

# New Testament Quotations of the Septuagint within Patristic Literature

## A Study on Textual Criticism and Hermeneutics

The differences between the textual traditions of Septuagint texts and the transmission of those writings within the New Testament imply possibilities of correction from either the Old Testament text to the New Testament text or vice versa. Encompassing both manuscript traditions and patristic quotations, I will question the principles of existence and non-existence of cross influences. Does a relative homogeneity of manuscript tradition determine a relative homogeneity of text-forms in patristic literature? On the level of hermeneutics, furthermore, I will interpret a selection of statements from ancient Christian exegetes, which disclose the background of their exegesis and commentary.

### 1. Christian Disinterest Concerning this Issue

Ancient anti-Christian critiques were familiar with the problem of the differences between Septuagint text and New Testament quotations. Some rebuked the evangelists as forgers.<sup>1</sup> It goes without saying that ancient preconditions of external textual criticism differed from modern ones; nevertheless, ancient Christian exegetes were often reticent to discuss the issue.

Even in extensive commentaries, we rarely find any statement regarding this problem. Concerning the differences between Matt 26:31 and Zech 13:7 (see below), the Venerable Bede just writes, *Hoc aliis verbis in Zacharia propheta scriptum est.*<sup>2</sup> We can explain his reluctance by referring to ancient Christian hermeneutics, wherein theologians were able to integrate each of the textual variants into their system of belief. In the eyes of the patristic authors, the New Testament author grasped the meaning of the Old Text despite his altering the text-form.<sup>3</sup> We can compare Jerome's

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Jerome, *Ep.* 57.7.1–9.1, CSEL 54:512–18; id., *In Os.* 3:11.1, CCSL 76:121.

<sup>2</sup> The Venerable Bede, *In Matt.*, PL 92:114ab.

<sup>3</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Is.* 41, GCS 57, 330; Jerome, *In Matt.*, SC 259:276; id., *In Am.*, CCSL 76:297; id., *In Ab.* 1:2.4, CCSL 76 A, 600; id., *In Is.* 9:29.13, CCSL 73:375; The Venerable Bede, *Retract. in Act.*, CCSL 121:121–122.

concept of translation as “sense for sense and not word for word”,<sup>4</sup> justifying his view by referring to Rom 14:5 and 1Cor 7:7.<sup>5</sup> If we compare the Scholia on Homer, we sometimes observe different readings standing side-by-side without any comment but also discussions concerning the correct text. Neither Homer’s poems nor their commentators (Zenodot of Ephesus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, Aristarch of Samothrace) were sacrosanct.

As mentioned above, pre-conditions of external textual criticism in the ancient period differed from modern ones. Of course, the translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion were well known among ancient exegetes, but they did not own any technical system of fabricated designations for anonymous codices. Authors who were familiar with problems of textual criticism, like Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome, were able to refer to textual tradition only in a general way. We seldom find remarks concerning the relative multitude of manuscripts offering a distinct text form; our perception of the dispersal of distinct readings was not achievable for them. It is therefore hardly astonishing that Jerome sometimes marks variants as Old Testament text-forms that which we know as New Testament readings,<sup>6</sup> whereas other authors include Old Testament readings in their rendering of the New Testament text.<sup>7</sup> Origen’s concept of textual criticism is one of external criticism oriented to the criterion of concordance with the text-form of the other translations and with the Hebrew text.<sup>8</sup> With regard to internal textual criticism, we can compare Jerome’s work

---

<sup>4</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 57.5.2, CSEL 54:508. His concession “in ... the holy scriptures ... even the order of the words is a mystery” (*ibid.*) does not have real consequences in Jerome’s exegesis. He later dissociates himself from this concession (*Ep.* 106.55, CSEL 55:275).

<sup>5</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 119.11, CSEL 55:468; *Ep.* 125.8, CSEL 56:126–27.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Jerome, *In Os* 1:2.23, on Hos 2:25 [23]: *diligam non dilectam* (cf. B-V 407 CoAethp Cyrp); *id.*, *In Is.* 8:27.9, CCSL 73:349 (*peccatum eius* instead of *eius peccatum*; transposition based on Rom 11:27 τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν instead of αὐτοῦ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν [Isa 27:9<sup>LXX</sup>]; cf. the hexaplaric sub-group ol and 377<sup>mss</sup>). The mss. 393 and 534 offer a text-form of Isa 6:9 with the plus πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον (Acts 28:26) after πορεύθητι. Jerome knows this reading as Septuagint reading (*In Is.* 3:6.9, CCSL 73:91, in the Lemma) without dealing with alternatives. In Isa 59:20, some mss. (22c-93 564\* 407 534) offer ἐκ instead of ἔνεκεν, which is in accordance with Rom 11:26. But also Jerome, *In Is.* 16:59.20, CCSL 73 A:689, quotes this text-form. In his comment on Jer 5:21, Jerome does not refer to Mark 8:18. The Lemma of his commentary offers a reading, which comes close to Mark 8:18 with regard to the 2. Pl. and the usage of participle: *qui habentes oculos non uidetis et aures et non auditis* (Jerome, *In Ier.* 2.2, CCSL 74:59).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Ps.*, PG 23:740cd, on Ps 68:10 and Joh 2:17. The same is true for the reception of Ps 50:6 in Rom 3:4. Origen, *In Rom.* 2.14, FC 3/1:316, 328; Theodoret, *In Rom.*, PG 82:77b offer νικήσης instead of νικήσεις in the lemma. The reading is witnessed also in many New Testament manuscripts (B G L Ψ 365 1175 1505 1739 etc.).

<sup>8</sup> NEUSCHÄFER, *Origenes*, 98.

with modern textual criticism to some extent,<sup>9</sup> though we should bear in mind the difference in aims between ancient and modern textual criticism. Ancient philologists on Homer or the Bible intended to constitute the best text,<sup>10</sup> not the eldest.<sup>11</sup>

There are three reasons for discussing distinct readings: 1. Theological issues are touched upon; 2. Anti-Christian critiques criticize the Bible; 3. Theologians sought to corroborate Christian identity by actual anti-Jewish polemics. In these cases, Christian authors did not refer to the unconscious changes. Jerome's comment on Hab 2:4 is an exception,<sup>12</sup> but demonstrates that ancient Christian exegetes were philological scholars<sup>13</sup> working within the restrictions caused by the sanctity of the authoritative texts. Furthermore, we should bear in mind the concept of reality, which encompasses also those issues which nowadays belong to the category of human designation in Western thought, e.g., the substantiality of Jesus's divine nature or his birth by a virgin. Any argument for a Christological reading of Isa 7:14 or Hos 11:1 presupposes and corroborates this concept of reality.

## 2. The Background of New Testament Authors in Ancient Christian View

Especially with regard to Jerome, we must bear in mind the ancient Christian notion of the background of the New Testament authors. Due to the biblical preconditions, the Jewish origin of Matthew, Paul and John was a matter of fact. Beyond the biblical preconditions, ancient exegetes corroborate the Jewish background of many New Testament writings.<sup>14</sup> Mark, the

<sup>9</sup> Cf. my study "Jerome as Textual Critic" (in this volume pp. 362–378).

<sup>10</sup> That is true also for the characterization ἀκριβεῖς ἀντίγραφοι in Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Ps.*, PG 23:901d, on Ps 78:2. In this way, Eusebius characterizes manuscripts, which, by offering διὰ τοῦ προφήτου, avoid the well-known wrong attribution in Matt 13:35 v.l. to Isaiah.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. BENGEL, *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 384: *ea (lectio), quae quiddam priscum, grave, breve habet, praepositur: ea quae maiore perspicuitate et plenitudine blanditur, tanquam consilio introducta, plerumque postponitur.*

<sup>12</sup> Jerome, *In Ab.* 1:2.4, CCSL 76 A:597, refers to the confusion of ו and ו as reasoning the distinct variants of Hab 2:4.

<sup>13</sup> They also dealt with topics, which are not theological in the narrow sense, cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, *Onomasticon*; The Venerable Bede, *Nomina regionum atque locorum de Actibus Apostolorum*; Julius Africanus, *Chronographiae*; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Chronica*; Jerome, *Liber Hebraicarum Quaestionum*; Hadrian, *Introductio*; Ps.-Eucherius of Lyons, *De situ Hierosolymitanae Urbis*; Theodosius, *de situ terrae sanctae.*

<sup>14</sup> Matthew originally wrote his Gospel in Hebrew (Papias, in Eusebius of Caesarea, *H.e.* 3:39.15, GCS 9/1:292; Jerome, *In Os.* 3:11.1, CCSL 76:121).

pupil of Peter (cf. 1Petr 5:13)<sup>15</sup>, is mostly identified with John Mark (Acts 12:12)<sup>16</sup>, sometimes reckoned among to the priests<sup>17</sup> who became believers according to Acts 6:7b<sup>18</sup>, sometimes, like Luke, among to the seventy disciples mentioned in Luke 10:1.<sup>19</sup> In any case, his Jewish origin was undisputed. Luke, on the other side, was more familiar with Greek than with Hebrew.<sup>20</sup>

Within Jerome's work, we have to distinguish two traces of argumentation standing side-by-side beyond these matters: 1. The New Testament writers did not follow the Hebrew source text or the Septuagint but rendered the meaning of the biblical sentences by their own words because they were "Hebrews of Hebrews", educated in the Law;<sup>21</sup> 2. They rendered the Hebrew text, not the Septuagint.<sup>22</sup> Some Old Testament quotations within the gospels of Matthew and John are proofs for this thesis. Jerome is not aware of obverse facts,<sup>23</sup> and none of his adversaries dared to refute his one-sided thesis.<sup>24</sup> It is well-known that Jerome's negative evaluation of the Septuagint increased during his lifetime.<sup>25</sup>

In the next section, I will deal with the most important differences between the Septuagint texts and the New Testament quotations.

### 3. Differences between the Septuagint Texts and New Testament Quotations

In the following, I will present the different text-forms of any patristic quotations which are identifiable as Old Testament or New Testament texts, and then patristic statements on exegesis and hermeneutics. I will

---

<sup>15</sup> Ps.-Oecumenius of Tricca, *In 2Petr.* 8, PG 119:576c, knows and abhors the thesis that Mark would be Peter's fleshly son.

<sup>16</sup> According to Ammonius of Alexandria, the identification of the evangelist Mark with John Mark named in Acts 12:12 is a matter of high probability but he does not explicitly state it as undeniable (Ammonius of Alexandria, *Frgm Act.*, PG 85:1540c).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. the monarchian prologues to the gospel: *sacerdotium in Israhel agens secundum carnem Levita* (*Die Monarchianischen Evangelienprologe*, ed. Lietzmann, 15). Hippolytus of Rome, *Ref.* 7:30.1, GCS 26:215, knows the legend of Mark with the stumbling fingers: He has damaged himself in order to avoid his ordination to priesthood.

<sup>18</sup> The Venerable Bede, *Mc.*, prol., CCSL 120:432.

<sup>19</sup> Theophylact, *In Matt.*, PG 123:145c.

<sup>20</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 3:6.9, CCSL 73:91f.

<sup>21</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 3:6.9, CCSL 73:91f.

<sup>22</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 9:29.13, CCSL 73:375; id., *In Ier.* 6:18.2, CCSL 74:306f.

<sup>23</sup> Jerome does not realize that Paul in Rom 10:20 follows the Septuagint of Isa 65:1, not the Masoretic text (Jerome, *In Is.* 18:65.1, CCSL 73 A:743).

<sup>24</sup> Cf. MARKSCHIES, "Hieronymus und die 'Hebraica Veritas'," 145.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, "Hieronymus – Gottes Wort," 746–758.

begin with Isa 7:14. The other examples are ordered along the ordering within the Septuagint.

