

Septuagint Quotations in Acts

This study is a text-critical study concerning reception history; issues of interpretation sometimes are included but they are not the main point.¹ I cannot deal in detail with the problems of the so-called “Western” text of Acts. The claim is far more modest: I will collect variants in the textual traditions of Acts which have analogues in variants of the presupposed Old Testament texts in order to grasp the character of the textual development of both strands.

There are multiple reasons why it seems useful to make a contribution to textual criticism: 1. In prior research, New Testament quotations were evaluated as influencing the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint source texts. Nowadays, New Testament text-forms often are regarded as witnesses of a text-form prior to them. Both the *Göttingen Septuaginta* and the *Editio Critica Maior* of Acts enable us to identify analogies and discrepancies more precisely. In some cases, Luke is not the initiator but a witness of a distinct Geek reading among other Greek readings. 2. In comparison to the Hebrew strand of textual development, the Septuagint often is a witness but not the initiator of a distinct textual tradition. The divergent text types are not always to be grouped in accordance with the criterion of language.² 3. It is useful to integrate also patristic quotations. Of course, we have to be cautious with regard to the methodological problem of variants and non-variants, e.g. independent stylistic improvements or biblical harmonization.³ 4. Luke regards also details of Church history announced by biblical prophecy. Therefore, it is necessary to clarify the textual basis for his theological conception.

¹ Cf. RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, passim. The Habilitation thesis of Dietrich Rusam focuses on the threefold function of the Old Testament quotations in Luke-Acts (command, illustration, announcement). I also suggest a threefold function (account, announcement, norm; MEISER, “Das Alte Testament,” 179–187). According to Mogens Müller, Luke emphasizes the correspondence of prophecy and fulfilment and imitates the stylistic character of the Septuagint – it was not possible for him to correct the Septuagint text by comparing it with the Hebrew – in order to present his work as continuation of God’s history with humankind included in the Holy Scripture, in order to write himself “Holy Scripture” (MÜLLER, “Lukas und die Septuaginta,” passim).

² LIM, “Qumran Scholarship,” 70; cf. DOCHERTY, “‘Do you Understand ...?’,” 116.

³ Cf. KAUFMAN, “Using Patristic Evidence,” passim; KIEL, “‘Neue’ Varianten,” 39–40; MEISER, “Quotations of Jewish Scriptures in Greek and Latin Texts,” in this Volume 269–273. This methodological problem is true not only for patristic quotations.

1. History of Research

The results of the seminal work of Traugott Holtz⁴ can be summarized as follows:

1. Luke's text was that of the Septuagint; readings against the Septuagint cannot be found anywhere. Luke tried to quote the Septuagint precisely and standardized quotes he received from his sources to the readings of his Septuagint.

2. The Septuagint text at least of Isaiah and the Twelve Prophets used by Luke is close to the text type of Codex Alexandrinus, not Codex Vaticanus. In the Codex Alexandrinus, the Septuagint text is not corrected according to New Testament quotations. These must rather be regarded as independent witnesses of an early dissemination of the Septuagint text in the text-form of Alexandrinus.

3. Luke knew and used Isaiah, the Twelve Prophets and the Psalms. There is no proof for an independent knowledge of the Pentateuch. The so-called Septuagintisms do not owe their existence to direct knowledge of the Pentateuch, but rather to the language of the community, consciously or unconsciously influenced by the Septuagint.

Of course, these theses provoked further dispute.

Martin Rese argued against Holtz that some changes in Luke were not to be regarded as an oversight, but meant a conscious, theologically motivated intervention of the *auctor ad Theophilum*.⁵

In his Study "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts," Joseph Fitzmyer offers an overview of Lucan introductory formulae⁶ and summarizes narratological⁷ and linguistic characteristics of Lucan usage.⁸ The

⁴ HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*.

⁵ RESE, *Motive*, 211–216.

⁶ FITZMYER, "Use," 526–527. They have parallels rarely in the Septuagint but more often in Qumran (527).

⁷ FITZMYER, "Use," 531: "Luke has used OT quotations, never in his well-known summary statements, rarely in his narrative accounts, but frequently in the discourses that he has put on the lips of important figures in his account." Many quotations "are found in the Lucan discourses in Acts, in the speeches of Peter, Paul, and Stephen. These speeches were either missionary discourses, intended to stir up belief among Jews in Jesus as the Messiah and in his role in salvation history, or a polemical, apologetic discourse, in which Stephen is portrayed indicting the Jews for their disbelief" (536).

⁸ Cf. FITZMYER, "Use," 534: "What is to be noted ... is that in no case is there a citation that follows the Hebrew MT rather than the Greek, when the latter differs from the Hebrew. Even in Acts 4:11, when Luke cites Ps 118:22, his text is clearly a rewording of the Greek and not a translation of the Hebrew; similarly in Acts 7:7b the Lucan quotation does not correspond to the Hebrew."

quotations, mostly of the Pentateuch, Psalms, and Prophets,⁹ serve as “proof from prophecy”¹⁰ – Luke interprets texts which are not prophetic *per se* in a prophetic way.¹¹ In this manner, Luke continued to write biblical history.¹²

Gert Jacobus Steyn presented a detailed monograph on Acts 1:16–22; 2:14–41; 3:11–26; 13:16–48; 22:30–23:9 and 28:16–28, interpreting these texts with regard to textual criticism and hermeneutics. The latter point includes rationales for both selection and segmentation of the source texts. Most of the Old Testament quotations occur in dialogues or speeches addressed to Jews. Luke was aware of the traditional Christian reception of some Old Testament texts; sometimes he “checked these quotations against his Scriptures.”¹³ There is, however, “insufficient proof of the existence of a so-called ‘testimony book’, which might have been used by Luke ... in order to substantiate the specific selection of texts as found in the *Acta Apostolorum*.”¹⁴ There is also no sufficient proof of written traditions concerning quotations of Scripture known to the evangelist. Luke’s text mostly is the Septuagint text witnessed also in Septuagint manuscripts; only in a few cases, his text comes close to the reading of the Hebrew text.

According to Martin Karrer, Ulrich Bernhard Schmid and Marcus Sigismund,¹⁵ Luke did not always use a source text which is discernible also in the Septuagint manuscript group about Codex Alexandrinus; Luke’s quotations are witnesses to the vivid textual development at the turn to the first century CE. He also feels free to alter the source text. In the first centuries CE, no one saw any need for harmonizing Old and New Testament texts; sometimes there were analogous developments that did not depend upon direct influence.

