. In doing so, Paul uses the older wording with ἀγαπᾶν, i.e. the wording of the original Septuagint.

At this point we may refer to the above mentioned active form רמי, "he says" in 4QXII<sup>d</sup> for 2:1 and also in 4QXII<sup>s</sup> for 2:25. This most probably refers to God as subject. The active formulation (instead of the *passivum divinum*) supports Paul's introduction of the quotation with καλέσω. I would not contend that Paul necessarily knew this Hebrew reading, but at least it shows that also before Paul the *passivum divinum* has been expressed in the active sense with God as subject, and that either he did the same, or that he relied on such an understanding and tradition.

Hos 1f. is also taken up in 1 Pet 2:10: οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες.<sup>17</sup> This scripture reference – as also the other scripture references in 1 Peter – is not an exact quotation and it also is not introduced as a quotation.<sup>18</sup> However, it takes up the above mentioned passages (from Hos 1:6,9 to 2:1,25) and integrates them in the argumentation. However, the use of ἠλεημένοι and ἐλεηθέντες (as opposed to ἠγαπημένη etc., cf. above), i.e. the exact rendering of רמי, shows that now the younger text form of the Septuagint is used. – This observation agrees with the fact that 1 Peter is several decades later than the letter to the Romans, and it shows that indeed the New Testament quotations reflect the development of the Septuagint tradition.

---

<sup>17</sup> NA<sup>28</sup> shows no variants for this passage.

<sup>18</sup> For the typical ways of referring to scripture in 1 Peter see Martin Vahrenhorst, "Der Text der Septuaginta in den Zitaten des 1. Petrusbriefes," in *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity: Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum* (ed. Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer; SCS 60; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 259-275.



Comparing the readings we come to the conclusion that evidently Paul used the older version, i.e. the Old Greek, which rendered אָמַר according to its sense with ἀγαπήσω (testified in B-V-407 et al.), while 1 Peter referred to the later version that rendered אָמַר with the more literal translation ἐλέησω. While there would be hardly a reason to change from ἐλέησω to ἀγαπήσω, the change from ἀγαπήσω to ἐλέησω can readily be explained as isomorphic adaptation, typical for the kaige-recension.

## 2.2. Hos 11:1 in Matth 2:15

Hos 11:1b אָמַר אֱלֹהִים מִיִּצְרָאֵל בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Ra + Gō: καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ

Matth 2:15: ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου

Ms 86:	Hebr.	(1)	ουμεμισραιμ	καραθι	λαβανι	(=MT)
	Aquila	(2) Α.	καὶ ἀπο Αἰγύπτου	ἐκάλεσα	τὸν υἱόν μου	
	Symmachus	(3) Σ.	ἐξ Αἰγύπτου	κέκληται	υἱός μου	
	LXX	(4) Οἱ Ο΄.	καὶ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου	μετεκάλεσα	τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ	
	Theodotion	(5) Θ.		ἐκάλεσα	αὐτὸν υἱόν μου	

+ scholia: “Τούτῳ ἐχρήσατο ὁ Ματθαῖος, ὡς ὄντως ἔχοντος δηλονότι τοῦ Ἑβραϊκοῦ ὡς καὶ ὁ Α. ἠρμήνευσε”

This is the famous text about God, having called his son, i.e. Israel, out of Egypt. It is taken up by Matthew in the story of Herod’s murdering the children and of the flight of Jesus’ family to Egypt and the return from there. The Septuagint text in almost all its witnesses clearly reads different from the MT: “... and from Egypt I called his children.” Evidently Israel, whom God loved, is understood as Jacob (renamed Israel in Gen 32:29) whom God loved, according to the Genesis story and according to Mal 1:2-3. As Jacob died in Egypt, God did not call Jacob out of Egypt, but his progeny, therefore the Septuagint talks about “his sons.”

This clearly is a harmonization, and one may wonder if it was made by the translator or already found in the Hebrew *Vorlage*, as in Hebrew there is the minor difference of one י only.

In Matthew we have an exact rendition of the Hebrew text as we know it. One may assume that Matthew deliberately followed the Hebrew text and that he made his own translation.

But there is an interesting alternative: In Ms. 86 (see above) there is an excerpt from the Hexapla.<sup>19</sup> It begins with the transcription of the Hebrew text as we know it, and there are the Recentiores besides

<sup>19</sup> See the presentation in Ziegler, *Dodekapropheton*, 172.

the Septuagint. Interestingly not only Aquila but also Symmachus and Theodotion read the singular; esp. Aquila reads exactly as Matthew. There is also a note beside the small synopsis which explains that Aquila has the same reading as Matthew. One may still assume that Matthew made his own translation, but it seems more convincing that there was already a Greek text, that had been adapted to the Hebrew, in other words: a precursor (or a “devancier”) of Aquila or simply the kaige-text that was known to Matthew and quoted by him.