### 3.1. Isa 7:14/Matt 1:23

The famous difference between *παρθένος* (LXX) and *νεᾶνις* (Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus) does not offer problems with regard to textual history. Since the days of Justin Martyr, Isa 7:14 is most likely to raise statements on the Septuagint and its differences to the Masoretic text within Christian literature, with or without explicit anti-Jewish polemics.<sup>26</sup> With regard to the topic of Jesus's virgin birth, we observe a fourfold strategy of Christian apologetics: 1. With regard to textual history, Christian authors claim the inspiration of the Septuagint<sup>27</sup> and allege that the translation *νεᾶνις* is motivated by anti-Christian polemics.<sup>28</sup> 2. With regard to "real history", Christian authors declare the young woman's interpretation on the wife of Ahaz and the child Hezekiah to be wrong.<sup>29</sup> 3. Philologically, they claim that *νεᾶνις* designates a woman according to her age and does not exclude her virginity in any way.<sup>30</sup> 4. The argument that logically only the birth from a virgin should be evaluated as a sign<sup>31</sup> rather than a birth by any young woman. But this symbolic character of the events suggested in Isa 7:14 may also be regarded as sufficient by the ancient Christian authors as a contradiction against a verdict of Emperor Julian the Apostate, who had formulated: "The married woman was no longer a virgin, and before

---

<sup>26</sup> Ephraem, *Comm. in Diatess.* 2.8, FC 54/1:165 thinks that the Jews killed Isaiah because of the prophecy of Isaiah 7:14 (On the motive of the killing of Isaiah, cf. Heb 11:37).

<sup>27</sup> Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:21.2, FC 8/3:256.

<sup>28</sup> Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:21.1, FC 8/3:252–54; Theophylact, *In Matt.*, PG 123:160a; similarly Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Matt.*, PG 129:132c–33a.

<sup>29</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 77.3f., Bobichon I 396, similarly Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 9.1–16, FC 75:232–242; Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 7:1.40–50, GCS 23:305–307. There is no contemporary of Ahas to which the prophecy fits (Origen, *Cels* 1:25, GCS 2:86f.). Cyril of Alexandria, *In Is.*, PG 70:204c–205a, offers a twofold argumentation: 1. Nowhere in the Bible, Hezekiah is called Emanuel; 2. Human beings are able to distinguish between good and bad only when they become elder.

<sup>30</sup> Similarly, *ἀδελφός* does not only refer to the biological brother (Jerome, *Virg. Mar.* 14, PL 23:183–206. Both Mary (Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 8.2, GCS 29/1:395) and the virgin Eve in Paradise are called *mulier* (cf. MEISER, *Galater*, 181).

<sup>31</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 84.1, Bobichon I 414; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:19.3; 3.21.6, FC 8/3:242, 266; Origen, *Cels.* 1:35, SC 132:172; Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 9,7–8, FC 75:234–36; Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 7:1.30, GCS 23:303; Ambrose, *Luc.* II 78, CCSL 14, 65; John Chrysostom, *In Is.* 7.5 (sic!), SC 304:314; Theodoret, *In Is.*, SC 276:288–290; Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Matt.*, PG 129:133a.

she could give birth she was locked up with the man who had married her.”<sup>32</sup>

But Isa 7:14 deserves our attention not merely because of this known problem. We can observe a divergence of text-forms also concerning *ἔξει* and *καλέσεις* in both Septuagint manuscripts and patristic quotations.

Aquila and Symmachus offer *συλλαμβάνει* instead of *ἔξει*.<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, *λήψεται* (originating in Luke 1:31 *συλλήμψη*)<sup>34</sup> is witnessed in Septuagint manuscripts<sup>35</sup> as well as in patristic quotations.<sup>36</sup> Irenaeus and Tertullian offer this variant throughout their works.<sup>37</sup> Justin’s example shows how the readings here can become unimportant in the consciousness of Christian authors: He casually cites *λήψεται* as a translation favored by Jews,<sup>38</sup> although he himself repeatedly presupposes this reading.<sup>39</sup> Justin offers *ἔχειν* only in two places in the first Apology. This variant gradually became more widespread from the middle of the third century onwards.<sup>40</sup> But still Jerome presupposes *λήψεται* as the normal reading of the Isaiah text. He justifies Matthew’s reading *ἔξει* with the idea that the prophet writes about the future, the evangelist about the past: The conception is already in the past at the time of the angel’s testimony.<sup>41</sup>

The range of variations for the verb form, which concerns the naming of the child, is even greater. Many manuscripts of Isa 7:14 offer *καλέσεις*, though Matt 1:23 reads *καλέσουσιν*. The singular from Isa 7:14 has occasionally flowed into the reproduction of Matt 1:23.<sup>42</sup> However, corrections have been made much more frequently in the opposite direction, in Septu-

<sup>32</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *Juln* 8:16, GCS NF 21:551.

<sup>33</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 7:1.32f., GCS 23:304.

<sup>34</sup> The editors of <sup>28</sup>Nestle-Aland do not offer any variants.

<sup>35</sup> O’ L’-311-46-233-456 C’’ 301 393 403’ 449 538.

<sup>36</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 43.5, Bobichon I 290 etc. (see below); Cyprian, *Test.* 2:9, CCSL 3:41; id., *Ep.* 10.4.2, CCSL 3 B:51; (Ps.?)-Hippolyt, *Pasc.* 46, SC 27:171; Novatian, *Trin.* 9.6; 12.3, CCSL 4:25, 31; Lactantius, *Inst.* IV 12,4; *Epit.* 39,3, CSEL 19:310. 715; Origen, *Hom. Is.* 2.1, GCS 33:249–250; id., *Hom. Ez.* 1,4, GCS 33:328; id., *Cels.* 1:33, SC 132:166; id., *Comm. in Matt.* ser. 6, GCS 38:11; Pamphilus, *Apol. Orig.* 84, SC 464:152; Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 7:1.27, 30, 32, GCS 23:303f.; Ps.-Basilius, *In Is.* 201, PG 30:464a; Ps.-Basilius, *Hom. in sanctam Christi generationem* 3.4, PG 31:1464c; 1465d; Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui spatio*, GNO 9:276; John Chrysostom, *In Is.* 7.4 (sic!), SC 304:308; Pacianus of Barcelona, *Bapt.* 3.1, SC 410:152; Theodoret, *In Is.*, SC 276:286. Hippolyt, *Ref.* 5.8.45, GCS 26:97, offers the variant *ἡ παρθένος ἡ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα καὶ συλλαμβάνουσα καὶ τρίτουσα υἱόν*.

<sup>37</sup> Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:16.2; 21.4, FC 8/3:188 (quotation of Matthew), 262.

<sup>38</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 43.8, Bobichon I, 292.

<sup>39</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 43.5; 66.2; 68.6; 71.3; 84.1, Bobichon I, 290, 362, 370, 380, 414.

<sup>40</sup> Justin, *I.Apol.* 33.1, 4, PTS 38:80//SC 507: 216, 218//OECT:172//FC 91:126.

<sup>41</sup> Jerome, *In Matt.*, SC 242:80.

<sup>42</sup> D *pc* bo<sup>mss</sup>; Origen, *Hom. Is.* 2.1, GCS 33:250; Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 7:1.55, GCS 23:308.

agint manuscripts<sup>43</sup> as in many patristic quotations,<sup>44</sup> sometimes even in the commentaries.<sup>45</sup> There is also the reading *καλέσετε* in Septuagint manuscripts<sup>46</sup> as in ancient Christian literature,<sup>47</sup> as well as the reading *καλέσει*.<sup>48</sup> Jerome explains the genesis of this reading as follows: תתקן was understood as 3. Sg. fem., not as 2. Sg. masc.<sup>49</sup> Origen gives an indication of how it came to the plural reading *καλέσουσιν*: Ahaz could hardly have called the Savior who appeared many generations after him Emmanuel. But he intends to also justify the singular in Isa 7:14: Due to the equation of David with Jesus Christ, the “house of David” names the church.<sup>50</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea offers another solution: His starting point is that Joseph shall call the child “Jesus”, not “Immanuel”. The addressed “House of David” is therefore not to trust foreign gods, but only to describe as Immanuel the one who comes to his aid in the military tribulations of his time, and who will be born of the Virgin, but already now assists as “God with us”. After this very sophisticated exegesis, Eusebius continues with a very sober explanation: He suggests a corruption of text in Matt 1:23, caused by scribes who did not recognize the meaning of the singular.<sup>51</sup> He quotes *καλέσεις* as a rendering of Matt 1:23.<sup>52</sup> This objection by Eusebius had no consequences. Jerome explains the difference between *καλέσεις* and *καλέσουσιν* again with his standard theorem of analogous, not literal, reproduction.<sup>53</sup>

<sup>43</sup> 26-106, 90<sup>mg</sup>, 130 233 393 410<sup>c</sup> 449<sup>v</sup> 456 534 764<sup>c</sup> Bo sy<sup>p</sup>.

<sup>44</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 66.2, Bobichon I 362 (but cf. id. *Dial.* 43.5, Bobichon I 290); Cyprian, *Test.* 2:9, CCL 3:41; id., *Ep.* 10,4,2, CCL 3 B:51; (Ps.?)-Hippolyt, *Pasc.* 46, SC 27:171; Origen, *Hom. Ier.* 1.7, GCS 6:6; id., *Comm. Matt.* ser. 6, GCS 38:11; Epiphanius, *Anc.* 32.10; 116.2, GCS 25:42, 143; GCS 31:320; Ps.-Basilus, *Hom. in sanctam Christi generationem* 4, PG 31:1465b; Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui spatio*, GNO 9:276; John Chrysostom, *In Is.*, PG 56:82; id., *Anom.* 7, SC 396:152; Cyril of Alexandria, *Juln.* 8:42, GCS NF 21:589 (but cf. id. *In Is.* I 5, PG 70:204a [within the lemma]; 205 C [in the commentary]); Cyril of Alexandria, *Inc. unigen.*, SC 97:208; John of Damascus, *Hom.* 6.4, SC 80:54.

<sup>45</sup> Ps.-Basilus, *In Is.* 215, 226, PG 30:489c; 512c; John Chrysostom, *In Is.* 7.4 (sic!), SC 304:308.

<sup>46</sup> Q<sup>txt</sup> L<sup>v</sup> cII 301 403 538 Sa.

<sup>47</sup> Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3.21.4, FC 8/3:262; Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 9,1, CCL 2:1364; Lactantius, *Inst.* 4: 12.4; *Epit.* 39.3, CSEL 19:310, 715.

<sup>48</sup> S 311-46. In Matt 1:23, the codex Sinaiticus offers *καλέσουσιν*. The similar is true for codex Vaticanus, which in Isa 7:14 reads *καλέσεις*, in Matt 1:23 reads *καλέσουσιν*; cf. KARRER and SCHMID, “Old Testament Quotations,” 162.

<sup>49</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 3:7.14, CCL 73:104. The rendering *carathi* is curious.

<sup>50</sup> Origen, *Hom. Is.* 2.1, GCS 33:250.

<sup>51</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Is.* 44, GCS 57:48f.

<sup>52</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 6:1.55, GCS 23:308.

<sup>53</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 3:7.14, CCL 73:104.

3.2. *Ps 13:3/Rom 3:13–18*

Some manuscripts of Ps 13:3<sup>54</sup> offer a text-form which seems to be influenced by Rom 3:13–18, perhaps due to the quotation of Ps 13:3 (πάντες ἐξέκλιναν ἅμα ἠχρεώθησαν· οὐκ ἔστιν [ὁ<sup>55</sup>] ποιῶν χρηστότητα) in Rom 3:12. Jerome and The Venerable Bede criticize this variant: the scribes who added Rom 3:13–18 did not recognize the character of the quotation within Romans 3 as a mixed quotation.<sup>56</sup> In modern research, Alfred Rahlfs suggested a Christian interpolation.<sup>57</sup> Yet it is also possible to argue the opposite, that the addition proves that New Testament quotations are influenced by distinct text-forms of the Old Testament pre-texts.<sup>58</sup>

3.3. *Hos 11:1/Matt 2:15*

Hos 11:1 <sup>MT</sup>	ממצרים קראתי לבני
Hos 11:1 <sup>LXX</sup>	ἐξ Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ
Matt 2:15	ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου = Hos 11:1 <sup>Aq</sup> . <sup>59</sup>

The difference in the text of this passage lies in the final turn. Only the singular reading of the passage makes the Christological interpretation possible. Julian the Apostate criticized Matthew, alleging that he intended to mock the credulity of the gentile Christians.<sup>60</sup> The variant *filium meum* first penetrates the Coptic, Ethiopian and partly Armenian translations, but not the Greek manuscript tradition.