Nowadays, interferences between Qumran and New Testament textual criticism are in focus. With regard to Qumran-texts which are written in Hebrew but represent a Septuagint type of text (4QJer^{b,d}, 4QDeut^a; 4QLev^d, 4QExod^b), Timothy Lim writes: “Post-Qumran textual criticism has shown that a text written in one language could be aligned textually

⁹ FITZMYER, “Use,” 532: “...there are no quotations from the historical books ... This is striking, because Luke’s obvious desire in writing Luke-Acts is to construct a story of the Jesus-event and its sequel in imitation of biblical narratives of old.”

¹⁰ FITZMYER, “Use,” 537. Luke “made use of the device of promise and fulfillment. He saw that that record of God’s dealings with his people in the OT was meant as a promise of what God would accomplish in the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth and its sequel.”

¹¹ Fitzmyer, “Use,” 536–537.

¹² FITZMYER, “Use,” 538.

¹³ STEYN, *Quotations*, 231.

¹⁴ STEYN, *Quotations*, 232.

¹⁵ KARRER/SCHMID/SIGISMUND, “Doppelwerk.”

with a type that is usually associated with another language.”¹⁶ Susan Docherty also underlines that language and text-type are not to be conflated. “The Qumran manuscripts illustrate that a copy of the Bible written in Hebrew (such as 4QJer^b) may be Septuagintal in type, so there is a need for sounder distinctions to be drawn between language and text-type in classifying the quotations of the Old Testament in the New.”¹⁷ This is true insofar as in many cases the Septuagint is a witness but not the initiator of a distinct text-form.

In this study, I will compare the textual traditions of Acts and the textual traditions of the Old Testament pre-texts.

2. The First Petrine Speech

2.1. Acts 1:20a/Ps 68[69]:26

Whereas Ps 68:26 reads ἔπαυλις αὐτῶν,¹⁸ Acts 1:20a reads ἔπαυλις αὐτοῦ, probably in order to refer the quotation to the fate of Judas Iscariot. The textual transmission of Acts 1:20aa sometimes is influenced by the source text: Some manuscripts offer αὐτῶν instead of αὐτοῦ.¹⁹ On the other hand, ἡρημωμένη (Ps 68[69]:26a) is only twice witnessed in the manuscripts of Acts 1:20a²⁰ which read normally ἔρημος. The lemma in John Chrysostom’s third homily on Acts offers a combination of both texts: ... αὐτῶν ἔρημος.²¹ In Acts 1:20ab, the manuscript tradition offers καὶ μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ whereas the Psalm text reads καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν.²² Perhaps the mentioning of σκηνώματα is omitted due to the new context, the fate of Judas – an antagonism between Scripture and reality should be avoided.

¹⁶ LIM, “Qumran Scholarship,” 70.

¹⁷ DOCHERTY, “Do you Understand...,” 116.

¹⁸ In ancient Christian commentaries on Psalms, there was no need to alter the plural into the singular: the plural was referred to the fate of the Jews 70 CE (Augustine, *En. Ps.* 68 s. 2.10, CCSL 39:924; Cassiodorus, *Expos. Ps.*, CCSL 97:617). The Old Testament source text is suitable for the context in the New Testament only due to the Septuagint’s ἔπαυλις which afterwards is reinforced by ἐπισκοπή (JOHNSON, *Midrash*, 15).

¹⁹ 61* 69* 81 180* 326 630 1243 1751 1837 2495 pc d*t.

²⁰ 81 (ἔρημωμένη), 1243 (ἡρημωμένη).

²¹ John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 3.2, PG 60:35. The lemma in Ps.-Oecumenius of Tricca, *In Act.* PG 118:57d; Theophylact, *In Act.*, PG 125:524b/857b, quotes the text of Acts.

²² In some commentaries of Psalms, the lemma is quoted according to the Psalm text; cf. Theodoret, *In Psalm*, PG 80:1408c (interpreting ἡρημωμένη to the fate of Jerusalem 587 BCE and 70 CE).

2.2. Acts 1:20b/Ps 108[109]:8

In Acts 1:20b, the imperative²³ λαβέτω replaces the optative λάβοι of Ps 108[109]:8. In the manuscript tradition of Ps 108, the Codex R offers the New Testament text-form, probably influenced by Acts 1:20.²⁴ On the other hand, λάβοι is witnessed by many later manuscripts of Acts 1:20,²⁵ but also in the lemma in Ps.-Oecumenius.²⁶

3. The Second Petrine Speech

3.1. Acts 2:17/Joel 3:1

The addition λέγει ὁ θεός probably is due to Luke himself.²⁷ The formula ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐσχάταις (Acts 2:17) instead of μετὰ ταῦτα (Joel 3:1) interprets the events recorded in Acts 2 as eschatological fulfilment,²⁸ not as a prophetic announcement within history, but some Acts manuscripts offer μετὰ ταῦτα instead of ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐσχάταις or in combination with it.²⁹ The intention of the replacement of ὑμῶν by αὐτῶν in the manuscript tradition of Acts 2:17³⁰ may be “to enhance the universality of the extent of salvation.”³¹ The changing of πᾶσαν σάρκα into πάσας σάρκας in D has no parallel in the textual tradition of Joel 3:1.

Joel 3:1 reads the accusative ἐνουπνία as offered also by many manuscripts and commentaries on Acts.³² Acts 2:17 and some Septuagint manu-

²³ This imperative perhaps is to be interpreted as divine demand (STEYN, *Quotations*, 60). John Chryostom, *Hom. Act.* 3.2, PG 60:35, interprets it as spoken by the prophet.

²⁴ STEYN, *Quotations*, 58.

²⁵ Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 19.

²⁶ Ps.-Oecumenius of Tricca, *In Act.* PG 118:57d; the manuscripts of Theophylact, *In Act.*, PG 125:524b, quote sometimes λάβη, sometimes λάβοι. Theodoret, *In Psalm.*, PG 80:1757a, offers λάβοι in the lemma.

²⁷ STEYN, *Septuagint Quotations*, 79. Neither λέγει ὁ θεός nor λέγει [ὁ] κύριος (D[05] E[08] 354 467 617 629 without article, 1884 with article) has an influence on the textual transmission of Joel 3:1.

²⁸ According to BLUMHOFER, “Alteration,” 503–506, who refers to Isa 2:2 as the next parallel concerning the formula “in those days,” just this beginning already includes the participation of the nations in God’s salvation history. In the eyes of Luke, the formula πᾶσαν σάρκα is not to be restricted to the inhabitants of Judah but to the nations in general (BLUMHOFER, “Alteration,” 507–508).

²⁹ The wording μετὰ ταῦτα is offered in the Acts manuscripts B 076; the conflated reading μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is offered in C 365 467 621 1842.

³⁰ D g i r. The codices D and r omit also the third and the fourth ὑμῶν.

³¹ ELLIOTT, “Textual Study,” 26.