### 2.3. Hos 13:14 in 1 Cor 15:55

MT: מִיָּד שְׂאוּל אֶפְדֵם מִמָּוֶת אֲנִי אֶחְיֶה דְבַר יְהוָה אֲנִי אֶחְיֶה שְׂאוּל גַּם מִסִּתְּרָה מֵעֵינַי׃

Ra and Gō: ἐκ χειρὸς ἄδου ῥύσομαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐκ θανάτου λυτρώσομαι αὐτούς· ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου, θάνατε; ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου, ἄδι; παράκλησις κέκρυπται ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου.

1 Cor 15:55: κατεπόθη ὁ θάνατος εἰς νίκος. 55 ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νίκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον.

The Greek text as it is given in the Ra and Gō editions is a quite exact rendering of the Hebrew text, although the original woe oracle (if one considers the context) has become an announcement of salvation. There evidently was some difficulty with the translation of מוֹת דְּבַר יְהוָה which is discussed in the commentaries,<sup>20</sup> and mirrored in the variants of the Greek text: Some manuscripts, the Armenian translation and some quotations from the fathers read νίκη. The Lucianic/Antiochene tradition reads διαθήκη, which at least shows that there is no cross influence from the New Testament. Aquila reads ῥήματα σου and so confirms MT. Symmachus translates πλήγη, which evidently is deduced from the context. The Hebrew text may be correct if one considers the well known polysemy of the root דבר. It is about death and the effects of death. Septuagint and Symmachus try a meaningful translation. The text wants to express some serious threat. Nothing shall escape. In this sense νίκη as also διαθήκη express the claim death has for the people. In Deut 9:5 διαθήκη stand for דְּבַר יְהוָה. The translator(s) could have used that passage from the Pentateuch for translating this difficult passage. But also a later editor could have done this. ΔΙΚΗ and ΝΙΚΗ are graphically very close. This might have facilitated the change, but probably it occurred not by mistake only. Again there is the question about the direction of change. As it is closer to the Hebrew and in view of its strong attestation δίκη may have been the original reading. In this case, Paul with νίκη would have had a reading before him that, at least to

---

<sup>20</sup> The commentaries (e.g. Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea* (BK 14/1; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1990<sup>4</sup>), ad loc., mention different solutions like referring to II דְּבַר יְהוָה, thorns (besides I דְּבַר יְהוָה plague), which is also found in Ps 91:6. The Septuagint translator certainly had דבר, word, deed, in mind. See also the discussion in Jan Joosten, Eberhard Bons and Stephan Kessler, *Les Douze Prophètes. Osée* (La Bible d’Alexandrie 23.1; Paris: Cerf, 2002), 160-161.

some degree, originated as a scribal mistake, but that was also meaningful.<sup>21</sup> The reading διαθήκη of the Lucianic/Antiochene text may be a learned correction, but most probably it was also made in Early Jewish/Pre-Christian time, because later on, in view of Paul’s letter, the wording would hardly have been changed.

Hos 13:14/1 Cor 15:55 leads to an interesting observation on the Early Jewish textual history: Paul refers to a reading that quite early originated as a reading mistake but also because of the difficulty of the text. It is either a mistake or it is the Old Greek, but it is not an isomorphic correction. Paul employed the reading for his argumentation about resurrection and why he changed from νίκη to νίκος is a different matter and belongs to New Testament exegesis.