Justin, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian do not quote Hos 11:1. Origen does not discuss the variants but discusses the assumption of some others that Matt 2:15 is taken from Nbs. 24:8 (θεὸς ὠδήγησεν αὐτὸν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου). In this way, the singular could be explained.<sup>61</sup> I have not found the addition to Matt 2:15 in any ancient text-critical debates. In his comment on Hos 11:1, Theodoret does not give any remark regarding this

<sup>54</sup> B<sup>19</sup>-2019 U<sup>19</sup>-1221.

<sup>55</sup> Some manuscripts of the Psalm offer the article (S-2019 U-1221), some manuscripts of Rom 3:12 omit it (A B G Ψ, 33. 1739. 1881).

<sup>56</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 16. prol., CCSL 73 A:641–642; The Venerable Bede, *Expos. Act.*, CCSL 121:13. For the Venerable Bede, there is a parallel case in the incorrect treatment of a combination of quotations by an inexperienced scribe of Ps 108:8, who erroneously entered the words from Ps 68[69]:26 due to Acts 1:20. This is the case in ms. Paris. Bibl. Nat., Lat. 11947.

<sup>57</sup> RAHLFS, *Psalmi cum Odis*, 31, considers this addition secondarily omitted in the so-called Antiochene text and in the Codex Alexandrinus (cf. KOCH, *Schrift*, 56).

<sup>58</sup> Cf. KARRER/SIGISMUND/SCHMID, “Beobachtungen,” 143–156.

<sup>59</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 9:4.1, GCS 23:412; *Ecl. Proph.* 1.13, PG 22:1069d.

<sup>60</sup> Jerome, *In Os.*, CCSL 76:121.

<sup>61</sup> Origen, *Hom. Num.* 17.6, GCS 30:165.



problem. We can only deny any influence of Matt 2:15.<sup>62</sup> The same is true for the commentaries on the Twelve written by Cyril of Alexandria and Theodor of Mopsuestia.<sup>63</sup> Neither of them speaks of Matt 2:15. At least here, it is true that if only the Hebrew text offers the possibility of a Christological interpretation, but it is no longer known to the Christian authors, they renounce such an interpretation. Whether this observation can be generalized remains to be seen.<sup>64</sup>

Some authors, however, explicitly mention the text difference. Jerome refers to Matthew's origins in the Hebrew-speaking tradition. Matt 2:15 becomes a main argument for him for the thesis developed in his late years that the evangelists and apostles basically followed the Hebrew text. Eusebius of Caesarea does not perceive the character of the flashback. He refers to tensions within the text of Hosea: After the statements in Hos 10:14, it is illogical that the same people should be blamed in Hos 10:14 and the words of praise should follow. "Israel" therefore stands for Christ.<sup>65</sup> According to Eusebius, Aquila's rendering (Ἐν ὄρθρω κατεσιωπήθη βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι παῖς Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἠγάπησα αὐτόν, καὶ ἀπὸ Αἰγύπτου ἐκάλεσα τὸν υἱόν μου) has in mind that King Herod did not succeed in getting hold of the person of Jesus thanks to the wise men.<sup>66</sup> On the basis of the tension between Hos 11:1 and Hos 11:2 (reference to the veneration of Baal), Theophylact of Achrida rebukes the Jewish exegesis of Hos 11:1 which refers that verse to Israel's Exodus.<sup>67</sup>

### 3.4. Amos 5:25–27/Acts 7:42f.

The first of the three text differences is best presented in tabular form.

ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ = I  
οἶκος Ἰσραήλ = II  
τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη = III

<sup>62</sup> Theodoret of Cyrus, *In Os.* PG 81:1612a: αὐτοὺς Αἰγύπτου μετεκάλεσα; similarly Theophylact, *In Os.*, PG 126:758a.

<sup>63</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *In Os.*, PG 71:261d–64c; Theodor of Mopsuestia, *In Os.*, PG 66:189b–d.

<sup>64</sup> Similarly, in some commentaries on Isaiah, which are oriented exclusively to the Septuagint, we do not find references to 1Cor 14:21 in the exegesis of Isa 28:11. Perhaps it is also decisive in this case that there is no special theological interest in these verses.

<sup>65</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 9:4.6–8, GCS 23:412f.; similarly id., *Ecl. proph.* 3.11, PG 22:1337bc. Also Theophylact, *In Os.*, PG 126:758b, suggests the equation of "Israel" and "Christ".

<sup>66</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. proph.*, 3.11, PG 22:1136d–1137a.

<sup>67</sup> Theophylact, *In Matt.*, PG 123:168d–169a; similarly Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Matt.*, PG 129:152a. In an anonymous margin gloss, the rebuke of anti-Christian changing of text occurs also here (PG 129:1152b).

text-form	order of elements	Septuagint manuscripts (according to Ziegler)	Patristic quotations
Am 5:25–27			
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη	I – II – III	A	Epiphanius <sup>pt</sup> : II – III
οἶκος Ἰσραήλ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ	II – III – I	C-68 233 <sup>s</sup> Sy <sup>h</sup>	III. var. – I: John Chrysostom III – I: John Chrysostom
ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη οἶκος Ἰσραήλ	I – III – II	MT, B V – 239 – Q-26 <sup>s</sup> -49 <sup>s</sup> 198-407	Jerome
τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη οἶκος Ἰσραήλ	III – II	Gö	
Acts 7:42			
ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ οἶκος Ἰσραήλ	III (var.) – I – II		III invar. – I – II: Theodor of Mopsuestia; III var. – I – II Anastasius Sinaita
	III – II – I		Epiphanius <sup>pt</sup> Cyril of Alexandria

The divergence of the order of these individual phrases in the Septuagint tradition continues without interruption in the history of the reception of the passage in ancient Christian literature. Acts provides the order of elements I and II and converts the words within element III.<sup>68</sup> There is no evidence of this change in the Septuagint manuscripts. In Justin's quotation of Amos 5:25–27, the order of elements I and II corresponds to LXX<sup>A</sup> and Acts. Epiphanius of Salamis offers the text-forms *προσηνέγκατέ μοι, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη*<sup>69</sup> and *μη ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα θυσίαν προσηνέγκατέ μοι, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ* side-by-side.<sup>70</sup> Due to the closeness to the Hebrew text, Jerome quotes the variant offered by the Codex Vaticanus and others.<sup>71</sup> In his homilies on Acts, John Chrysostom reads *σφαγὰς καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατε, ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*.<sup>72</sup> Within the Lemma

<sup>68</sup> STOWASSER, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11f.," 56, considers a re-arranging already in the *Vorlage*.

<sup>69</sup> Epiphanius of Salamis, *Haer.* 66.71.2, GCS 37:112.

<sup>70</sup> Epiphanius of Salamis, *Haer.* 42.12.3 refut. 18, GCS 31:167.

<sup>71</sup> Jerome, *In Am.*, CCSL 76:296.

<sup>72</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Ac.*, PG 60:137.

of the commentary on Amos written by Cyril of Alexandria, we find another variant: τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη προσηγάκατέ μοι, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.<sup>73</sup> Theodoret shortens the passage (τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον).<sup>74</sup> Theodor of Mopsuestia omits μοι and adds οἶκος Ἰσραήλ – in this way, the order is in accordance with Acts 7:43. The word order τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη remains unchanged. Anastasius Sinaita offers the word order of Acts 7:43, including the conversion of ἔτη and τεσσαράκοντα.<sup>75</sup>

The other two text-critical differences are more important. The first is that in comparison to Amos 5:26, Acts 7:43 adds the rebuke of “worship” (προσκυνεῖν). The second is that according to Acts 7:43, the place of exile is Babylon, while according to Amos 5:27 (similarly CD VII 15.19), the place of exile is Damascus.

The additional rebuke of worship is first witnessed in John Chrysostom and in the disputatio *adversus Iudaeos* written by Anastasius Sinaita<sup>76</sup> but not in the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint text.

The reading “Babylon” is also very rarely verifiable in the manuscript tradition of Amos 5:27 and in some commentaries on Acts.<sup>77</sup> In his commentary on Amos, Cyril is content with the information, which cannot be verified from today’s point of view, that Stephen followed the Hebrew, not the Greek tradition. In his commentary on Acts, he associates the neighborhood of the Moabites with Damascus. After the addressees of Stephen’s speech had fulfilled the wickedness of the Moabites, they would be told that they would be banished even further away, not only to Damascus, but to Babylon. According to Theodoret, the Prophet wants to scare his listeners at the furthest possible distance; by “Damascus,” he actually means Assyria. Stephen extends the interpretation to its logical conclusion.<sup>78</sup> Similarly, Ps.-Oecumenius understands Babylon the designate the outermost end of the Syria-Damascus region.<sup>79</sup> Anti-Jewish polemics still remain here at the level of describing the Prophet’s presence. The same applies even to Jerome, who likes to derive anti-Jewish polemics from divergent texts

<sup>73</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *In Am.*, PG 71:508d.

<sup>74</sup> Theodoret, *In Am.*, PG 81:1692d.

<sup>75</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Ac.*, PG 60:137; (Ps.?)–Theodor of Mopsuestia, *in Am.*, PG 66:280a; Anastasius Sinaita, *Disputatio adversus Iudaeos*, PG 89:1249a.

<sup>76</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Ac.*, PG 60:137; Anastasius Sinaita, *disputatio adversus Iudaeos*, PG 89:1249a; cf. Anonymi Auctoris *Theognosiae dissertatio contra Iudaeos* II, CCSG 14:23.

<sup>77</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. Ac.*, PG 60:137, is an exception. Some other commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles are only fragmentarily preserved and offer nothing with regard to this problem, e.g. Didymus, Theodor of Mopsuestia, Ammonius of Alexandria.

<sup>78</sup> Theodoret, *In Am.*, PG 81:1693a; similarly (Ps.?)–Theodor of Mopsuestia, *In Am.*, PG 66:280c: Stephen expressed *σάφέςτερον* what in Amos 5:27 were *μηνούμενοι τόποι*.

<sup>79</sup> Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:148c.

elsewhere<sup>80</sup> and suspects the translators of wanting to obscure the mystery of Christ.<sup>81</sup> One should by no means believe that Stephen was mistaken. The subsequent martyr justifies his interpretation by the fact that, according to the Prophet, the people of Israel always longed for the flesh pots of Babylon and despised the manna given from heaven.<sup>82</sup> According to Julian of Aeclanum, Stephen combined diverse by similar periods in his rebuke, following common biblical usage.<sup>83</sup> Beda extends this anti-Jewish attack to the present day: *Propter haec, inquit, sacrilegia uos non in Babylonem tantummodo sed ultra Babyloniam quoque captiui duceimini*. Like many other authors, he sees the situation of the Jewish people after 70 CE as God's punishment.<sup>84</sup>

### 3.5. Mic 5:1/Matt 2:6

Mic 5:1<sup>LXX</sup>    και σύ Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθά, ὀλιγοστός εἶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐν χιλιάσιν Ἰουδα ἐκ σοῦ μοι ἐξελεύσεται τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα ἐν τῷ Ἰσραηλ

Matt 2:6        και σύ Βηθλεεμ, γῆ Ἰούδα, οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη εἶ ἐν τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν Ἰούδα ἐκ σοῦ γὰρ ἐξεεύσεται ἡωούμενος, ὅστις ποιμαίνει τὸν λαόν μου τὸν Ἰσραηλ

Both text forms differ as follows: Matt 2:6 reads γῆ Ἰούδα instead of οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθα; Matt 2:6 adds the negation, witnessed sometimes also in Septuagint manuscripts,<sup>85</sup> further ἐλαχίστη instead of ὀλιγοστός and ἡγούμενος instead of τοῦ εἶναι εἰς ἄρχοντα. The pronoun μοι (Mic 5:1) is omitted in Matt 2:6; on the other hand, the term λαός is introduced.

---

<sup>80</sup> Isa 52:5<sup>LXX</sup> reads: δι' ὑμᾶς διὰ παντὸς τὸν ὄνομά μου βλασφημεῖται ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. In the MT, the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν has no analogy. Jerome comments the MT as follows: The name of God is blasphemed *in synagogis uestris, qui diebus ac noctibus blasphemant Salvatore, et sub nomine, ut saepe dixi, Nazarenorum, ter in die in Christianos congerunt maledicta* (Jerome, *In Is.* 14:52.5, CCSL 73 A:578). Jerome can also accuse the post-Christian transcribers of Hebrew codices, where only the Septuagint, but not the Masoretic text, makes the sense, which is necessary for the New Testament author (Jerome, *in Gal*, CCSL 77 A:83f. 92).