³² See Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 39, concerning the manuscript tradition; cf. John Chryostom, *Hom. Act.* 5.1, PG 60:50f., in the lemma and the commentary; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:59a, in the lemma; Theophylact, *In Act.*, PG 125:541a, in the lemma.

scripts³³ read the dative ἐνυπνίοις.³⁴ Ziegler and Rahlfs posit the influence of Acts 2:17 on the manuscripts of Joel 3:1 which read the dative.³⁵ According to Traugott Holtz, the dative in Acts 2:17 is not the invention of Luke but a witness for a distinct text-form. Most of the Septuagint manuscripts accommodated to the common construction with the accusative.³⁶ The accusative readings of the manuscripts of Acts and the commentaries of John Chrysostom and Ps.-Oecumenius³⁷ prove the influence of the Old Testament source on the transmission of the New Testament text.

3.2. Acts 2:18/Joel 3:2

The reading καί γε in Acts 2:18 is a witness of the καιγε-recension known to Luke.³⁸ The addition of μου probably is made by Luke himself, interpreting God's servants as the Jesus-believers.³⁹ At the end, Acts 2:18 offers the addition καί προφητεύσουσιν⁴⁰ witnessed also in some manuscripts of Joel 3:2 with Lucianic or Antiochene text-type.⁴¹ If it is true that some readings in some Lucianic manuscripts are old readings, then it is possible to assume that Luke was not the initiator but a witness of this addition.⁴²

³³ \aleph^c -V A (106, 26)-Q(544)-49/764)-198-233(710,410)-534.

³⁴ According to Strutwolf (ed.), ECM, 39, there are many witnesses for the changing of the dative into the accusative in the manuscript tradition of Acts 2:17.

³⁵ Ziegler (ed.), *Duodecim prophetae*, 235; Rahlfs (ed.), *Septuaginta II*, 522.

³⁶ HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 9f.; STEYN, *Quotations*, 89.

³⁷ John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Act.* 5.1, PG 60:50, in the lemma; Ps-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:69a, in the lemma.

³⁸ This reading is offered also in some commentaries in the lemma, cf. Ps-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:69a; Theophylact, *In Act.*, PG 125:541a (some manuscripts offer καίτοι); D* 1501 read ἐγώ, 1884 reads γὰρ μὲν.

³⁹ STEYN, *Quotations*, 81f. Within the transmission of Acts this addition is omitted in 180*. Within the Septuagint tradition, some important manuscripts do not offer this μου (W S* V), but many others read it.

⁴⁰ The New Testament Codex D and the Old Latin manuscript p omit this final clause, perhaps in harmonization with Joel 3:2 (cf. also ELLIOTT, "Textual Study," 26). There is also a difference to Irenaeus, *Haer.* 3:17.1, SC 211:330, who witnesses this phrasing in the form *ut prophetent* – this difference is one of the examples between Irenaeus and D which challenges the theory of a D-Text-Type (STRUTWOLF, "Irenäus," 153). Further, D $\text{gig r vg}^{\text{mss}}$ etc. omit the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις. This reading is not attested in the manuscript tradition of Joel 3:2.

⁴¹ 36-III(46, 86, 711)-49(613). This addition is missing in Theodoret, *In Joel.*, PG 81:6153a.

⁴² Cf. LIM, "Qumran Scholarship," 69: "Not every variant is an exegetical variant created by the author."

3.3. Acts 2:19/Joel 3:3

In Acts 2:19, the terms ἄνω, σημεῖα and κάτω are added. These terms have their parallels also in the textual tradition of Joel 3:3.⁴³ Perhaps Luke himself added σημεῖα in order to prepare for the reference to Jesus's deeds in Acts 2:22.⁴⁴ In the textual tradition of Acts, ἄνω sometimes is omitted⁴⁵ whereas the textual transmission of κάτω is thoroughgoing. Further, the phrase αἶμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτρίδα καπνοῦ is omitted by some manuscripts,⁴⁶ perhaps as unfitting to the concept of divine benevolence. Patristic and medieval authors referred this phrase to the destroying of Jerusalem 70 CE and/or the Last Judgment.⁴⁷

3.4. Acts 2:20/Joel 3:4

In the textual tradition of Acts 2:20, before ἐλθεῖν, the word ἦ sometimes is offered,⁴⁸ similarly the article τὴν before ἡμέραν⁴⁹. Both additions are not a main part of the Septuagint texts of Joel 3:2.⁵⁰ Further, the final καὶ ἐπιφανῆ is missing in some manuscripts of Acts 2,⁵¹ perhaps due to *homioarkton*⁵² whereas it is witnessed in Septuagint tradition without alternations.

3.5. Acts 2:21/Joel 3:5

The textual tradition of Acts 2:21 does not raise significant problems⁵³; the textual traditions seem to be independent from one another. Why did Luke

⁴³ For ἄνω cf. S^c 22^c-36-III-49''-407 198 233', for σημεῖα cf. S^c-V 22^c-36-III-49'' 26 239^{ms}. For κάτω cf. 36-LII(46, 86^{ms}, 711)-49(764, 613). STEYN, *Quotations*, 83, considers this reading part of the source text for Luke. All three elements are mentioned in Cyril of Alexandria, *In Joel*, PG 71:381c, in the lemma.

⁴⁴ RESE, *Motive*, 49; STEYN, *Quotations*, 84–86. This term is omitted only in L156S.

⁴⁵ A 69 94.

⁴⁶ D it.

⁴⁷ Theodoret, *In Joel*, PG 81:1653d (Last Judgement, due to Luke 21:25); Ps-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:69c (both); Theophylact, *In Act.*, PG 125:541d (both).

⁴⁸ B 1739 Byz. There are many manuscripts of Acts, however, where ἦ is omitted (see Strutwolf, *ECM*, 41), in accordance with the main textual tradition of Joel 3:4. In Joel 3:4, ἦ is added only in W(?) III-613 130'-239 106. The editors of Acts in *ECM* decided to integrate ἦ in the guiding line.

⁴⁹ 74 κ² A C E Ψ 1739 Byz. It is omitted by κ* B D 076, in accordance with Joel 3:4. The editors of *ECM* decided to integrate the article τὴν before ἡμέραν in the guiding line. Some manuscripts of the JI-txt omit the article (W B-S-V Q'-26-49' 198 534'), the rest offer it.

⁵⁰ They are witnessed in Theodoret, *In Joel*, PG 81:1653c, in the lemma.

⁵¹ κ D 886 gig r.

⁵² ELLIOTT, "Textual Study," 26.