#### 2.4. Amos 9:11f. in Acts 15:16f.

MT	Ra = Gō	Acts 15
<p>11 בַּיּוֹמֵהוּ אֵקִים . . .</p> <p>אֶת־סֶכֶת דָּוִד . . .</p> <p>הַנֶּפֶץ . . .</p> <p>וְגִדְרָתָּ? . . .</p> <p>אֶת־פְּרָצֶיהָ . . .</p> <p>וְהִרְסֵהוּ . . .</p> <p>אֵקִים וּבְנִיתֶיהָ . . .</p> <p>כִּי־מִי עוֹלָם; . . .</p> <p>12 לְמַעַן יִירָשׁוּ . . .</p> <p>אֶת־שְׂאֵרֵי אָדָם . . .</p> <p>וְכָל־הַגּוֹיִם . . .</p> <p>אֶת־רִגְלֵי אֶתְרָא שְׂמִי עָלֶיהָ מ . . .</p> <p>בְּאִם־הַיְהוָה . . .</p> <p>עֲשֵׂה אֵת . . .</p>	<p>11 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ <u>ἀναστήσω</u></p> <p>τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ</p> <p>τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν</p> <p><u>καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω</u></p> <p>τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς</p> <p>καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς</p> <p><u>ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω</u></p> <p>αὐτήν</p> <p><u>καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος.</u></p> <p>12 ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν (με)</p> <p>οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων</p> <p>καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, ἐφ’ οὓς</p> <p>ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου</p> <p>ἐπ’ αὐτούς,</p> <p>λέγει κύριος [+ <u>ὁ θεὸς Ra</u>]</p> <p>ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.</p>	<p>16 μετὰ ταῦτα <u>ἀναστρέψω</u></p> <p><u>καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω</u></p> <p>τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ</p> <p>τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν</p> <p>καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς</p> <p><u>ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω</u> αὐτήν,</p> <p>17 ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν</p> <p>οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων</p> <p><u>τὸν κύριον</u></p> <p>καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὓς</p> <p>ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου</p> <p>ἐπ’ αὐτούς,</p> <p>λέγει κύριος</p> <p>ποιῶν ταῦτα</p> <p>18 γνωστὰ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος.</p>

<sup>21</sup> Vinzenz Hamp, “Die Verwechslung von ‚Wort‘ – ‚Pest‘ im Alten Testament,” in idem: *Weisheit und Gottesfurcht. Aufsätze zur alttestamentlichen Einleitung, Exegese und Theologie* (St. Ottilien: EOS, 1990), 91-95: 93, also considered the change as a mistake in the Greek tradition (“innergriechische Verderbnis”). See also Joosten, Bons and Kessler, *Osée*, 160-161, and Eberhard Bons, “Hosea – Osée,” in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen II* (ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2336.

Also, this text is widely discussed,<sup>22</sup> however, we do not discuss the literary questions regarding Amos 9 nor the exegetical questions of Acts 15, but again we concentrate on text critical problems. Looking at the two Greek texts, one easily can see that there is about the same content, but in a different sequence of the words. In Acts 15:16 καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω is brought forward and by omission of τὰ πεπωκότα αὐτῆς the doubling with κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς is avoided. This simplification and also the introduction with μετὰ ταῦτα may have been created by the translator. This change most probably is not made by Luke, as ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (without the preceding verse) would fit his intention as well. There is also the difference between ἀναστήσω and ἀναστρέψω. One could assume that ἀναστήσω is used by Luke for the resurrection of Jesus only. But Luke who has two thirds of all occurrences of ἀνίστημι in the New Testament (45x in Acts, 27x in Luke out of 108x in the whole New Testament) uses the word in many different contexts and with different meanings.<sup>23</sup>

Rather, ἀναστήσω seems to be the adaptation to the standard rendering of דִּק, both Qal and Hif'il with a form of ἀνίστημι. Taking into account also the word order, one sees that there is no real reason for a change from Septuagint to Acts. But in the other direction the change can be explained as adaptation to the Hebrew text and its word order.

However, at the same time one may admit that καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος in the last line of the verse may have been omitted by Luke or his tradition, because it is not so fitting for the context.

In v. 12 the differences between the Greek texts are smaller. One may discuss if τὸν κύριον is an addition by Luke or if it was deleted in the Septuagint tradition. However, ἐκζητήσωσιν (which is different from the Hebrew text) somehow needs an object. Therefore one may assume that the older Greek text had τὸν κύριον (in accordance e.g. with Amos 5:4 and 5:14: seek the Lord), and that it was deleted by isomorphic reason in the transmission of the Septuagint text.

---

<sup>22</sup> Frederick Fyvie Bruce, "The Apostolic Decree of Acts 15," in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments* (ed. Wolfgang Schrage; BZNW 47; Berlin, New York: de Gruyter, 1986), 115-124; Jostein Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift als Zeuge der Heidenmission. Die Rezeption von Amos 9,11-12 in Apg 15,16-18," in Jostein Ådna and Scott J. Hafemann, *Evangelium - Schriftauslegung - Kirche. Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65. Geburtstag* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 1- 23; Wolfgang Kraus, "The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11-12 as a Test Case," in 'Translation is required'. *The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert; SBL.SCS 56, Atlanta, Ga.: SBL Press 2010), 171 – 190; see also Wolfgang Kraus, "Die Aufnahme von Am 9,11f. LXX in Apg 15.15f. Ein Beitrag zur Wirkungsgeschichte eines Textes aus hellenistischer Zeit", in *Juda und Jerusalem in der Seleukidenzeit. Herrschaft - Widerstand - Identität. Festschrift für Heinz-Josef Fabry* (ed. Ulrich Dahmen and Johannes Schnocks; Bonner biblische Beiträge 159, Göttingen: V&R unipress 2010, 297 - 322.