<sup>81</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 57.7.8, CSEL 54:515–516; *Ep.* 121.2.6, CSEL 56/1:9. The judgement in *Ep.* 106.7.7, CSEL 54:515 is milder: one should not blame the translators when they have obscured the mystery of Christ but consider Jac 3:2: “We all miss in many ways.”

<sup>82</sup> Jerome, *In Am.*, CCSL 76:297: *Magis enim intellegentiam quam uerbum posuit, quia trans Damascus ducti sunt in Babylonem, sive trans Babylonem*. However, Jerome also turns this against idolatrous (= heretic) Christians who worship what they have devised themselves.

<sup>83</sup> Julian of Aeclanum, *In Am.* 1:5.25–27, CCSL 88:296.

<sup>84</sup> The Venerable Bede, *Expos. Act.*, CCSL 121:36–37.

<sup>85</sup> L 49' 407 C-239 26'.

How have the text forms influenced each other? Justin and some other authors follow Matt 2:6 when quoting Mic 5:1<sup>86</sup> whereas Ps.-Cyprian and others quote Mic 5:1 in relative accordance with the known Septuagint text.<sup>87</sup> Eusebius once offers a mixed quotation: the beginning οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθα stems from Mic 5:1, the continuation οὐδαμῶς ἐλαχίστη from Matt 2:6.<sup>88</sup> Theodoret and Theophylact quote in the Lemma according to the Septuagint. The addition of the Lemma is not influential in the text of the commentary, therefore probably not part of the *Vorlage* for both exegetes.<sup>89</sup> To summarize, in the case of Mic 5:1, the New Testament text dominates especially in earlier times. Later, the phenomenon diminishes. It is most likely the copyists worked more precisely, preferring the older text. However, in terms of the differences in the reception of Mic 5:1 in comparison to Isa 7:14, the Christian text form of Isa 7:14 lasts much longer than that of Mic 5:1.

According to Christian authors, Jewish authors refer Mic 5:1 to contemporary or at least pre-Christian figures in order to falsify Christian claims. But a Christian exegete also interprets Mic 5:1 in this way, (Ps.-) Theodor of Mopsuestia, who writes that Mic 5:1 refers to Zerobabel who returned from Babylon. Theodoret and others know this interpretation only as a contemporary Jewish exegesis.<sup>90</sup> They counter this interpretation that Zerobabel was also born there. Jerome offers another kind of anti-Jewish exegesis, stating that Matthew offers the version used by the Jewish priests of his time to accuse them of negligence in the textual transmission of the Holy Scriptures.<sup>91</sup>

### 3.6. *Hab 2:4/Gal 3:11/Rom 1:17/Hebr 10:38*

This article will only discuss the second half of the verse with its divergent distribution of personal pronouns. The easiest way to explain the change

---

<sup>86</sup> Justin, *I. Apol.* 34,1, PTS 38:82//SC 507:220//OECT:174//FC 91:128; id., *Dial.* 78.1, Bobichon I 398; Irenaeus, *Dem.* 38, FC 8/1:77; Tertullian, *Adv. Iud.* 13.2, CCSL 2:1384; Origen, *Princ.* 4.1.5, GCS 22:300; Pamphilus, *Apol. Orig.* 84, SC 464:152; Ambrose, *In Lc.* 3. 35, CCSL 14:94.

<sup>87</sup> Cyprian, *Test.* 2:12, CCSL 3, 44f.; Origen, *Cels.* 1:51, SC 132:214; Origen, *Hom. Lev.* 8.4, GCS 29:400; *Hom. Lc.*, Frgm. 55, GCS 49:249; Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 2.3,148; 3.2.46; 6.13.21; 7.2.1, GCS 23:87, 103, 266, 328; Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.* 3.6, SC 247:248; Jerome, *In Mi.*, CCSL 76:481; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Mi.*, PG 71:712b–713d; *Dial. Trin.* 2, SC 231:304; id., *In unigen.* SC 97:292.

<sup>88</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *Qu. Ev.* 8.4, SC 523:150.

<sup>89</sup> Theodoret, *In Mi.*, PG 81:1768a; Theophylact, *In Mi.*, PG 126:1132b.

<sup>90</sup> Theodoret, *In Mi.*, PG 81:1768bc; Theophylact, *In Matt.*, PG 123:164b; Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Matt.*, PG 129:141c.

<sup>91</sup> Jerome, *In Mi.*, CCSL 76:481. The wording of Matt 2:6 does not match either the Masoretic or the Hebrew text of Mic 5:1.

between μου and αὐτοῦ is to refer to the change between ι and ϝ.<sup>92</sup> None of the following readings must necessarily have arisen first in the Greek language area (and as a Christian reading).

Hab 2:4 <sup>MT</sup>	יהי צדק במצונתו יחיה <sup>93</sup> Hab 2:4 <sup>Aq</sup> , <sup>94</sup> Tertullian pt. <sup>95</sup>
Hab 2:4 <sup>LXXA</sup> Hebr 10:38 Röm 1:17	ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται A' 49-407n36-III C-68 AchArm <sup>p</sup> ; P46 & A H* 33 1739 lat sab oms; Clement of Alexandria, <sup>96</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, <sup>97</sup> Theodoret (within the Lemma). <sup>98</sup> C*
Hab 2:4 <sup>LXXB.S</sup> Hebr 10:38	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως μου ζήσεται (Ps.-)Cyprian pt; <sup>99</sup> Origen (pt); <sup>100</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea (pt); <sup>101</sup> Jerome; <sup>102</sup> (Ps.-)Theodoret of Mopsuestia <sup>103</sup> D* pc μ sy
Hab 2:4 Gal 3:11/Röm 1:17 Hebr 10:38	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται Origen (pt); <sup>104</sup> Cyril of Alexandria <sup>105</sup> P13; D <sup>2</sup> H <sup>c</sup> I Ψ 1881

We can state an analogy concerning the reception of Amos 5:25–27 and Hab 2:4: The richness of variations in the various strands of manuscript tradition has its parallels in the variety of text forms in patristic literature. Ancient theologians do not see any necessity to decide on a single reading<sup>106</sup> Theophylact knows that the reading he uses is not the only one possible.<sup>107</sup> Even Jerome is not interested in these variants but in another prob-

<sup>92</sup> Jerome, *In Ab.* 1:2.4, CCSL 76 A:597.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. also 8HevXIIgr, Col. VII 30: καὶ δίκαιος ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ζήσεται. This reading is presupposed also in 1QpHab VIII 1.

<sup>94</sup> Vde. Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 6:14.8, GCS 23:269; Jerome, *In Ab.* 1.2.4., CCSL 76 A:597.

<sup>95</sup> Tertullian, *Castit.* 7.4, CCSL 2:1025 (*uiuī fide sua*); id., *Adv. Marc.* 4:18.9, CCSL 1:591 (*iustus ex fide usa uiuet*). This reading *ex fide uiuī* in Hab 2:4, corroborated by the apostle, proves the unity of the God of both testaments (*Adv. Marc.* 5:3.9, CCSL 1:670).

<sup>96</sup> Clement of Alexandria, *Str.* 2:8.2, GCS 15:117.

<sup>97</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 6:14.8, GCS 23:268–269.

<sup>98</sup> Theodoret, *In Ab.* PG 81:1819b; Theophylact, *In Ab.*, PG 126:853a–c.

<sup>99</sup> Cyprian, *Test.* 1:5; 3:42, CCSL 3:10, 134.

<sup>100</sup> Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 1.15, FC 2/1:134.

<sup>101</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 6:14.1, GCS 23:267.

<sup>102</sup> Jerome, *In Ab.* 1:2.4, CCSL 76 A:596.

<sup>103</sup> (Ps.-)Theodor of Mopsuestia, *In Ab.*, PG 66:436a.

<sup>104</sup> Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 1:13, FC 2/1:124.

<sup>105</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *In Ab.*, PG 71:869d–872c, in the lemma and commentary.

<sup>106</sup> I did not find any discussion whether *ἐκ πίστεως* belongs to *δίκαιος* or to *ζήσεται*.

<sup>107</sup> Theophylact, *In Ab.*, PG 126:853b: [...] διὸ καὶ εἴρηται, ὡς τινα τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἔχει Ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου τουτέστιν ὁ τῆ ἐμῆ χάριτι δίκαιος γεγονός.

lem: Why did Paul not use the Hebrew text when writing to the Romans? Jerome answers that the Romans did not know the Hebrew text.<sup>108</sup> He does not refer to Hebr 10:37–38.

The anomaly in this general trend is Eusebius of Caesarea. As is well known, there is a difference between Hebr 10:38 and Hab 2:4 in the order of the clauses. Hab 2:3f.<sup>LXX</sup> reads: “If it (i.e. the appointed time) should tarry, wait for it, for when it comes it will come and not delay. If it draws back, my soul is not pleased in it. But the just shall live by my faith.”<sup>109</sup> Hebr 10:37f. offers the last two clauses in a varied order. Eusebius fully appreciates the achievement of the author of Hebrews. He clarifies the unclear phrase in Hebr 10:37f.: How should the phrase *ἐὰν ὑποστείληται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ* be related to “the coming one”? In the arrangement according to Hebr 10:38, the clause has an adequate sense, that the one characterized by *ὑποστείληται* is the one who does not believe in Jesus Christ.<sup>110</sup> Theodoret and Theophylact do not address this problem.<sup>111</sup>

### 3.7. Zech 13:7/Mark 14:27/Matt 26:31

Within the exegesis of Zech 13:7 and Mark 14:27/Matt 26:31, commentators try to integrate the differences into a theological harmony of higher order. The textual history of Zech 13:7 is very complex.

Mark 14:27 reads *πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται*;<sup>112</sup> Matt 26:31 offers *πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποιμνῆς* as quotation of Zech 13:7. There are variants at three points of the text.

1. The verb at the beginning is read as imperative 2. Sg. in the Masoretic text and in many other manuscripts and can be interpreted as a request to God. Some Christian authors interpret this reading as a request to God to make the salvific suffering of Jesus possible.<sup>113</sup> In addition, the indicative 1. Sg. occurs in Matt 26:31 and in the Fajjum fragment as well as in some

<sup>108</sup> Jerome, *In Ab.* 1:2.4, CCSL 76 A:600.

<sup>109</sup> V. 4a is a new beginning, cf. KRAUS, “Hab:2:3–4,” 106–110.

<sup>110</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 6:14.4, GCS 23:268.

<sup>111</sup> Theodoret, *In Hebr.*, PG 82:756cd; Theophylact, *In Hebr.*, PG 125:340bc.

<sup>112</sup> In the textual tradition of Mark 14:27, the ordering of *τὰ πρόβατα διασκορπισθήσονται* is sometimes re-arranged: *διασκορπισθήσονται τὰ πρόβατα* (A Ψ f<sup>1</sup> lat). The Codex K, following this alternate ordering, adds *τῆς ποιμνῆς* in order to make the text close to Zech 13:7.

<sup>113</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 53.6, Bobichon I 320; Irenaeus, *Epid.* 76, FC 8/1:84; Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecl. proph.* 3.27, PG 22:1153d; (Ps.?)-Theodor of Mopsuestia, *In Zach.*, PG 66:187; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Zach.*, PG 72:236b; Theodoret, *In Zach.*, PG 81:1949a (he refers to divine *συγχώρησις*); Anonymi Auctoris *Theognosiae dissertatio contra Iudaeos* II, CCSG 14:23.

Septuagint manuscripts<sup>114</sup> and in Jerome.<sup>115</sup> On the other hand, several important Septuagint manuscripts, as well as some patristic quotations, offer the imperative 2. Pl.<sup>116</sup>

2. There are variants concerning the object of the verb. The Masoretic text and the gospels, and some patristic quotations, offer the singular,<sup>117</sup> while the Septuagint tradition mostly offers the plural.<sup>118</sup>

3. In the continuation, Zech 13:7<sup>LXX-A</sup> offers ἐκοπάσατε whereas LXX<sup>A</sup> offers διασκορπισθήσονται. The text of the gospels and some patristic quotations<sup>119</sup> again come close to LXX<sup>A</sup>. The reading ἀπολείται is not a real text-critical variant but a polemic changing which interprets the catastrophe of Jerusalem (70 CE) as punishment for the refutation of Jesus, perhaps motivated by Zech 13:6 (“I was beaten in my beloved house”).