⁵³ The word ἔσται is omitted in 2495, πᾶς in 35* 180* 383 467 630. Some manuscripts read ἐπικαλέσεται (94 330 808 L60) instead of ἐπικαλέσεται, whereas the reading

Testament manuscripts (8* B) did not influence the textual transmission of Ps 15. The final words ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι supported the use of this text as a proof for the concept of physical resurrection, but it is disputed whether this was the conception also of the translator⁶³ or not.⁶⁴

In Acts 2:27a, the textual tradition is divided between ἄδην and ἄδου, similarly as in Ps 15:10a. Further, Ps 15:10b and Acts 2:27b read οὐδέ. In Acts 2:27b, ms. 1409 offers οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου εἰς διαφθοράν instead of οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν⁶⁵, an obvious smoothing out. There are no parallels listed in Rahlfs's edition of Psalms. The finishing clausula in Ps 15:11 (τερπύοντες ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου εἰς τέλος)⁶⁶ did not influence the textual transmission of Acts 2:28.

4. The Third Petrine Speech

4.1. Acts 3:22–23; 7:37/Deut 18:15, 18, 19; Lev 23:29

The word order of Acts 3:22 is in accordance with Deut 18:18, and the comparative particle ὡς, witnessed throughout in Acts 3:22,⁶⁷ is taken from Deut 18:15.⁶⁸ The second person singular is changed to the second person plural,⁶⁹ as an adaptation to the setting of the speech (cf. ἀδελφοί, Acts

97:140–141 presuppose *lingua* (in lemma and commentary). The rendering γλώσσά μου could be a content-based rendering (SCHMITT, “Ps 16,8–11,” 235; SIFFER-WIEDERHOLD, “Psalm 15[16],” 1532–1533) or a free rendering of another vocalization of the defectively written כבד (כבד; liver; GUNKEL, *Psalmen*, 54) or יוֹשֵׁל (tongue; SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 49 footnote 187, who admits the difficulties of this suggestion). We could, however, explain the reading γλώσσα as an inner-Greek variant from ΔΟΞΑ to ΓΛΩΣΣΑ.

⁶³ SCHAPER, *Eschatology*, 49.

⁶⁴ AEJMELEAUS, “Faith, Hope, and Interpretation”; PIETERSMA, “Psalm 15,” 526–527.

⁶⁵ Only this reading made Ps 15,8–11 applicable for Luke's reference to Jesus' resurrection (RESE, *Motive*, 57). In ancient Christian exegesis, Luke's reception is not always obliging: Theodor of Mopsuestia, *In Ps.*, CCSL 88 A:81, refers *sanctum* to Israel in comparison to the nations which do not have any knowledge of God.

⁶⁶ It has been debated why Luke does not quote the end of Ps 15:11. “Possibly Luke sees the ‘delight’ in the risen Christ's reception of the Spirit to be poured out” (FITZMYER, “Use of the Old Testament,” 537–538).

⁶⁷ Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 92.

⁶⁸ Deut 18:18 reads throughout ὡσπερ; the occurrence of ὡσπερ in Acts 3:17; 11:15 provides assurance that Luke had no tendency to avoid this word.

⁶⁹ The omission of ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν after the first ὑμῶν, due to a homoioteleuton, in 621 1838 (621 and 1838* read only ἡμῶν, 1838^c reads ὑμῶν), has no parallels in the textual tradition of Deut 18:15, 18. The same is true for the omission of κατὰ πάντα in L1825.

3:17). Luke may have quoted from memory,⁷⁰ which would explain the additional *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* at the end of the verse. The hexaplaric reading *ἐκ μέσου σου* of Deut 18:15, corresponding to the MT,⁷¹ is nowhere witnessed in the manuscripts of Acts or in ancient reception of Acts 3:22, as is the case also with the reading *καὶ τὰ πάντα* instead of *κατὰ πάντα* in LXX-ms. 616. The verb *ἀκούω* in Acts 3:22 is offered in four different variants: *ἀκούσετε* (43 Or), *ἀκούσασθε* (180 636 1243⁷²), *ἀκούεσθε*⁷³ (383*) and *ἀκούετε* (1838). Neither the transposition *hunc sicut me audietis* (= αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐμὲ ἀκούσεσθε) in the Gospel Commentary of Fortunatianus of Aquileia⁷⁴ nor the replacement of *ἀνίστημι* by *ἐγείρω* in Epiphanius's works⁷⁵ had any consequence for the transmission of either the Old Testament or the New Testament texts. At the end of Acts 3:23,⁷⁶ some manuscripts add *αὐτῆς* after *λαοῦ*, in accordance with Lev 23:29.⁷⁷

The quotation in Acts 7:37 offers abbreviations in comparison to Acts 3:22: the reading *κύριος ὁ θεός* in Acts 3:22, in accordance with Deut 18:15, is shortened to *ὁ θεός*⁷⁸; the concluding words *αὐτοῦ ἀκούεσθε* of Deut 18:15, repeated in Acts 3:22, are omitted. The omission can be interpreted as pure abridgment. However, if the main issue of Acts 7:37 is the parallelism between Moses and Jesus with regard to their fate (and not the admonition to listen),⁷⁹ then the omission can be justified also with regard to the content.

4.2. Acts 3:25/Deut 18:15, 18, 19; Lev 23:29

In the textual tradition of Acts 3:25, sometimes *εὐλογηθήσονται* A*vid B Ψ (044) 523) or *ἐπευλογηθήσονται* instead of *ἐνευλογηθήσονται* is offered.

⁷⁰ On the basis of Jewish texts like 4Q175, the thesis of an early Christian *testimonium* sometimes is debated (cf. NOTLEY, "Kingdom," 295–296; BARRETT, *Acts*, 210); STEYN, *Quotations*, 142, correctly characterizes such these as "problematic, questionable and unprovable."

⁷¹ WEVERS, *Notes on Deuteronomy*, 301.

⁷² *ἀκούσασθε* is also witnessed once in the textual tradition of Deut 18:15 (ms. 610).

⁷³ *ἀκούεσθε* is also witnessed twice in the textual tradition of Deut 18:15 (ms. 246 122).

⁷⁴ Gäbel, "Quotations," 69.

⁷⁵ Vde. WEVERS/QUAST, *Deuteronomium*, 225.

⁷⁶ The Venerable Bede, *Retract. Act.*, CCSL 121:121, observing the differences between Acts 3:23 and Deut 18:15–19 on the grounds that Peter was attending to the meaning of Moses's saying, not of the exact wording.

⁷⁷ 94 180 307 453 610 614 1448c 1501 1678 1875 2374 2412 2652 2818. The variant *αὐτοῦ* is offered by 467 1751.

⁷⁸ Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:145b offers the full formula *κύριος ὁ θεός* in the lemma; this may, however, be only a witness to common biblical language; it is no witness for a reading of Acts 7:37 in accordance with Acts 3:22.

⁷⁹ RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, 137.