<sup>23</sup> Walter Klaiber, *Auferstehung I. Der sprachliche Befund* (TBLNT I; Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1997), 89-91.

The larger difference in v. 12 is the difference between the Hebrew and the Greek text: the rest of Edom or the rest of the people / of mankind. While MT reads אדום, the country southeast of the Dead Sea, the Greek text presupposes אדם, man or mankind. Edom as former part of the kingdom of David – at least according to biblical tradition – looks somewhat isolated and small in relation to the following וְכָל-הַגּוֹיִם, all the nations. In this respect, אדם, mankind, fits much better the context of this eschatological announcement. Also ἐκζητήσωσιν is a good continuation of the context: v. 11 speaks about the resurrection of the house/kingdom of David and v. 12 about God’s dealing with mankind. There is only a minor difference between שׂר, to seek, and ירש, to inherit, which means that the difference originated as a misreading of the Hebrew text.

The change from אדם, man/mankind to אדום, Edom in v. 12, most probably occurred to justify the conquest of Edom by John Hyrcan (134-104 BCE.). This would fit with other observations, e.g. that the chronology of the Masoretic text was changed so that it would point to 164 BCE, the year of the rededication of the temple, as the beginning of a new era.<sup>24</sup> One may even mention that אדם also could be read as Edom, although usually it had plene spelling. This means that the ו in אדום would mainly indicate and secure the new reading.

To sum up: The Septuagint shows the older reading of Amos 9:11-12, while Edom in the Masoretic text is a later change. The quotation in Acts 15 supports the Septuagint text, yet esp. in v. 11 it preserved the older text, while the Septuagint tradition underwent an isomorphic Hebraizing revision.

## 2.5. Joel 3:5a in Rom 10:13

MT: וְהָיָה, כִּלְאִשְׁרָאֵל יִקְרָא, בְּשֵׁם מִיְהוָה הַקָּדוֹשׁ

Ra and Gō: καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται

Rom 10:13: πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.

In the Septuagint tradition, there are only some minor variants. The Greek text is an exact rendering of the Hebrew text. γάρ most probably is inserted by Paul as the quotation should confirm the argumentation: “because”. There are no observations relevant for textual history.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>24</sup> See e.g. Martin Rösel, *Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1994), 129-144, with reference to older literature.

<sup>25</sup> For details and for reception history see Marguerite Harl, Cécile Dogniez, Laurence Brottier, Michel Casevitz and Pierre Sandevour, *Les Douze Prophètes. Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie* (La Bible d’Alexandrie 23.4-9; Paris: Cerf, 1999), 35.70f. See also Barbara Eberhard and Annette von Stockhausen, *Joel* (LXX.E II, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2382.

## 2.6. Nah 2:1 (with Is 52:7) in Rom 10:15

MT: הַגָּה, עַל־הַהָרִים רַגְלֵי מְבַשֵּׂר מְשֻׁמֵּעַ, שְׁלוֹם

Ra and Gö: ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη οἱ πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου καὶ ἀπαγγέλλοντος εἰρήνην

Rom 10:15: ὡς ὥραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων [τὰ] ἀγαθά.

Is 52:7: ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθά

MT: מֵהַנְּאֻוֹ, עַל־הַהָרִים רַגְלֵי מְבַשֵּׂר מְשֻׁמֵּעַ, שְׁלוֹם מְבַשֵּׂר מְשֻׁמֵּעַ, יְשׁוּעָה

While Nah 2:1 and Is 52:7 refer to the feet of one messenger, Rom 10:15 speaks about many messengers, according to the plurality of Christian messengers that bring the gospel. One also can see that the quotation combines two scripture passages: ἀγαθά is taken over from Is 52. There is a text critical problem in Rom 10:15: Many important manuscripts (cf. NA<sup>28</sup>) have τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην after πόδες. This certainly is an adaptation to the Septuagint reference texts that speak of messengers of peace.