Where the difference between the text forms is taken into account, mechanical causes of the text change are not named. Critics of Christianity accuse Matthew of falsification: He has transformed what is considered in Zech 13:7 as the prophet’s request into a statement of God.<sup>120</sup> Some Christian exegetes include Ps 68[69]:27 (ὅτι ὄν σὺ ἐπάταξας, αὐτοὶ κατεδίωξαν) or comment on this phrase including Zech 13:7.<sup>121</sup> Within the frame of ancient Christian hermeneutics, the combination of Ps 68[69]:27 and Zech 13:7/Matt 26:31 is self-evident: 1. The singular in the words of Jesus is explained. 2. In Ps 68[69]:27, ἐπάταξας refers to God, and κατεδίωξαν to human adversaries. Both factors together favor the interpretation of Ps 68[69]:27 as referring to Jesus’s Passion, whereas otherwise in the New Testament the co-existence of the offering of Jesus by divine as well as by human subjects is testified. However, the divine surrender in no way justifies the actions of those who bring Jesus to death.<sup>122</sup> Theodoret and others do not speak of the cause of Jesus’s suffering by God, but of divine permissiveness. They follow the tendency well-known in ancient Jewish and Christian literature not to regard God directly as the cause of an evil.<sup>123</sup>

<sup>114</sup> V 538 46-86<sup>c</sup>-711<sup>c</sup> 106 233<sup>1</sup> Arab Arm.

<sup>115</sup> Jerome, *In Ion.* 2.4, CCSL 76:396f.; *Comm. Ps.*, FC 79:82.

<sup>116</sup> W<sup>1</sup> B-S\* Co (vid.) Aeth; Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.* 2.63, SC 247:176.

<sup>117</sup> Theodoret of Cyrus, *In Zach.*, PG 81:1949a; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Ps.*, PG 69:1173a; id., *In Zach.*, PG 72:236b; Theodor of Mopsuestia, *In Zach.*, PG 66:588a.

<sup>118</sup> W<sup>1</sup> B-S\* Aeth; Gregory of Nazianzen, *Or.* 2.63, SC 247:176.

<sup>119</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 53.6, Bobichon I 320 reads διασκορπισθήσονται; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Zach.*, PG 72:236b; Theodoret, *In Zach.*, PG 81:1949a, offer διασκορπισθήσεται.

<sup>120</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 57.7.5, CSEL 54:514.

<sup>121</sup> Jerome, *In Ion.* 2.4, CCSL 76:396f., who justifies the reference of Jona 2:4 to the passion of Jesus Christ.

<sup>122</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *In Ps.*, PG 69:1173a, similarly id., *In Zach.*, PG 72:236b–240a (without explicit reference to Matt 26:31).

<sup>123</sup> Theodoret of Cyrus, *In Zach.*, PG 81:1949a; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Matt.*, PG 72:453b. He refers to John 19:11 as the biblical basis of the concept of divine permission.



Euthymius Zigabenus considers it a peculiarity of the Hebrew language to call the one who tolerates an event the originator of this event, because he did not prevent what he could prevent.<sup>124</sup>

### 3.8. Isa 28:16/Isa 8:14/Rom 9:33/1Petr 2:6

Isa 28:16 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμελίδια Σιων λίθον πολυτελεῖν ἐκλεκτὸν ἀκρογωνιαῖον, καὶ ὁ πιστεῦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ

Isa 8:14 καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσῃ αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι

Rom 9:33 ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιων λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάκου, καὶ ὁ πιστεῦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυθῆσεται

1Petr 2:6 ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιων λίθον ἀκρογωνιαῖον ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεῦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῆ

Rom 9:33 is a mixed quotation of Isa 28:16 Σιων λίθον and Isa 8:14 λίθου προσκόμματι πέτρα πτώματι... 1Petr renders Isa 28:16 in a slightly varied way. From Rom 9:33, προσκόμματος is influential for the textual history of Isa 8:14 instead of προσκόμματι. Barn 6:2, Irenaeus, Tertullian and (Ps.-)Cyprian quote Isa 28:16 as the prophet's speech, not influenced by its reception and continuation in Rom 9:33.<sup>125</sup> The verb τίθημι (Rom 9:33; 1Petr 2:6) is not part of the textual tradition of Isa 28:16 but is part of the quotation of Isa 28:16 in Eusebius of Caesarea.<sup>126</sup>

Aware of the character of Rom 9:33 as mixed quotation, Origen emphasizes the selective nature of reception within Paul's line of thought.<sup>127</sup> Jerome, in his commentary on Isaiah, refers to Rom 9:33 only in his interpretation of Isa 8:14, but not in that of Isa 28:16,<sup>128</sup> and he does not explain the text difference any further. Elsewhere he only repeats his favorite comment that the sense does not diverge anyway.<sup>129</sup> Eusebius's quotation of Isa 28:16 is influenced by 1Petr 2:6 (ἔντιμον).<sup>130</sup> Cyril of Alexandria in his commentary on Isaiah presupposes the Septuagint text of Isa 8:14; 28:16;<sup>131</sup> he does not refer to Rom 9:33. Theodoret offers ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐμβαλῶ εἰς τὰ θεμελίδια Σιῶν λίθον πολυτελεῖν in his lemma to Isa 28:16; he interprets the θεμελιός (sic) by referring to 1Cor 3:11. I was unable to find anything

<sup>124</sup> Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Ps.*, PG 128:701c.

<sup>125</sup> Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:21.7, FC 8/3:266–268; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 5:6.10, CCSL 1:681; Cyprian, *Test.* 2:16, CCSL 3:51.

<sup>126</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Is.* 93; GCS 57:183; τοῦτον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἐπαγγέλεται θῆσειν εἰς τὰ θεμελίδια Σιων.

<sup>127</sup> Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 7:19, FC 2/4:184.

<sup>128</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 3:8.14, CCSL 73:117.

<sup>129</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 57.9.8, CSEL 54:520.

<sup>130</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 1:7.14, GCS 23:37; cf. also Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Is.* 93, GCS 57:183 (τίμιον).

<sup>131</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, *In Is.*, PG 70:232c–233bB; 632c–633b.

on Isa 8:14 in his commentary.<sup>132</sup> We can observe a certain restraint in the tendencies of harmonization; the Christian authors were probably more interested in the two images that can be interpreted in Christ.

### 3.9. Isa 42:1–4/Matt 12:18–21

Isa 42:1–4 Ἰακωβὸ παῖς μου, ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ· Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἢ ψυχὴ μου· ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει. <sup>2</sup>οὐ κεκράξεται οὐδὲ ἀνήσει, οὐδὲ ἀκουσθήσεται ἔξω ἢ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ. <sup>3</sup>κάλυτον τεθλασμένον οὐ συντρίψει καὶ λίνον καπνεζόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ἀλλὰ εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει κρίσιν. <sup>4</sup>ἀναλάμψει καὶ οὐ θραυσθήσεται ἕως ἂν θῆ ἔπι τῆς γῆς κρίσιν· καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν.

Matt 12:18–21 ἰδοὺ ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἠρέτισα, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἢ ψυχὴ μου. Θήσω τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν, καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ. <sup>19</sup>οὐκ ἐρίσει οὐδὲ κραυγάζει, οὐδὲ ἀκούσει τις ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ. <sup>20</sup>κάλυτον συντετριμμένον οὐ κατεάξει καὶ λίνον τυφόμενον οὐ σβέσει, ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν. <sup>21</sup>καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν.

Numerous divergences are encountered, especially at the beginning of the parallel section. The most important are the additions “Jacob” and “Israel” in Isa 42:1<sup>LXX</sup> in comparison with Isa 42:1<sup>Aq; Sym; MT</sup> and Matt 12:18. Here our previous findings about Isa 7:14 and Amos 5:25 are not confirmed. The Septuagint manuscripts do not offer many variations. Bohairic manuscripts add κρίσιν before in v. 1, similar to Mat 12:18. The manuscript group cI integrates οὐ κραυγάζει (cf. Matt 12:19) at beginning of Isa 42:2; Ms. 534 replaces ἀνήσει with ἐρίσει (cf. Matt 12:19); Ms. 46 replaces τεθλασμένον with συντετριμμένον (Matt 12:20). Manuscript 534 replaces τῆ with ἐκβάλῃ and adds εἰς νίκος from Matt 12:20. This manuscript reveals the influence of New Testament quotations in other places as well.<sup>133</sup> This quiet history of the manuscript tradition of Isa 42:1–4 is contrasted by a multitude of mixed quotations in the patristic literature. All in all, the New Testament text tends to dominate, with quotations purely following the Septuagint text being much rarer. We may now concentrate on v. 1f.

Justin discusses Isa 42:1–4<sup>LXX</sup> in an almost pure form<sup>134</sup> and also as a mixed quote.<sup>135</sup> Tertullian offers Isa 42:1, identified as a prophetic quota-

<sup>132</sup> Theodoret, *In Is.*, SC 295:240–242.

<sup>133</sup> In Isa 6:9, the words πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον are added after πορεύθητι (cf. also 393 Ath II 1001, and the lemma in Jerome, *In Is.* 3:6.9f., CCSL 73:91).

<sup>134</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 135.2, Bobichon I 546.

<sup>135</sup> Justin, *Dial.* 123.8, Bobichon I 516–18; similarly Ps.-Cyprian, *Mont.* 15, CSEL 3/3:118f.: From Matt 12:18, *ecce* and *neque contendet* are taken, from Isa 42:2 the ordering of *non clamabit*.

tion, according to the wording of Matt 12:18,<sup>136</sup> and then Isa 42:2 as a mixed quote<sup>137</sup> and as a quote from Matt 12:19.<sup>138</sup> (Ps.?)-Cyprian and Novatian quote Isa 42:2 in the textual form of Matt 12:19.<sup>139</sup> Origen follows the Septuagint text in his quotation of Isa 42:1a, the Matthean text in his quotation of Isa 42:1b–4.<sup>140</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea partially follows the Septuagint text in his quotations of Isa 42:1, partially Matt 12:18; once he quotes Isa 42:1b–4 as a whole according to the Septuagint. Epiphanius quotes Isa 42:1 according to Matt 12:18, but as the testimony of God the Father. Conversely, no passages marked as Matthew’s quotation are found in his works. Cyril of Alexandria offers the pure Septuagint text in the lemma, in his commentary the pure Septuagint text of Isa 42:1. Theodoret refers to the reception by Matthew without naming the differences in the text.<sup>141</sup> Theophylact and Euthymius also do not discuss the differences.<sup>142</sup>

Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome comment on the problem. Both refer to the origin of Matthew; moreover, Eusebius offers the argument of realism, Jerome the argument of linguistic usage.

Eusebius aims at the correspondence between prophecy and reality: when the divine judgment announces judgment to the nations and breaks the crushed pipe, but erects the afflicted, it does not fit the people of Israel, but only Christ.<sup>143</sup> Due to the difference between “Jacob” and “Israel”, Jerome states that the prophet announces Jesus Christ. Where the prophet speaks of Israel, he says it literally, where he does not speak of Israel, but of Christ, he leaves out the names Jacob and Israel.<sup>144</sup> Cyril of Alexandria, however, offers a Christological interpretation despite the readings “Jacob” and “Israel”: Jesus comes after the flesh from Jacob’s seed, from Israel.

### 3.10. Isa 52:7/Rom 10:15

Isa 52:7 ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρέων, ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθὰ.

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

<sup>136</sup> Tertullian, *Prax.* 11.5, CCSL 2:1171.

<sup>137</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3:17.4, CCSL 1, 531; id., *Adv. Iud.* 9.28, CCSL 2:1373: *necque contendit neque clamavit* (from Matt 12:19) *neque audita est foris uox eius* (from Isa 42:2).

<sup>138</sup> Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 4:23.8, CCSL 1:606: *necque contendet neque clamabit neque uox eius in platea audietur* (from Isa 42:2).

<sup>139</sup> Cyprian, *Test.* 2:13, CCSL 3:46; Novatian, *Trin.* 9:6/48, CCSL 4:25.