Gen 22:18; 26:4 read *καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς*. The replacing of *ἔθνη* by *πατριάι* could be a conscious replacing: whereas *ἔθνη* normally names non-Jewish people, *πατριάι* includes also the Jews. In a speech addressed to Jews it would be futile to restrict God's blessing only to non-Jews.⁸⁰

5. The Prayer of the Congregation in Jerusalem

Acts 4:25–26/Ps 2:1–2

The Greek manuscript traditions of Ps 2:1–2 and of Acts 4:25–26 are in almost full concordance.⁸¹ The Latin tradition offers *fremuerunt* (La, Ga) and *tumultuatae sunt* (Tertullian). The Venerable Bede reads *fremuerunt* in his *Retractatio in Acta*.⁸²

6. Stephen's Speech

6.1. Acts 7:3/Gen 12:1

Acts 7:3 offers a shortened reading by omission of *ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου*.⁸³ The addition *δεῦρο* before *εἰς τὴν γῆν*, as found throughout in the manuscript tradition of Acts, is also witnessed in Septuagint manuscripts.⁸⁴ The second *ἐκ* of Acts 7:3 is omitted in some manuscripts (B D), whereas the omission of the article before *γῆν* is witnessed more often.⁸⁵

6.2. Acts 7:6/Gen 15:13

Acts 7:6 reads *ἐν γῆ ἀλλοτρίᾳ* instead of *ἐν γῆ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ* (Gen 15:13) and omits *καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς*, probably due to a pre-Lukan tendency of harmonizing with the Hebrew text in the tradition of the Septuagint.⁸⁶ The

⁸⁰ RESE, *Motive*, 73.

⁸¹ In the textual tradition of Acts 4:25, ms. 886 omits *καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κένα*. At the end of Acts 4:26, ms. 2374 offers *αὐτῶν* instead of *αὐτοῦ*. Ms. 2243 completely omits *κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ*.

⁸² The Venerable Bede, *Retr. Act*, CCSL 121:124.

⁸³ This abridgment is witnessed also in John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 15.2, PG 60:121. On the other hand, this omission is reversed by E(08) 218 945^c 1243 1270 1297 1359 1501 1505 1595 1704 1718 1884 2243 2495 2774 L587.

⁸⁴ 52* 53 n 343' 121-318) M 17'-82-135-426 C'' b d 53-246 n s 46 370 y z 54 59 509 730.

⁸⁵ In the textual tradition of Gen 12:1 the omission of the article is also attested.

⁸⁶ RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, 131–132. The phrase *καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς* is omitted also in ms. 55 of Gen 15:13.

word order τετρακόσια ἔτη (Gen 15:13) is throughout changed to ἔτη τετρακόσια. In these cases, the textual tradition of Gen 15:13 did not influence the transmission of Acts 7:6. Within the textual tradition of Acts 7:6, the first αὐτό (after δουλώσουσιν) is sometimes replaced by αὐτῶ⁸⁷ or αὐτούς⁸⁸ but not in patristic commentaries.⁸⁹ Only a few manuscripts of Acts 7:6 offer a second personal pronoun (αὐτό) after καλώσουσιν.⁹⁰ Within the textual tradition of Gen 15:13, ms 72 witnesses ἀλλοτρίᾳ analogous to Acts 7:6; Codex Alexandrinus witnesses αὐτό after δουλώσουσιν instead of αὐτούς, followed by Christian authors.⁹¹ The second αὐτούς of Gen 15:13 (after καλώσουσιν) is sometimes missing in Christian texts⁹² or replaced by αὐτό in the works of some Christian authors.⁹³ Acts 7:7b may be an allusion to Exod 3:12 but whereas Exod 3:12 refers to the Mountain Horeb, Acts 7:7 refers to the temple in Jerusalem.⁹⁴

6.3. Acts 7:18/Exod 1:8

In Acts 7:18, in some manuscripts⁹⁵ and patristic quotations,⁹⁶ the words ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον are missing⁹⁷; in the manuscript tradition of Exod 1:8, these words are witnessed without variation. A secondary addition could be explained as an accommodation to Exod 1:8. On the other hand, the omission of the words ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον could be the result of stylistic improvement. Therefore, Acts 7:18 is by no means an independent witness of a text-form of Exod 1:8 lacking these words. Variants to ἔτερος (an unusual rendering for ὄπι, found only here) in the Greek transmission of the book of Exodus⁹⁸ are not relevant for the textual criticism of Acts 7:18. Further, there

⁸⁷ Ψ33. 6. 33. 1175. 2495* et al. (vde. Strutwolf [ed.], *ECM*, 193). This has no parallel in the Septuagint textual tradition.

⁸⁸ D lat.

⁸⁹ John Chrysostom and Ps.-Oecumenius closely follow the main textual tradition of Acts (John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 16.1, PG 60:127; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:133b).

⁹⁰ In rendering Acts 7:6, ms 254 adds παραδώσουσιν between the two verbs. This has no parallel in the Septuagint tradition of Gen 15:13.

⁹¹ John Chrysostom, *Hom. adv. Iud.* 5,5, PG 48:890; id., *Hom. Drosidam martyrem* 5, PG 50:690.

⁹² John Chrysostom, *Hom. Gen.* 37.2, PG 53:344, in the lemma.

⁹³ John Chrysostom, *Hom. adv. Iud.* 5.5, PG 48:890.

⁹⁴ RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, 132. Insofar as Stephen can rebuke the insult that he would be disloyal to the Temple.

⁹⁵ Ψ45 (vid.) D E 81 614.1241.

⁹⁶ John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 16.1, PG 60:128; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:133d.

⁹⁷ They are offered by Ψ33 Ψ74, ⲛ A B C etc.

⁹⁸ WEVERS, *Notes on Exodus*, 3: The later revisers translated ὄπι by καινός.

are no cross-influences between the variants to οὐκ ᾔδει τὸν Ἰωσήφ in Exod 1:8⁹⁹ and Acts 7:18.¹⁰⁰

6.4. Acts 7:27–28, 35/Exod 2:14

The textual transmission of Exod 2:14¹⁰¹ offers some variants: εἰς ἄνδρα, ἡμᾶς instead of ἡμῶν,¹⁰² μή instead of ἦ,¹⁰³ omission of σύ,¹⁰⁴ θέλης instead of θέλεις.¹⁰⁵ Within the textual transmission of Acts 7:27, 35, we find ἡμῶν and ἡμᾶς side-by-side¹⁰⁶; the word order σὺ θέλεις sometimes is changed to θέλεις σύ (1837); in some manuscripts the personal pronoun σύ is omitted.¹⁰⁷ The negation μή¹⁰⁸ is witnessed throughout, whereas some variants of Exod 2:14 (εἰς ἄνδρα; θέλης) do not have any parallel in the transmission of Acts 7:27–28.