More difficult is the difference between ὥρα and ὥραῖος / ὥραῖοι. ὥρα is not the same as lat. hora (engl. hour), but it has the meaning of season, esp. the agreeable springtime. In this sense Brenton has “as a season of beauty upon the mountains”, and NETS “like season on the mountain”; LXX.D refers to springtime: “wie Frühling auf den Bergen.” Besides Paul, also part of the Septuagint tradition reads ὥραῖοι. According to the above mentioned principles Ziegler in Gö explains this as influence from Rom 10:15 and therefore considers it as secondary (in Ra this reading is not mentioned). However, in view of the many witnesses it cannot be discarded and it probably is the oldest reading. Traditionally ὥραῖοι is translated in the sense of Hebrew וְאוֹרֵי and probably influenced by the Vulgate (*quam pulchri super montes pedes...*) with “beautiful” (e.g. NRSV). But ὥραῖος at first simply is the adjective to ὥρα and means a specific time, esp. what a season brings and ripens and what fittingly happens. This aspect is well expressed by Joseph A. Fitzmyer (1993):<sup>26</sup> “How timely the arrival of those...” Similarly Klaus Haacker (1999):<sup>27</sup> “Wie willkommen sind ...” and also the Neue Zürcher Bibel (2007): “Wie sind doch willkommen die Füße der Boten...”

This means that Paul’s reading is very close to the meaning of the Septuagint. Because of the omission of the second ὡς, the word is directly connected with the feet of the messengers and therefore has to be set in the plural, which is not possible with the noun but requires an adjective. The difference therefore is less on the level of semantics but of grammar. The change may be made by Paul, but it may also be older. If the second ὡς was deleted because it has no counterpart in the Hebrew text, the change to the plural would have been necessary. In this case, the quotation Rom 10:15 would reflect

---

<sup>26</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993).

<sup>27</sup> Klaus Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (1999) (ThHK 6; Leipzig: EVA, 2012<sup>4</sup>).

a (mild) isomorphic revision of the Isaiah text. In view of the importance and the publicity of the book of Isaiah it is possible that such a revision was made earlier and/or probably spread out faster than with other prophetic books. If this is the case or if the change was simply made by Paul would need a wider investigation on the book of Isaiah.

## 2.7. Hab 1:5 in Acts 13:41

Hab 1:5 ראו בגוים מוהביתו והתמהו ותמהו כִּי־פֶעַל פֶּעַל בְּיַמֵּיכֶם לֹא תִצְמִינוּ בְּיַסְפָּר:

Ra and Gö: ἴδετε οἱ καταφρονηταί καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια καὶ ἀφανίσθητε διότι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται

Acts 13:41: Ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ θαυμάσατε, καὶ ἀφανίσθητε· ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, [ἔργον] ὃ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε, ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν.

Ra and Gö as also NA<sup>28</sup> present the main text tradition. There are some variants: In Ms 763 καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε is omitted which indeed may be an influence from Acts; in the Lucianic / Antiochene text but also in some other manuscripts there is καὶ ἴδετε before θαυμάσια which indeed may be an addition. In Acts the second ἔργον is missing in many manuscripts. Interestingly, the Recentiores read in the sense of *aspicite in gentibus*, which is clearly an adaptation to the Masoretic text, while other anonymous texts (mentioned by Jerome) with *calumniatores* and *declinantes* evidently render the Septuagint text.

The surprising οἱ καταφρονηταί, (you) despisers, can be explained as translation of בגוים as it is found in 1:13 and 2:5.<sup>28</sup> If it was read in defective spelling, the difference would even be smaller, only בגוים / בגדים. The explicitation of the addressees may also have caused the ὑμῖν at the end. There are two possibilities: Either the translators condensed the somewhat redundant text and added ὑμῖν. In this case, the traditional Septuagint text would reflect the adaption to the Hebrew (still with בגוים). Or the traditional Septuagint text is the original one and the author of Acts would have made the changes with about the same reasons as described. If one does not want to decide by some general rule, the case remains open.

## 2.8. Hab 2:4b in Rom 1:17, Gal 3:11b, and Hebr 10:38

---

<sup>28</sup> See the discussion in Harl et al., *Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie*, 249f., 275f., and Heinz-Josef Fabry, *Habakuk*, LXX.E II (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 2413-2428: 2419. Unfortunately, in 8HvXIIgr and IQpHab the words are missing; MurXII as usual agrees with MT; cf. Ego, *Minor Prophets*, 128f.

MT: :הַיָּשָׁרִים יִחְיֶה בְּאֵמוּנָא קִיָּמָא

Ra and Gō: ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται.