<sup>140</sup> Origen, *Io* 1:144, SC 120:134.

<sup>141</sup> Theodoret of Cyrus, *In Is.*, SC 295:432.

<sup>142</sup> Theophylact, *In Matt.*, PG 123:265a; Euthymus Zigabenus, *In Matt.*, PG 129:373a.

<sup>143</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 9:15.6, GCS 23:436f.; id., *Ecl. proph.* 4.20, PG 22:1225bc.

<sup>144</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 12: 42.1, CCSL 73 A:479.

Some Septuagint manuscripts of Isa 52:7 offer *ῥαῖοι* instead of *ῥα*, influenced by Rom 10:15.<sup>145</sup> Similarly, Aquila reads *ῥαιώθησαν*, Theodotion *εὐπρεπεῖς*, instead of *ῥα*.<sup>146</sup> On the other hand, Isa 52:7 provokes the addition of *εἰρήνη* in some manuscripts of Rom 10:15.<sup>147</sup>

Irenaeus and Tertullian offer a mixed quotation as the prophetic text, which is first formulated according to the model of the abridged version in Rom 10:15 and only in the second part takes up the dichotomy of Isa 52:7.<sup>148</sup> The plural at the beginning suggests itself for both, because they, according to Rom 9:33, recognize the witness ministry of the apostles predicted by the prophet. According to Origen, the prophet addresses God's work, the apostle Paul takes Isa 52:7 as a comparison and speaks of the work of human preachers.<sup>149</sup> In their commentaries on Isaiah, Jerome and Cyril of Alexandria do not refer to Rom 10:15.<sup>150</sup> Theodoret in his commentary on Isaiah offers a mixed text in the Lemma (*ὡς ῥαῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης*) and a reference to the apostle's activities in his comment.<sup>151</sup> He does not refer explicitly to Rom 10:15, but we can be sure that he bore the text in mind.

#### 4. Ancient Christian Exegetes on False Attributions of Old Testament Texts in the New Testament

Occasionally Old Testament texts in the New Testament are attributed to a false author. Today's exegetes suspect errors of memory or point out that the ancient Christian communities rarely had the complete Old Testament at their disposal. Old church hermeneutics cannot be so forgiving, for the claim of divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures also depends on credibility and historical correctness even in details. There are analogies to pagan

<sup>145</sup> Q<sup>mg</sup>.88 22c-62-III-36-93-86c-456 403' 407.

<sup>146</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Is.* 2:41, GCS 57:530.

<sup>147</sup> Ⲙ<sup>2</sup> D F G Y 33; lat sy; Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Is.* 2:41, GCS 57:530.

<sup>148</sup> Irenaeus, *Epist.* 86, FC 8/1:88; Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.* 3:33.1; 5:2.5, CCSL 1:538, 566.

<sup>149</sup> Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 8:6, FC 2/4:224. Origen quotes Isa 52:7 in different forms; the following listing is by no means complete. Sometimes he quotes Septuagint text (*Io.* 1:63, SC 120:92), sometimes he offers a mixed quotation: *quam famosi pedes evangelizantium pacem, evangelizantium bona* (*Hom. Is.* 5.2, GCS 33:264). The bipartism is taken from Isa 52:7, the plural is taken from Rom 10:15.

<sup>150</sup> Jerome, *In Is.* 14: 52.7, CCSL 73 A:580f.; Cyril of Alexandria, *In Is.*, PG 70:1152b-1156a.

<sup>151</sup> Theodoret, *In Is.*, SC 315:136.

philology on Homer, where the translators also pay attention to factual and historical correctness in theologically irrelevant details.<sup>152</sup>

#### 4.1. *Matt 13:35*

The evangelist introduces Ps 77[78]:2 as a reference to prophecy. The concept of David's Psalms as inspired by the divine gift of prophecy is a Jewish one (11Q05 VII 11), influenced by 2Sam 23:2. Following the reinforcement of this concept given in Acts 2:25–32; 13:34–37,<sup>153</sup> many Christian exegetes read all Psalms as prophecies concerning Israel's future<sup>154</sup> or Jesus Christ and the church. Furthermore, the subjects of prophecy not only concern the future but also the present and the past.<sup>155</sup> By the inclusion of the Psalms of Asaph within the biblical Psalms, also Asaph's psalms were interpreted in this way. Curiously, some scribes attribute Ps 77[78] to Isaiah.<sup>156</sup> Porphyry, who read the Bible in order to refute Christian claims of truth, deduced from this attribution the ignorance of the evangelist Matthew.<sup>157</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome supposed "Asaph" to be the original reading in Matt 13:35; an unqualified scribe replaced this name unknown to him by the famous name Isaiah.<sup>158</sup> Other authors refer to the quotation as such but not to the false attribution.<sup>159</sup>

#### 4.2. *Matt 27:9f.*

According to most of the Matthean manuscripts, the announcement quoted in Matt 27:9f. is incorrectly traced back to Jeremiah, rather than to Zecha-

---

<sup>152</sup> SCHMID, "Diplés und Quellenangaben im Codex Sinaiticus," 94–96, offers further examples with regard to this codex: The quotation within Matt 2:6 is attributed to Isaiah (Mic 5:1 would be correct), the quotation in Acts 13:41 to Joel (Hab 1:5 would be correct), the quotation in Mk 1:2f. to Isaiah (see below).

<sup>153</sup> The author of Acts reveals the text-based rationale: David's confession "you will not abandon my soul to Hades or give your devout to see corruption" came not true for himself, because he died (Acts 13:34–37, similarly in Acts 2:25–32). Within ancient Christian theology, the concept of "David as prophet" also can be based on other texts, e.g. Ps 50:13; 142:10, due to mentioning of *πνεῦμα* (Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech.* 16.28 (Rupp 240f.).

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Theodor of Mopsuestia, *In Ps.*, PG 66:673a–676c/CCSL 88 A:220f., on Ps 54:12 etc.

<sup>155</sup> Theodoret, *In Ps.*, PG 80:861a.

<sup>156</sup> ⲁ\* Ⓞ f<sup>1</sup>.13 33.

<sup>157</sup> Jerome, *In Ps.* 77, CCSL 78:66.

<sup>158</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Ps.*, PG 23:901cd; Jerome, *In Matt.*, SC 242:284.

<sup>159</sup> The Venerable Bede, *In Matt.*, PL 92:68c: *Hoc testimonium de septuagesimo psalmo sumptum est* (perhaps the missing *septimo* is omitted due to *aberratio oculorum*); Ps.-Athanasius (Hesychius?), *In Ps.*, PG 27:349d.

riah. Some manuscripts make this correction,<sup>160</sup> some scribes trace back this quotation to Isaiah,<sup>161</sup> and other codices omit a name altogether.<sup>162</sup>

Irenaeus and Hilary of Poitiers trace the quote back to Jeremiah. Origen knows that the quotation is not to be found in Jeremiah, either in the writings used by the Church or in the writings used by the Jews. Origen suspects an error on the part of the evangelist. According to his view, the thesis that the evangelist drew from an apocryphal text should not be refuted.<sup>163</sup> The apostle Paul quotes 1Cor 2:9 from an apocryphal prophecy of Elijah; 2Tim 3:8 from a text called “Jannes and Jambres.” Eusebius of Caesarea considers the error one of carelessness by the evangelist or the error of an inaccurate copyist.<sup>164</sup> Jerome, who knows that the biblical text of Jeremiah does not include the quotation, claims that he has received an apocryphon of Jeremiah from the Nazarenes<sup>165</sup> – researches are suspicious of Jerome’s statements of this kind. Jerome, however, believes that Matthew quoted from Zechariah, neglecting the sequence of words. In his commentary on Zechariah, Jerome does not mention Matthew. Neither do Cyril and Theophylact mention the problem in their commentary on Matthew. According to Theodoret, there is no need to explain Zech 11:12 because Matthew sufficiently explained it.<sup>166</sup> Theodoret does not deal with the textual problem at all. Quodvultdeus and Anastasius Sinaita trace the quotation in Matthew back to both Zechariah and Jeremiah.<sup>167</sup> Augustine is aware of the divergent readings within the codices. “Some of them state simply that it was spoken ‘by the prophet.’ It is possible, therefore, to affirm that those codices which do not contain the name of Jeremiah deserve rather to be followed.”<sup>168</sup> In the following, he presumes the detection of the rule called *lectio difficilior potior*:<sup>169</sup>

“I look also to this further consideration, namely, that there was no reason why this name should have been added [subsequently to the true text], and a corruption thus created; whereas there was certainly an intelligible reason for erasing the name from so many of the codices. For venturesome inexperience might readily have done that, when perplexed with the problem presented by the fact that this passage could not be found in Jeremiah.”

---

<sup>160</sup> 22 sy<sup>hmg</sup>.

<sup>161</sup> 21 l.

<sup>162</sup> Φ 33 a b sy<sup>s,p</sup> bo<sup>ms</sup>.

<sup>163</sup> Origen, *Comm. Matt.* Ser. 117, GCS 38:249; Cf. later Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Matt.*, PG 129:708c.

<sup>164</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 10:4.13, GCS 23:463.

<sup>165</sup> Jerome, *In Matt.*, SC 259:276.

<sup>166</sup> Theodoret, *In Zach.*, PG 81:1936d–1937a.

<sup>167</sup> Quodvultdeus, *Lib. prom.* 1:37, SC 101:234; Anastasius Sinaita, *Disputatio adversus Iudaeos*, PG 89:1244a.

<sup>168</sup> Augustine, *Cons. Ev.* 3.29, CSEL 43:304f.

<sup>169</sup> Augustine, *Cons. Ev.* 3.29, CSEL 43:305. ET: Philip Schaff, FaCh.

At the end, however, he rebukes such discussions as absurd: The one and the same Holy Spirit speaks in all prophets, and the concordance between the words of the prophets is sufficient.<sup>170</sup> The Venerable Bede accepts this precondition: There was no need for Matthew to improve anything.<sup>171</sup>

#### 4.3. *Mark 1:2–3*

In Mk 1,2f., the mixed quotation (Mal 3:1; Isa 40:3) is attributed only to Isaiah.<sup>172</sup> Origen mentions it without comment.<sup>173</sup> Porphyry accuses Mark of ignorance, in line with his allegation of inaccuracy at the beginning of his gospel.<sup>174</sup> Jerome takes comfort in this error when he is reproached for a translation error of his own.<sup>175</sup> Some manuscripts replace ἐν τῷ προφῆτῃ with the more general ἐν τοῖς προφήτοις.<sup>176</sup> Authors of the so-called Questions-and-Answers-Literature twice discussed the problem. Hesychius of Jerusalem interprets Mark 1:2f. as hyperbaton, similar to Gen 2 (reduplication of the story of Eve's creation) or Ps 52:4 ("killing a wall").<sup>177</sup> According to Ambrosiaster, Mark bore in mind that Isaiah was the first to formulate the main idea; therefore Mark combined the phrasings of both prophets under the name of the former one.<sup>178</sup> Similarly, The Venerable Bede states that Isaiah already formulated the sense of the words of Malachi; he then repeats Augustine's remark on the absurdity of such discussions.<sup>179</sup> Theophylact refers to the problem, but takes no position.<sup>180</sup>

#### 4.4. *John 10:34; 15:25/1Cor 14:21*

In John 10:34, Ps 81:6 is introduced by the formula "written in the Law", as is Ps 34:19 in John 15:25 and Isa 28:11 in 1Cor 14:21.<sup>181</sup> The passages

<sup>170</sup> Augustine, *Cons. Ev.* 3.30, CSEL 43:305f.

<sup>171</sup> The Venerable Bede, *In Matt.*, PL 92:102d.

<sup>172</sup> The reading is perhaps old but not primary: SCHMID, *Diplés*, 96f., considers a secondary coming-into-being: A margin gloss, added by a scribe, was introduced in the main text by a later copyist.

<sup>173</sup> Origen, *Cels.* 2:4, SC 132:290; id., *Comm. Rom.* 1:3, FC 2/1:88.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. Jerome, *In Mc.*, CCSL 78:453.

<sup>175</sup> Jerome, *Ep.* 57.9.3, CSEL 54:519.