6.5. Acts 7:33/Exod 3:5

Acts 7:33 offers λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου instead of λῦσαι τὸ ὑπόδημα ἐκ τῶν ποδῶν σου (Exod 3:5), ἐφ' ᾧ (cf. Josh 5:15) instead of ἐν ᾧ, and only seldom offers σύ before ἔστηκας.¹⁰⁹ The wording λῦσον is also part of Septuagint tradition¹¹⁰, similarly the omission of ἐκ¹¹¹ or the variant ἐφ'¹¹². In the textual transmission of Acts 7:33, the specific elements of the Septuagint tradition are witnessed with diverging density. Whereas λῦσαι is offered by only a few manuscripts,¹¹³ the prepositions ἐκ and ἐν are read by a lot of manuscripts.¹¹⁴ Insofar, the readings λῦσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου and ἐν ᾧ in the commentaries of John Chrysostom and Ps.-Oecumenius¹¹⁵ are not surprising.

⁹⁹ Ms 55, 319: οὐκ εἶδη τ. I.; ms 75: οὐκ ἐγινωσκε τ. I.

¹⁰⁰ D E gig p: οὐκ ἐμνήσθη τοῦ Ἰωσήφ.

¹⁰¹ WEVERS, *Notes on Exodus*, 18–19.

¹⁰² 58*-72-82'-376*-381' etc.

¹⁰³ A F M 15*-29'-135-376'.

¹⁰⁴ 426-707 25-52'-54* etc.

¹⁰⁵ 58-376 108 56' 84.

¹⁰⁶ The same is true for the textual transmission of Exod 2:14.

¹⁰⁷ 0142 81 321 436 614 636* 996 1891 2147 2412.

¹⁰⁸ The lemma in The Venerable Bede, *Expos. Act.*, CCSL 121:35 reads *et*.

¹⁰⁹ 88 378 467 468 915 1175 2243.

¹¹⁰ 72-618 b 121.527 z 55.

¹¹¹ 72-707-708 77 71*.

¹¹² Ms 130.

¹¹³ D^{c2} 61 321.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 222.

¹¹⁵ John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 16.3, PG 60:130; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:144b.

6.6. Acts 7:32/Exod 3:6

Instead of the singular (θεός) τοῦ πατρός σου, Acts 7:32 (throughout) and some mss. of Exod 3:6 offer the plural (θεός) τῶν πατέρων σου (58' 84), SamP also witnesses the plural (יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ). John William Wevers suggests an influence of Acts 7:32 on the Exodus manuscripts which offer the plural reading but admits that three fathers are listed in the following text, which justifies the plural.¹¹⁶ Perhaps this variant is an exegetical correction, independently made by SamP, Luke, and some Septuagint scribes.

6.7. Acts 7:34/Exod 3:7

Exod 3:7 offers κραυγῆς; Acts 7:34 reads στεναγμοῦ,¹¹⁷ perhaps as an allusion to Exod 2:24.¹¹⁸ Neither κραυγῆς nor the variant φωνῆς¹¹⁹ in the textual tradition of Exod 3:7 influenced the textual transmission of Acts 7:34. On the other hand, στεναγμοῦ is nowhere witnessed in the textual tradition of Exod 3:7. The perfect ἀκήκοα is witnessed throughout the manuscript tradition of Exod 3:7, sometimes also in the textual tradition of Acts 7:34.¹²⁰

6.8. Acts 7:40/Exod 32:1 parr. Exod 32:23

The texts differ only at one point, at the end: whereas Exod 32:1, 23 reads without any variation the perfect γέγονεν, the majority of manuscripts in Acts 7:40 read the imperfect ἐγένετο. In many manuscripts of Acts 7:40, however, the imperfect is corrected to the perfect of the source text.¹²¹

6.9. Acts 7:42–43/Amos 5:25–27

The end of Acts 7:42¹²² offers three elements in different order. Many manuscripts offer ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ οἶκος Ἰσραήλ; ms. 1563 offers ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα οἶκος Ἰσραήλ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; Cod. Alexandrinus of-

¹¹⁶ WEVERS, *Notes on Exodus*, 28.

¹¹⁷ Cf. also John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 16.3, PG 60:131; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:144c. A few manuscripts of Act 7:34 (436 621 1842) offer the plural τοῦς στεναγμούς.

¹¹⁸ KILGALLEN, Stephen Speech, 75 n. 48.

¹¹⁹ Ms 72 619.

¹²⁰ D 181 1175 1501.

¹²¹ D E Ψ 33. 61 81 88 181 431 614 1241 etc. (vde. Stutwolf [ed.], *ECM*, 232); John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 17.13, PG 60:135; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:145d, in the lemma.

¹²² The modern explanation of “the book of prophets” is also found in The Venerable Bede, *Retract. Act.*, CCSL 121:132: the Singular refers to the collection of the prophecies of the Twelve Prophets in one book.

fers ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα; other manuscripts offer ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ.¹²³ Sometimes ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ is omitted.¹²⁴ Within the textual tradition of Amos 5:25, Cod. Alexandrinus is in concordance with its text as written in Acts 7:42.¹²⁵ The word order οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ¹²⁶ has no parallel in the textual transmission of Acts 7:42. The phrase ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ is witnessed by Codex Vaticanus, which is here close to the Masoretic Text, but also by other manuscripts of Amos 5:25.¹²⁷ The word order ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα (Acts 7:42) vs. τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη (Amos 5:25) is stable in the distinct textual traditions; perhaps Acts 7:42 quotes a source text where the changing of word order already had happened.¹²⁸

The addition to the rebuke, προσκυνεῖν, in Acts 7:43 is not witnessed in the textual tradition of Amos 5:26 and not discussed in ancient Christian exegesis of Amos 5.¹²⁹ The omission of ὑμῶν after θεοῦ in Act 7:43 does not have any parallel in the textual tradition of Amos 5:26.¹³⁰ The difference between Βαβυλῶνος (Acts 7:43) and Δαμασκοῦ (Amos 5:27) is relatively stable in the textual traditions¹³¹ and is debated also in ancient Christian exegesis where Stephen's departure from the source text is to be justified.¹³²

6.10. Acts 7:49–50/Isa 66:1–2

In both Acts 7:49 and Isa 66:1, the personal pronoun before θρόνος is read by the vast majority as μοι, sometimes as μου.¹³³ The word order θρόνος μου, offered by some hexaplaric manuscripts of Isa 66:1, has no parallel in

¹²³ 18 35 206S 323 429 522 630 636 (*f) 945 1490 1509 1739 1751 1831S 1891 2299 2298. The manuscript 1704 adds the article ὁ before οἶκος.