Rom 1:17; ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Gal 3:11b: ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Hebr 10:38: ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται

This is one of the most famous sentences of the Old Testament and also in the New Testament. However, already the Hebrew text is complicated and its meaning is much debated, as it was already in early Jewish exegesis,<sup>29</sup> not the least because also the Hebrew text offers some problems.<sup>30</sup> Unfortunately, the Qumran texts do not help much.<sup>31</sup> For our purpose we concentrate on the comparison with the Greek text. At first, one finds a difference between the Hebrew and the Greek. While MT says “And the just one will live by/through/because of his faith” the Greek text reads “But the just one will live out of/from my faith”. The light adversative δέ relates to some contrast between the two parts of the sentence and goes not much beyond the Hebrew ו. The difference is the personal pronoun and also the preposition: Is it the faith of the man who is just, or is it the faith of God, who makes the man just? The μου of the Greek text may be understood as *genetivus possessivus*: Gods faithfulness, or as *genetivus objectivus*: faithfulness or trust in God. A similar question can also be asked regarding the Hebrew text. The difference between the MT and the Septuagint version may already reflect some inner Jewish discussion. In any case, μου goes back to ו, instead of ו and it is difficult to decide which is the original reading. Most probably the difference is not created by the translator.

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Gerhard Bodendorfer, “Der Gerechte wird aus dem Glauben leben,” in *Bibel und Midrasch. Zur Bedeutung der rabbinischen Exegese für die Bibelwissenschaft* (ed. Gerhard Bodendorfer, Matthias Millard and Bernhard Kagerer; FAT 24, Tübingen: Mohr, 1998), 13-41.

<sup>30</sup> See the discussion in Wolfgang Kraus, “Hab 2:3-4 in the Hebrew Tradition and in the Septuagint, with its Reception in the New Testament,” in *Septuagint and Reception. Essays prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* (ed. Johann Cook; VTS 127, Leiden: Brill, 2009), 101 - 17; and Matthias Millard, “‘Der Gerechte wird aus Glauben leben’ (Röm 1,17): Hab 2,4b in seinen textlichen und inhaltlichen Varianten im Alten Testament und Qumran sowie bei Paulus, Rabbi Simlay und Martin Luther,” in *Textual history and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity = Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im Frühen Christentum* (ed. Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer; SBL.SCS 60, Atlanta, Ga.: SBL Press 2013), 237 - 257; and in practically all the larger commentaries on Habakuk and on Romans.

<sup>31</sup> Only 4QXII<sup>g</sup> possibly represents two words from Hab 2:4; cf. R. E. Fuller, *The Twelve*, DJD 15, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997); on the Greek text see: Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever*, 52f. 93. See also the presentation in Ego, *Minor Prophets*, 132f., and in BHQ. In 1QpHab the lemma is close to MT but incomplete. The explanation seems to presuppose a suffix in the third person (his faith) as in MT (cf. Ego, *Minor Prophets*, 133, and BHQ, 118\*).



The quotation in Rom 1:17 leaves out the pronoun.<sup>32</sup> It may have been dropped already before, but most probably, Paul omitted to generalize the meaning. In Gal 3:11 the δέ is left out because a contrast would not fit the sentence and the intended meaning. In Hebr 10:38 the δέ is still there, only the μου has changed its place.<sup>33</sup>

However, the interesting text is the Naḥal Ḥever scroll. It reads: ... εν αυτω και δι]ΚΑΙΟΣ ΕΝ ΠΙΣΤΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΖΗΣΕΤ[αι. There is no δέ for the Hebrew copula but και. This reading is confirmed by Aquila: ... ἐν αὐτῷ· καὶ δίκαιος ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ζήσεται, and even by Symmachus who reads: ὁ δίκαιος τῆ ἐαυτοῦ πίστει ζήσκει. Naḥal Ḥever, Aquila and Symmachus not only agree in regard of the preposition with the Masoretic text, but they also have no δέ, and Naḥal Ḥever and Aquila render ἵ exactly with και. As Paul in Rom 1:17 and Hebr in 10:38 both use δέ, they still use the Old Greek and not yet the kaige text.

## 2.9. Zech 12:10 in Rev 1:7 and John 19:37

Zech 12:10: :והביטו אלי תאִתְּשֶׁא־רַגְלֵךְ וְדַדְּךָ לְעַלְיֹנָה וְיִחַי דְּוָמְךָ לְיִי וְהִמְרָע־לְעַבְדֵיכֶם׃

Ra and Gö: ἐπιβλέπονται πρὸς με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο, και κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαπητὸν και ὀδυνηθήσονται ὀδύνην ὡς ἐπὶ πρωτοτόκῳ

Rev 1:7b: και ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς και οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, και κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς.