<sup>176</sup> A W<sup>f13</sup> et al.; similarly Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:10.6; 3:16.3, FC 8/3:94, 190. In *Haer.* 3:11.8, FC 8/3:112, he refers to Isaiah.

<sup>177</sup> Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Collectio difficultatum et solutionum* 1, PG 93:1392b–1393b.

<sup>178</sup> Ambrosiaster, *Qu. V. N. T.* 57, CSEL 50:103f.

<sup>179</sup> The Venerable Bede, *In Mc.*, CCSL 120:439.

<sup>180</sup> Theophylact, *In Mc.*, PG 123:493d.

<sup>181</sup> The diverging text forms of Isa 28:11 and 1Cor 14:21 have not influenced the tradition of the manuscripts of both texts. In some commentaries on Isaiah, references to 1Cor 14:21 are missing, cf. Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Is.* 93, GCS 57:182; Cyril of Alex-

of the gospel of John imply a special problem: the omniscience of Jesus seems to be not entire.<sup>182</sup> Commenting on John 10:34 or Ps 81:6, some authors offer a moral interpretation. Christ teaches that every word of God, not only that spoken by Moses, but also that spoken by the prophets, should be received obediently as divine law. Therefore, prophetic words or psalms can be called the “law”.<sup>183</sup> In their commentaries on 1 Corinthians, some interpreters note that the quotation 1 Cor 14:21 actually comes from Isaiah, but the Apostle Paul calls the whole Old Testament “law”.<sup>184</sup>

#### 4.5. *Matt 2:23*

Normally, ancient Christian exegetes are aware of the problem that no concrete source is to be named.<sup>185</sup> They interpret *Ναζωραῖος* as “The Holy One of God” (John 6:69).<sup>186</sup> Eusebius continues with a Christological exegesis: There is a difference between those who have to be called “Nazarenes” and Jesus Christ who is “Nazarene”, holy, by nature.<sup>187</sup> Other exegetes offer a more sober solution by referring to the loss of books<sup>188</sup> or Jewish negligence<sup>189</sup> or the Babylonian exile and other accidents.<sup>190</sup>

We can conclude by stating that attributions entail the problem of the credibility of Holy Scripture. To explain any textual differences, ancient exegetes usually refer to the theological harmony between the real and the supposed author.

---

andria, *In Is.*, PG 70:625b (Cyril refers to Acts 2). Also Theodoret, *In 1 Cor.*, PG 82:344a, does not mention the problem. Jerome, *In Is.* 9:28.11, CCSL 73:360, refers to the difference between *καὶ* and *διὰ* (Isa 28:11<sup>LXX</sup>); Paul (*ἐξ*) followed the Hebrew text.

<sup>182</sup> Mark 13:32 raises the same problem; cf. Ambrosiaster, *Appendix quaestionum Novi Testamenti* 67, CSEL 50:460.

<sup>183</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Ps.*, PG 23:985ab; The Venerable Bede, *In Joh.*, PL 92:773d; Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Joh.*, PG 129:1337b.

<sup>184</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor.*, PG 61:308; Theodoret, *In 1 Cor.*, PG 82:344a; Ps.-Oecumenius of Tricca, *In 1 Cor.*, PG 118:852d; Theophylact, *In 1 Cor.*, PG 124:744a.

<sup>185</sup> Ephraem, *Comm. Diatess.* 3.9, FC 54/1:188f.; Jerome, *Apol. c. Rufinum* 2:25, SC 303:172–175, suppose Isaiah as source. The editors of these texts refer to Isa 11:1 as possible source text, cf. LANGE, *Ephraem der Syrer*, 189; LARDET, *St. Jérôme, Apologie contre Rufin.*, 175.

<sup>186</sup> Origen, *In Matt.*, Frgm. 36, GCS 41:30; Jerome, *In Matt.*, SC 242:88, The Venerable Bede, *In Matt.*, PL 92:45ab.

<sup>187</sup> Eusebius of Caesarea, *D.e.* 7:2.46–51, GCS 23:336f.

<sup>188</sup> John Chrysostom, *Hom. In Matt.*, PG 57:180f. (he refers to Jer 36 and 2Kgs.22).

<sup>189</sup> Theophylact, *In Matt.*, PG 123:172bc.

<sup>190</sup> Euthymius Zigabenus, *In Matt.*, PG 129:156d.



## 5. Conclusion

The relevance of patristic quotations for the textual history of the Septuagint and its reception is to be described as follows:

1. The divergence of the Septuagint manuscripts is reflected in the divergence of patristic quotations. On the other hand, as we observed with Isa 42:1–4, a relative homogeneity in the manuscript tradition did not always guarantee the same homogeneity in the patristic quotations.

2. In the processes of reception beyond scholarly exegesis, cross-influences between Septuagint text and New Testament text can be observed more frequently than in later commentaries. At least for the early period, one has to reckon with a high proportion of citations from memory for as long as there were no Christian writing schools and one could not visit non-Christian schools. On the other hand, the great codices of the fourth and fifth century show a progress in carefulness: “Manifestly the Septuagint and New Testament texts are to be seen separately even when both texts are written in the same scriptorium and incorporated in to one physical entity, one codex.”<sup>191</sup> In many cases, this conclusion is corroborated.

a) Sometimes the New Testament text-form is influenced by the Old Testament text, and sometimes (in early periods more frequently), the Old Testament text by the New Testament quotation. This is especially true in details which are relevant for Christology, but the phenomenon also appears in details which are irrelevant from our point of view.

b) There is no systematization of such cross-influences. The quantity of cross-influences does not depend on the degree of awareness of the Old Testament text, nor on whether the deviation is to be found in a word of Jesus, in a word of the apostle or in an authorial remark of the evangelist.

c) Sometimes additional biblical texts influence the text-form of a quotation.

d) Where the New Testament text agrees with the Masoretic text against the Septuagint, few authors mention the New Testament author’s preference for this text-form. Sometimes the reference to the New Testament is not established. Sometimes the reference is made without reference to textual differences.

e) Due to anti-Jewish polemics, Christian authors especially in the early period of exegesis are creative in inventing new readings.<sup>192</sup> Often these readings are not relevant for the textual history. Especially in later times, Christians abuse many texts for anti-Jewish polemics, independently from additional text changes.

---

<sup>191</sup> KARRER and SCHMID, “Old Testament Quotations,” 162.

<sup>192</sup> Cf Barn 2:7 etc.

3. Christian exegetes give text-critical comments when specific theological concerns of the Old Church are concerned. What from a more recent point of view is considered a shift of meaning is not always perceived as such in ancient ecclesiastical theology.

4. What we judge as dogmatic prejudice, old church authors evaluate as reality, with which they also want the reproduction of biblical texts to correspond. Individual remarks on the differences between the readings can be used to compare text and reality, but also for anti-Jewish polemics. Misallocations of New Testament authors are often declared irrelevant by referring to a higher unity of Holy Scripture.

5. Ancient Christian theologians are, within the limits of hermeneutic restriction of freedom in dealing with the sacred texts, scholars in the ancient sense. This must also be taken into account, for example, regarding their comments on Isa 7:14.<sup>193</sup>

## Bibliography

### Sources

- Rahlfs, Alfred, *Psalmi cum Odis*, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 31979).
- Ambrose, *In Lucam*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 14 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1957).
- Ambrosiaster, *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, rec. Alexander Souter, CSEL 50 (Vienna: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freytag, 1908), 1–416.
- , *Appendix quaestionum Novi Testamenti*, rec. Alexander Souter, CSEL 50 (Vienna: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freytag, 1908), 417–480.
- Ammonius of Alexandria, *Fragmenta in Actus Apostolorum*, PG 85:1523d–1608a.
- Anastasius Sinaita, *Disputatio adversus Iudaeos*, PG 89:1203a–1282b.
- Anonymi Auctoris *Theognosiae dissertatio contra Iudaeos* II, ed. Michiel Hostens, CCSG 14, (Turnhout: Brepols, 1986).
- Augustine, *De consensu evangelistarum*, ed. Franz Wehrich, CSEL 43 (Vienna: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freitag, 1904).
- Ps.-Basilus, *hom. in sanctam Christi generationem* 3.4, PG 31:1457c–1476a.
- , *Enarratio in Isaiam Prophetam*, PG 30:117a–668c.
- Bede, The Venerable, *Expositio in Evangelium Matthaei*, PL 92:9a–132a.
- , *In Marci Evangelium expositio*, ed. David Hurst, CCSL 120 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1960), 427–648.
- , The Venerable, *Expositio in Evangelium Iohannis*, PL 92:633d–938a.
- , *Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum*, eds. Max Ludwig Wolfram Laistner and David Hurst, CCSL 121 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1983), 105–163.
- , *Nomina regionum atque locorum de Actibus Apostolorum*, CCSL 121:165–178.

---

<sup>193</sup> My warm thanks to Jenny Pulido and Katharine Perry for improving my English.

- Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* I–VI, eds. Otto Stählin and Ludwig Früchtel, 4. edition ed. Ursula Treu, GCS 52 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985). *Stromata VII–VIII*, ed. Otto Stählin, 3. edition ed. Ursula Treu, GCS 17 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1970), 3–102.
- Cyprian, *Ad Quirinium testimoniorum libri tres*, ed. Robert Weber, CCSL 3 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972), 1–179.
- , *Epistularium*, ad fidem codicum summa cura selectorum necnon adhibitis ed. prioribus praecipuis ed. Gerard F. Diercks, CCSL 3 B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1994), CCSL 3 C (Turnhout: Brepols, 1996).
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Dialogues sur la Trinité*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Georges-Matthieu de Durand, I–III, SC 231, 237, 246 (Paris: Cerf, 1976–1978).
- , *De incarnatione unigeniti*, in: Cyrille d’Alexandrie, *Deux dialogues christologiques*, ed. Georges-Matthieu de Durand, SC 97 (Paris: Cerf, 1964), 188–301.
- , *Gegen Julian. Teil 2: Buch 6 – 10 und Fragmente*, eds. Wolfram Kinzig and Thoms Brüggemann, GCS NF 21 (Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter, 2017).
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Explanatio in Psalmos*, PG 69:717a–1276b.
- , *Commentarius in Prophetas Minoras*, PG 71; PG 72:9a–364d.
- , *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*, PG 70:9a–1450c.
- , *Commentarii in Matthaum fragmenta*, PG 72:365–474.
- Cyril of Jerusalem, *Opera quae supersunt omnia*, eds. Wilhelm Karl Reischl and Joseph Rupp (Munich: Lentner, 1848–1860 = Hildesheim: Olms, 1967).
- Ephraem, *Kommentar zum Diatessaron*, ed. Christian Lange, FC 54/1–2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008).
- Epiphanius of Salamis, *Ancoratus*, in: Epiphanius von Salamis, *Ancoratus*, Panarion haer. 1–33, ed. Karl Holl, GCS 25 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915), 1–149.
- , *Panarion, haer. 1–33*, ed. Karl Holl, GCS 25 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1915); *haer. 34–64*, ed. Karl Holl, GCS 31 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1922), 2. edition ed. Jürgen Dummer (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980); *haer. 65–80, De fide*, ed. Karl Holl (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1933), 2. edition ed. Jürgen Dummer (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985).
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Chronica*, GCS 20; Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt, mit textkritischem Commentar, ed. Josef Karst, GCS 20 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1911).
- , *Demonstratio evangelica*, ed. Ivar A. Heikel, GCS 23 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913).
- , *Eclogae Propheticae*, PG 22:1021a–1261c.
- , *Die Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Eduard Schwartz, Die lateinische Übersetzung des Rufinus, ed. Theodor Mommsen, Vol. 1: Bücher I bis V (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903); Vol. 2: Bücher VI bis X, GCS 9/2 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908); Bd. 3: Einleitungen, Übersichten und Register (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909).
- , *In Psalmos*, PG 23; PG 24:9a–76c.
- , *Der Jesajakommentar*, ed. Joseph Ziegler, GCS 57 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1975).
- , *Onomasticon*, ed. Erich Klostermann, GCS 11/1 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904).
- , *Questions évangéliques*, ed. Claudio Zamagni, SC 523 (Paris: Cerf, 2008).
- Euthymius Zigabenus, *Commentarius in Psalmos Davidis*, PG 128:41a–1326.
- , *Evangelii secundum Matthaum enarratio*, PG 129:107a–766a.
- , *Evangelii secundum Johannem enarratio*, PG 129:1105b–1502d.
- Grégoire de Nazianze, *Discours 1–3*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction par Jean Bernardi, SC 247 (Paris: Cerf, 1978).
- Gregory of Nyssa, *De tridui inter mortem et resurrectionem domini nostri Iesu Christi spatio*, ed. Ernst Gebhardt, GNO 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 273–306.
- Hadrian, *Introductio*, PG 98:1273a–1312b.
- Hesychius of Jerusalem, *Collectio difficultatum et solutionum*, PG 93:1391a–1448c.