¹²⁴ B*.C² 365 1251.

¹²⁵ In general, one observes that the NT text traditions exhibit a closeness to the Alexandrian group of Septuagint manuscripts (cf. UTZSCHNEIDER, "Bones," 288, 292 et al.).

¹²⁶ C-68 233'.

¹²⁷ V-239-Q-26'-49'-198-407 III.

¹²⁸ STOWASSER, "Am 5,25", 56. The textual tradition of Acts 7:42 is divided between τεσσαράκοντα and τεσσαράκοντα.

¹²⁹ It would be expected in Jerome, *In Am.* 2:5.25–27, CCSL 76:296–298; Julian of Eclanum, *In Am.* 2:5.25–37, CCSL 88:296–298; Theodoret, *In Am.*, PG 81:1692d–1693a.

¹³⁰ The personal pronoun is omitted in B D 94 307 453 610 886* 2818. This list represents an "incoherent attestation" (WACHTEL, "Commentary," 13). The inclusion of ὑμῶν is the *lectio difficilior* (WACHTEL, "Commentary," 13).

¹³¹ In the textual tradition of Acts 7:43, we find no harmonization with Amos 5:27. On the other side, within the textual tradition of Amos 5:27, we sometimes find (Q^{ms} b 26) harmonization with Acts 7:43.

¹³² Cf. my study "New Testament Quotations within Patristic Literature," in this Volume (pp. 317–320).

¹³³ Acts 7:49 according to P74, D*; Isa 66:1 according to Q B 565.

the textual tradition of Acts.¹³⁴ On the other side, the addition of ἔστιν before (D) or after θρόνος (1729) in Acts 7:49 has no parallel in the textual tradition of Isa 66:1. In accordance with the MT, some manuscripts or manuscript groups change from ἡ δὲ γῆ to καὶ ἡ γῆ;¹³⁵ in the manuscript tradition of Acts 7:49 this has a parallel only in Codex Vaticanus. In the textual traditions of both Acts 7:49 and Isa 66:1, a form of οἰκοδομέω is offered as οἰκοδομήσετε or οἰκοδομήσατε. In the following, Isa 66:1 reads ποῖος τόπος, whereas Acts 7:49 offers τίς τόπος¹³⁶ and Acts 7:49 D reads ποῖος τόπος, in accordance with Isa 66:1. On the other hand, the variant τίς τόπος influenced also the textual transmission of Isa 66:1.¹³⁷ So we may infer a mutual influence only in some details.

Acts 7:50 quotes the beginning of Isa 66:2 as an interrogative sentence,¹³⁸ but this did not influence the transmission of Isaiah.¹³⁹ The order of ταῦτα and πάντα is uncertain in both traditions. In Acts 7:50, the majority reads ταῦτα πάντα but important witnesses offer πάντα ταῦτα, according to the main tradition of Isa 66:2.¹⁴⁰ In Acts 7:50, there is a tendency to correct the text of Acts to correspond with the text of Isaiah.

7. Philip's Argument

7.1. Acts 8:32/Isa 53:7

In Acts 8:32, the textual tradition is divided between κείραντος or κείροντος and οὕτως (the majority) or οὕτως (a strong minority), whereas in the textual tradition of Isa 53:7 κείραντος¹⁴¹ and οὕτως¹⁴² are only seldom witnessed.

7.2. Acts 8:33/Isa 53:8

In Acts 8:33, the first αὐτοῦ (after ταπεινώσει) is omitted by some important old manuscripts¹⁴³ and therefore in the *Editio Critica Maior* re-

¹³⁴ oII (= 109-736).

¹³⁵ O L⁻ 62-86^c-456 449' 538 544.

¹³⁶ Cf. also John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 17.1, PG 60:135; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:149a, in the lemma; The Venerable Bede, *Expos. Act.*, CCSL 121:37.

¹³⁷ Cf. 26-86^{txt} 534.

¹³⁸ Cf. also John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 17.1, PG 60:135; Ps.-Oecumenius, *In Act.*, PG 118:149a, in the lemma.

¹³⁹ Ziegler (ed.), *Isaiah*, 364.

¹⁴⁰ ʔ74 A C D E(08) 025 69 319 365 398 2147 2298 2652 2805 L23 L156. In the manuscript tradition of Isa 66:2, ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα is offered only in oI cl.

¹⁴¹ S^c A' V 763-62-86^c-233^{txt}-456.

¹⁴² V-88 51^c-233.

¹⁴³ ʔ74^{vid} 8 A B C 103 629 876 1642* 1739 2298.

garded as uncertain; some manuscripts of Isa 53:8 also offer this αὐτοῦ.¹⁴⁴ Before γενεάν, many manuscripts in Acts, but also some manuscripts of Isa 53:8, insert δέ.¹⁴⁵ We observe mutual influence of the two traditions here.

8. Paul's Speech in Antioch

8.1. Acts 13:22/Ps 88[89]:21; 1Sam 13:14

The phrasing εὐρον Δαυιδ is unanimously attested in both Acts 13:22 and Ps 88[89]:21; τὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦαί¹⁴⁶ occurs only in 1Clem 18.1 and Act 13:22 (neither Ps 88:21 nor 1Sam 13:14 is the LXX-Vorlage).¹⁴⁷ Therefore, some authors suggest a testimony book as common source. Other authors have expressed weighty methodological concerns: 4Q174 only shows that there were testimony books in ancient Judaism. Whether (Ps.-)Cyprian, *Testimonia*, had literary predecessors in Christian circles, cannot be proved.¹⁴⁸ The reading ἄνθρωπον of 1Kgdms 13:14 did not influence the textual transmission of Acts 13:22 where ἄνδρα is witnessed without alternatives.¹⁴⁹

8.2. Acts 13:33/Ps 2:7

The Greek manuscript traditions of Ps 2:7–8 and of Acts 13:33 are in full concordance.¹⁵⁰ This is true also with regard to the plus in Acts 13:33 cod. D et al., the quotation of Ps 2:8. In some manuscripts of Acts 13:33, the source text is named “Psalm 1”¹⁵¹ which has elicited various attempts to

¹⁴⁴ 106 L''-147-46-86^c-233 764 403' 407 534.

¹⁴⁵ For Acts cf. Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 280, for Isa 53:8 cf. 26-86-106 V 147-36-93-46-456 309 239' 403' 407 534, Cyril of Alexandria, *In Jes.*, PG 70:1177a, in the lemma, but not in the lemma of Theodoret, *In Is.*, SC 315:154. The reading τε instead of δέ (Acts 8:33 according to 044) has no influence on the textual tradition of Isa 53.

¹⁴⁶ In the textual tradition of Acts 13:22, τὸν δοῦλόν μου instead of τὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦαί is witnessed in ms 1838. This is a clear case of harmonization to the Old Testament source.