John 19:37: και πάλιν ἐτέρα γραφὴ λέγει· ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν

The book of Revelation is full of scripture references, however most of them are between quotation and allusion and many of them combine different texts. Also the quotation in Rev 1:7 is a mixed quotation (Mischzitat). Besides Dan 7:13 there are especially words from Zech 12:10-14. Rev 1:7b relates to Zech 12:10 and reads: και ὄψεται αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς και οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν, και κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. “and every eye will see Him, even those who pierced Him; and all the tribes of the earth will mourn over Him...” (NAS). On the other hand, a number of Septuagint manuscripts and the editions read in Zech 12:10: ἐπιβλέπονται πρὸς με ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο και κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαπητὸν και ὀδυνηθήσονται ὀδύνην ὡς ἐπὶ πρωτοτόκῳ. “and they shall look to me because they have danced triumphantly, and they shall mourn for him, with a mourning as for a loved one, and they shall be pained with pain as for a first born.”

<sup>32</sup> There is one manuscript (C\*, i.e. the original, uncorrected text of Codex C) with μου. This Plus most probably is a secondary influence from the Septuagint tradition. The “diagnostic” word for our question is the δέ.

<sup>33</sup> We again concentrate here on the δέ. There is some variation in word sequence of μου and ἐκ πίστεως. This is normally understood as influence from and adaptation towards the Pauline reading. See the discussion e.g. in Martin Karrer, *Der Brief an die Hebräer Kapitel 5,11-13,25* (ÖTK 20/2; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2008), 240f., fn. 5.

(NETS). Besides some details, the difference between *κατωρχήσαντο*, “they have danced” and *ἐξεκέντησαν*, “they have pierced” is the most striking also in comparison with the Hebrew text. The “have danced” certainly does not fit the context in Zech 12 and it is different from the known Hebrew texts. There have been different explanations like as a euphemism.<sup>34</sup> Such may have been the interpretation and justification of the reading as it was found. Maybe already the translator choose this specific word for dancing in order to make sense (in a similar sense as later on the church fathers did in their exegesis)<sup>35</sup> of the strange Hebrew *Vorlage*. But the difference is simply explained as a scribal mistake, i.e. a metathesis from *קדד*, to pierce, to *קדד*, to dance, as it is e.g. found in Qoh 3:4 “time to dance”. The reading *ἐξεκέντησαν* from *קדד*, they pierced, is found in all the Lucianic / Antiochene manuscripts and in some other manuscripts, in all the versions and also in the Recentiores (see the apparatus in Gö), i.e. it is very well attested. This reading is not only found in the Septuagint manuscripts, but also in Rev 1:7b and in John 19: 37, referring to Jesus’ death where he was pierced by the soldier.

The explanation as metathesis shows that both readings originated in the Hebrew tradition. There are two possibilities: Either the reading with “dancing” goes back to the original translator, and it was later on corrected (most probably not as a single correction but within a larger procedure, i.e. kaige-type revision), or the Old Greek had the correct text and the “wrong” reading came about by a revision towards the faulty Hebrew text. One may tend to the first explanation, but it is hard to decide. One may add that the Recentiores, esp. Aquila, certainly would not have taken over a new Christian reading, so well presenting a prophetic announcement of the death of Jesus. This means that the reading existed in the first century already. For our inquiry, the observations show that the quotations in John 19:37 and in Rev 1:7b are part of the textual history of the Septuagint and that they are the earliest witnesses to that reading.

## 2.10 Mal 1:2f in Rom 9:13

MT: *יִשְׂרָאֵל יִשְׁעֵי תַּעֲבֹר, בְּרַגְלֵי תַּעֲבֹר*

Ra and Gō: *καὶ ἠγάπησα τὸν Ἰακωβ, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα*

Rom 9:13: *τὸν Ἰακὼβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαῦ ἐμίσησα.*

<sup>34</sup> See the discussion in Marguerite Harl, Cécile Dogniez, Michel Casevitz, *Les Douze Prophètes. Aggée, Zacharie* (La Bible d’Alexandrie 23.10-11; Paris, Cerf, 2007) 159-162; see also *LXX.D* and *LXX.E II* ad loc.

<sup>35</sup> See Harl, Dogniez, Casevitz, *Aggée, Zacharie*, 159-161.

The text critical discussion in this case may be short: There is a difference in word sequence in the first part: While Ra and Gō read καὶ ἠγάπησα τὸν Ἰακωβ the quotation in Rom 9:13 reads: τὸν Ἰακωβ ἠγάπησα.

Is there any reason for this difference? Would Paul have inverted the sentence? There is hardly a reason. Jacob is not an important figure for Paul's argumentations (like e.g. Abraham).<sup>36</sup> He is mentioned only in Rom 9:13 and 11:26. The emphasis is as much on loving and hating as on Jacob and Esau. But this is hardly a reason to change the word order. However, in the other direction the change can be explained: The Septuagint text in Rahlfs and the Göttingen edition represent an adaptation to the Hebrew word order: Therefore the quotation in Rom 9:13 reflects the Old Greek and constitutes its oldest textual witness, while Rahlfs and the Göttingen edition opted for the revised text.