- Hippolytus of Rome, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, ed. Paul Wendland, GCS 26 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1916).
- Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*. Gegen die Häresien, ed. Norbert Brox, Vol. 1, FC 8/1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 99–357; Vol. 2, FC 8/2 (Freiburg: Herder, 1993); Vol. 3, FC 8/3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1995); Vol. 4, FC 8/4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1997); Vol. 5, FC 8/5 (Freiburg: Herder, 2001).
- Jérôme, *Apologie contre Rufinum*, ed. Pierre Lardet, SC 303 (Paris: Cerf, 1983).
- , *Tractatus in Psalmos*, cura et studio Germain Morin/Bernard Capelle/Jean Fraipont, CCSL 78 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1958), 3–447.
  - , *Commentarii in Prophetas minores*, cura et studio Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 76 / 76 A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969).
  - , *Commentariorum in Esaiam libri XVIII*, cura et studio Marcus Adriaen, Bd. I: Libri I–XI, CCSL 73 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963); Vol. II: Libri XII–XVIII, in *Esaiam parvula abbreviatio*, CCSL 73 A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963).
  - , *Commentarii in Ieremiam*, cura et studio Siegfried Reiter, CCSL 74 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1960).
  - , *Commentaire sur Matthieu*, ed. Émile Bonnard, SC 242; 259 (Paris: Cerf, 1977–1979).
  - , *In Marci Evangelium*, cura et studio Germain Morin, CCSL 78 (2nd ed. Turnhout: Brepols, 1958), 449–500.
  - , *Epistulae*, rec. Isidor Hilberg, Vol. 1, *Epistulae 1–70*, CSEL 54 (Wien: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freytag, 1910), second edition ed. Margit Kamptner (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996); Vol. 2, *Epistulae 71–120*, CSEL 55 (Wien: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freytag, 1912), second edition ed. Margit Kamptner, Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996); Vol. 3, *Epistulae 121–154*, CSEL 56 (Wien: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freytag, 1918), second edition ed. Margit Kamptner, Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996).
  - , *Hebraicae quaestiones in libro Geneseos*, ed. Paul de Lagarde, CCSL 72 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1959), 1–56.
  - , *De virginitate Mariae adversus Helvidium*, PL 23:193a–216b.
- John Chrysostom, *Sur l'égalité du père et du fils. Contre les anomeens homélies VII–XII*, ed. Anne-Marie Malingrey, SC 396 (Paris: Cerf, 1994).
- , *Commentaire sur Isaïe*. Introduction, texte critique et notes par Jean Dumortier, traduction par Arthur Liefvooghe, SC 304 (Paris: Cerf, 1983).
  - , *Homiliae in Actus Apostolorum*, PG 60:13–384.
  - , *Homiliae in primam epistolam ad Corinthos*, PG 61:9–382.
- John of Damascus, *Homélies sur la Nativité et la Dormition*, ed. Pierre Voulet, SC 80 (Paris: Cerf, 1961).
- Julian of Eclanum, *In Amos Prophetam*, eds. Lucas De Coninck and Maria Josepha d'Hont, CCSL 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977), 260–329.
- Julius Africanus, *Chronographiae*, PG 10:63–94.
- Justin, *Apologiae – Apologien*. Eingeleitet, übersetzt und kommentiert von Jörg Ulrich, FC 91 (Freiburg: Herder, 2021).
- , *Apologie pour les chrétiens*. Introduction, texte critique, traduction par Charles Munnier, SC 507 (Paris: Cerf, 2006).
  - , *Apologies*, ed. with a Commentary on the Text by Denis Minns and Paul Parvis, OECT (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
  - , *Dialogue avec Tryphon*. Édition critique, traduction, commentaire par Philippe Bobichon, Par. 47/1–2 (Fribourg: Fribourg University Press, 2003).

- Lactantius, *Divinae Institutiones*, eds. Samuel Brandt and Georg Laubmann, CSEL 19 (Prague: Tempsky/Vienna: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freytag, 1890), 1–672.
- , *Epitome*, eds. Samuel Brandt and Georg Laubmann, CSEL 19 (Prague: Tempsky/Vienna: Tempsky/Leipzig: Freytag, 1890), 673–761.
- Das Muratorische Fragment und die Monarchianischen Prologe zu den Evangelien*, ed. Hans Lietzmann, Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen I (Bonn: Marcus & Weber, 1902; 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1933).
- Novatian, *De Trinitate*, in: *Novatiani opera quae supersunt nunc primum in unum collecta ad fidem codicum qui adhuc extant necnon adhibitis editionibus veteribus* ed. Gerard F. Diercks, CCSL 4 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972), 1–78.
- Origen, *Contre Celse*, Introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Marcel Borret, Tome 1, SC 132 (Paris: Cerf, 1967).
- , *De principiis*, ed. Paul Koetschau, GCS 22 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1913).
- , *Die Leviticushomilien*, ed. Willem A. Baehrens, GCS 29 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1920), 280–507.
- , *Die Numerihomilien*, ed. Willem A. Baehrens, GCS 30 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921), 1–285.
- , *Die Jesajahomilien*, ed. Willem A. Baehrens, GCS 33 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925), 242–289.
- , *Die Ezechielhomilien*, ed. Willem A. Baehrens, GCS 33 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925), 308–454.
- , *Matthäuserklärung, Vol. 1: Die griechisch erhaltenen Tomoi*, ed. Erich Klostermann, GCS 40 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1935), 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. ed., Ursula Treu (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968); *Vol. 2: Die lateinische Übersetzung der commentariorum series*, ed. Erich Klostermann, GCS 38 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1933), 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. ed. Ursula Treu (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1976); *Vol. 3: Fragmente und Indices*, 1. Hälfte, ed. Erich Klostermann, GCS 41 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1941), 2 ed. ed. Ursula Treu (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968).
- , *Die Homilien zu Lukas in der Übersetzung des Hieronymus und die griechischen Reste der Homilie und des Lukas-Kommentars*, ed. Max Rauer, GCS 49 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930).
- , *Commentarii in epistolam ad Romanos–Römerbrief*, übersetzt und eingeleitet von Theresia Heither, Vol. 1: erstes und zweites Buch, FC 2/1 (Freiburg: Herder, 1990); Vol. 2: drittes und viertes Buch, FC 2/2 (Freiburg: Herder, 1992); Vol. 3: fünftes und sechstes Buch, FC 2/3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1993); Vol. 4: siebtes und achtes Buch, FC 2/4 (Freiburg: Herder, 1994); Vol. 5: neuntes und zehntes Buch, FC 2/5 (Freiburg: Herder, 1996); Vol. 6: Fragmente, FC 2/6 (Freiburg: Herder, 1999).
- Pacianus, *De baptismo*, in: Pacian, *Écrits*, introduction, texte critique, commentaire et index par Carmelo Granado, traduction par Chantal Épitalon et Michel Lestienne, SC 410 (Paris: Cerf, 1995), 148–165.
- Pamphilus, *apologia pro Origene*. Texte critique, traduction et notes par René Amacker et Éric Junod, Vol. 1–2, SC 464/465 (Paris: Cerf, 2002).
- Ps.-Cyprian, *De montibus Sina et Sion*, ed. Wilhelm Hartel, CSEL 3/3 (Vienna: Gerold, 1871), 104–119.
- Ps.-Eucherius of Lyons, *De situ Hierosolymitanae Urbis atque ipsius Iudaeae epistola ad Faustum presbyterum*, CSEL 39 :123–134.
- Ps.-Oecumenius of Tricca, *Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum*, PG 118:29a–308b.
- , *Commentarius in epistolam primam ad Corinthios*, PG 118:635b–906b.
- , *Commentarii in epistolam secundam S. Petri*, PG 119:577a– 618a.

- Quodvultdeus, *Livre des promesses et des prédictions de Dieu*, ed. René Braun, SC 101/102 (Paris: Cerf, 1964).
- Tertullian, *Adversus Iudaeos*, cura et studio Aemilius Kroymann, CCSL 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 1337–1396.
- , *Adversus Marcionem*, cura et studio Aemilius Kroymann, CCSL 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 437–726.
- , *Adversus Praxean*, ad fidem editionum Aemilius Kroymann/Ernest Evans, CCSL 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 1157–1205.
- , *De exhortatione castitatis*, cura et studio Aemilius Kroymann, CCSL 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 1013–1035.
- Theodor of Mopsuestia, *Expositio in Psalmos*, PG 66:647b–696d.
- , *Commentarius in XII Minoras Prophetas*, PG 66:123a–632c.
- Theodoret, *Commentarius in Duodecim Prophetas*, PG 81:1545b–1988a.
- , *Commentaire sur Isaïe*, Vol. 1: (Sections 1–3) introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean-Noël Guinot, SC 276 (Paris: Cerf, 1980); Vol. 2: (Sections 4–13) texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean-Noël Guinot, SC 295 (Paris: Cerf, 1982); Vol. 3: (Sections 14–20) texte critique, traduction, notes et index par Jean-Noël Guinot, SC 315 (Paris: Cerf, 1984).
- , *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG 80:857a–1997b.
- , *Interpretatio Epistolae ad Romanos*, PG 82:43b–226c.
- , *Interpretatio Epistolae Primae ad Corinthios*, PG 82:225c–376a.
- , *Interpretatio Epistulae ad Hebraeos*, PG 82:673c–786c.
- Theodosius, *de situ terrae sanctae*, ed. Paul Geyer, CSEL 39 (Prague: Tempsky/Vienna: Tempsky/Leipig: Freytag, 1898), 135–150.
- Theophylact, *Expositio in Prophetam Oseam*, PG 126:575b–820a.
- , *Enarratio in Evangelium Matthaei*, PG 123:139a–488a.
- , *Enarratio in Evangelium Marci*, PG 123:487a–682c.
- , *Commentarius in epistolam primam ad Corinthios*, PG 124:559a–794c.
- , *Expositio Epistolae ad Hebraeos*, PG 125:185a–404a.

### Secondary Literature

- BENGEL, JOHANN ALBRECHT, *Novum Testamentum Graecum* (Tübingen: Johann Georg Cotta, 1734).
- KARRER, MARTIN, and ULRICH B. SCHMID, “Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament and the Textual History of the Bible – the Wuppertal Research project,” in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament. Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, eds. Martin Karrer and Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund, ANTF 43 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 155–196.
- KARRER, MARTIN/SIGISMUND, MARCUS/ULRICH B. SCHMID, “Textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu den Zusätzen in den Septuaginta-Psalmen,” in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 140–161.
- KOCH, DIETRICH-ALEX, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums, Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*, BHTh 69 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1986).
- KRAUS, WOLFGANG, “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, VTSup 127 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 101–117.

- MARKSCHIES, CHRISTOPH, "Hieronymus und die Hebraica Veritas," in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum*, eds. Martin Hengel and Anna Maria Schwemer, WUNT 72 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 131–181.
- MEISER, MARTIN, *Galater*, NTP 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007).
- NEUSCHÄFER, BERNHARD, *Origenes als Philologe*, Vol. 1: Text, SBA 18/1 (Basel: Reinhardt, 1987).
- SCHMID, ULRICH B., "Diplés und Quellenangaben im Codex Sinaiticus," in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament. Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, eds. Martin Karrer and Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund, ANTF 43 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 83–98.
- SCHULZ-FLÜGEL, "Hieronymus – Gottes Wort: Septuaginta oder hebraica Veritas," in *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and Siegfried Kreuzer, WUNT 325 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 746–758.
- STOWASSER, MARTIN, "Am 5,25–27; 9,11f. in der Qumranüberlieferung und in der Apostelgeschichte. Text- und traditionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu 4Q174 (Florilegium) III 12/CD VII 16/Apg 7,42b–43; 15,16–18," *ZNW* 92 (2001): 47–63.