### 3. Conclusions

3.1 New Testament quotations may have influenced the transmission of the Septuagint text, but such an influence may not be taken as default assumption. In contrast, the evidence of the codices contradicts such an assumption: In many cases, the quotations are marked (e.g. by a diplé), but textual differences have not been levelled out.<sup>37</sup>

3.2. Readings in the Septuagint manuscripts may not be judged as secondary just because a New Testament reading agrees with them.

---

<sup>36</sup> In the Pauline letters, Jacob is mentioned only twice and only in Rom 9:13 and 11:26 in quotations. That these two passages became important later on is a matter of reception history; for this see Laurence Vianès, *Les Douze Prophètes. Malachie* (La Bible d'Alexandrie 23.12; Paris: Cerf, 2011) 70.

<sup>37</sup> See Martin Karrer, "Der Text der Septuaginta im frühen Christentum: Bericht über das Wuppertaler Forschungsprojekt," in *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity / Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im Frühen Christentum* (ed. Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer; SBL.SCS 60, Atlanta, Ga.: SBL Press, 2013), 21-59: "Die Leitfrage der Interdependenz zwischen Septuaginta- und neutestamentlicher Überlieferung ist im Wesentlichen geklärt: Sekundäreinflüsse von der Septuaginta aufs Neue Testament sind im Zitatbereich zwar gelegentlich vorhanden, haben aber nicht das in der älteren Forschung postulierte Gewicht. ... Die Hauptüberlieferung der Septuaginta und des Neuen Testaments erfolgte unter weniger Querbenutzungen als erwartet." (51f.; "Diese Beobachtung hat Folgen für die Textkritik. In den kritischen Ausgaben des Septuagintatextes sind einzelne Stellen neu zu prüfen, bei deren Rekonstruktion die Editoren Einflüsse des Neuen Testaments zu hoch werteten;" (52) "Nicht minder gewichtig sind die Folgen für die Textgeschichte. Die frühchristlichen Zitate, die häufig älter als die materiell vorhandene Überlieferung der Septuaginta sind, gewinnen Gewicht in der Textgeschichte der griechischen Schriften Israels." (52).

Although few, such cases can be found also in manuscripts from the passages investigated in this paper: see above, 2.7.: Hab 1:5 in Acts 13:41: "In Ms 763 καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε is omitted which indeed may be an influence from Acts. In the Lucianic / Antiochene text but also in some other manuscripts there is καὶ ἴδετε before θαυμάσια which indeed may be an addition". However, such cases are rather the rare exceptions from few or single manuscripts that confirm the basic observation.

3.3. Quotations of the Septuagint in the New Testament must be evaluated in each case without preliminary assumptions, according to text critical rules only.

3.4. The Greek text had spread out in two waves: First the Old Greek and second – beginning with the 1<sup>st</sup> cent. BCE – a text revised (in different degrees) towards the (protomasoretic) Hebrew text. This means that in New Testament times, both text forms existed and that the New Testament authors may have used either one of the text forms.

3.5. There is evidence that at least for the quotations from *Dodekapropheton* Paul used / had available an Old Greek text,<sup>38</sup> while later authors used revised text forms (see e.g. 2.7: Hab 2:4b in Rom 1:17, Gal 3:11b, and Hebr 10:38), i.e. the so-called kaige-text, or sometimes even already a text close to the later Aquila text (see 2.2.: Hos 11:1 in Matth 2:15).

3.6. New Testament quotations are not only part of the transmission history of the Septuagint, but also important – and in most cases the oldest – witnesses to the Septuagint text.

-----

---

<sup>38</sup> Also this insight may not be automatically generalized to other books. Different books of the Septuagint may have been revised at different times, and – maybe even more important – may have spread out at different speed. Cf. above, 2.6.: Nah 2:1 (with Is 52:7) in Rom 10:15, where it seems that Is 52:7 is quoted from a revised (semi-kaige?) text; which is explicable as the book of Isaiah was more used – and more often copied – than Dodekapropheton (cf. the number of scrolls in Qumran and the number of quotations in the New Testament). However, a quotation like from 3 Kgdms 19:18 in Rom 11:4 shows that, at least for this book, Paul also used an Old Greek manuscript; see Siegfried Kreuzer, “Translation – Revision – Tradition. Problems and Tasks in the Historical Books,” in idem, *The Bible in Greek. Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint* (SBL.SCS 63, Atlanta, Ga.: SBL Press, 2015), 78-93:85.