¹⁴⁷ With this combination of quotations, the author of *I Clement* in the context of the quotation of Ps 51:3–19 (1Clem 18.2–17) recommends David's humility to the Corinthians as a model: David is humble, despite the divine witness concerning him.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. RESE, *Motive*, 217–223 on the history of research; STEYN, *Quotations*, 232.

¹⁴⁹ The concluding ὅς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου has no basis in the Septuagint, but its analogue in TgJon 1Sam 13:14 (BARRETT, *Acts*, 636).

¹⁵⁰ It is much disputed whether ἀναστήσει in the quotation refers to Jesus's coming in general (RESE, *Motive*, 86; BARRETT, *Acts*, 645, referring to Acts 3:22) or to his resurrection and exaltation (STEYN, *Quotations*, 176, referring to the following context).

¹⁵¹ D gig. STEYN, *Quotations*, 170–171, refers to similar rabbinic traditions (e.g. bBer 9b). Whereas ELLIOTT, “Textual Study,” 27, regard this reading as *lectio difficilior* and therefore original, WACHTEL, “‘Western Text’,” 143, considers it a later idiosyncrasy of the so-called “Western” tradition in comparison to Byzantine text tradition.

solve this problem.¹⁵² Other manuscripts, however, are correct in naming the source text $\psi\alpha\lambda\mu$ B.¹⁵³

8.3. Acts 13:34/Isa 55:3

Both textual traditions diverge with regard to the verb: Acts 13:34 throughout offers $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$,¹⁵⁴ Isa 55:3 $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$. The two textual traditions did not influence one another in this regard. Similarly, the motif of $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\kappa\eta$ $\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma$ in Isa 55:3 is not received in the tradition of Acts 13:34; due to the nearly undisputed $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$,¹⁵⁵ Christian scribes would not have attributed the everlasting covenant to (potentially unbelieving) Jews. But it may be true also for Luke: “The *promise* which was made to David, and which was fulfilled in Jesus replaces thus the idea of the *covenant* which God has entered into with Israel.”¹⁵⁶

8.4. Acts 13:35/Ps 15[16]:10b

There are no great problems of textual transmission. Within the quote in Acts 13:35, the introductory $\omicron\upsilon$ is witnessed throughout. Acts 13:35 offers the simple $\omicron\upsilon$ instead of $\omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in the source text. This variant, in Ps 15:10b witnessed also by Ga (non Vulg), corresponds also to MT. However, this does not prove Luke’s sudden textual closeness to MT but can be regarded as redactional change by Luke. It is the first quoted word, and there is no necessity for a copulative element.

8.5. Acts 13:41/Hab 1:5

Within the manuscript tradition of Acts 13:41,¹⁵⁷ sometimes $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ or $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ instead of $\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ is offered,¹⁵⁸ but this does not have parallels

¹⁵² According to Hilary of Poitiers, *In Psalm.*, SC 515:214–216, Paul as a “Hebrew from Hebrews” (Phil 3:5) used a Hebrew text which did not include any numbering. Jerome, *Comm. Ps.* 1, CCSL 72:178–179, lists some possible reasons why Ps 1 has no titulus; one of them he describes: *Aliter: apud Hebraeos et primus et secundus unus est psalmus, quod in apostolorum quoque Actibus conprobatur.* The Venerable Bede, *Expos. Act.*, CCSL 121:63, accepts this explanation. Cassiodorus, *Expos. Ps.*, CC.S 97:39, emphasizes that Ps 2 is the first of the Psalms which has a *titulus*. In Theodore of Mopsuestia, *In Ps.*, CCSL 88 A:5, 10, 15; Theodoret, *In Ps.*, PG 80:865b–869a, 873b–d; Augustine, *En. Ps.*, CCSL 38:1, 4, we do not find anything on this problem; The inattention to this problem may be due to limited dissemination of this reading.

¹⁵³ SCHMID, “Diplé,” 86, concerning Codex Sinaiticus.

¹⁵⁴ Is $\delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega$ introduced by Luke with regard to Acts 13:35 (RESE, *Motive*, 86)? Isa 55:3 names the consequences and Ps 15[16]:10 the reality of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

¹⁵⁵ Only in ms. 2774 of Acts 13:34, $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ is replaced by $\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\acute{\omega}$.

¹⁵⁶ STEYN, *Quotations*, 179 (italics Steyn).

¹⁵⁷ The scribe of Codex Sinaiticus identified this quotation as stemming from Joel. Similarly, he erroneously attributed the quotation of Mic 5:1 in Matt 2:6 as stemming

within the text tradition of Hab 1:5; the same is the case with the omission of *καὶ ἀφανίσθητε* in ms. 630 2200 (Acts 13:41). Instead of *θαυμάσατε*, some manuscripts of Acts 13:41 read *θαυμάσετε* (κ 319) or *θαυμάζετε* (61). Other manuscripts include elements of the textual tradition of Hab 1:5 which are not represented in the main tradition of Acts, but in different ways: *θαυμάσατε καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε*¹⁵⁹ or *ἐπιβλέψατε καὶ θαυμάσατε*,¹⁶⁰ according to the word order in Hab 1:5. A few manuscripts of Acts 13:41 include also *θαυμάσια*, in accordance with the source text.¹⁶¹ Within the textual tradition of Hab 1:5, the omission of *καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε* is witnessed only in ms. 763. Codex Q* offers *θαυμάσετε* instead of *θαυμάσατε*. The addition of *καὶ ἴδετε* before *θαυμάσια*¹⁶² has no parallel in the textual tradition of Acts 13:41. In this cluster of problems, we observe stable independent transmissions of Acts 13:41 and Hab 1:5.

In the following, the transmission of *ὅτι* (Acts 13:41) vs. *διότι* (Hab 1:5) is stable, without reciprocal influence. That is not true for the word order within the phrase *ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγώ* (Acts 13:41)/*ἔργον ἐγώ ἐργάζομαι* (Hab 1:5). Within the textual tradition of Acts 13:41,¹⁶³ the word order of the main tradition line in Hab 1:5 is witnessed in a lot of manuscripts, beginning with C E(08) 044 097,¹⁶⁴ whereas the word order of Acts 13:41 has no influence on the transmission of Hab 1:5. The second *ἔργον* in Acts 13:41¹⁶⁵, omitted by many manuscripts including D E (08),¹⁶⁶ has no parallel in the textual tradition of Hab 1:5. The same is the case with the variant *πιστεύετε* (025). The last verb is read in both texts in the main tradition as

from Isaiah. On the other hand, he correctly identifies texts of Psalms and Pentateuch. This demonstrates that he was more familiar with these books than with the Twelve Prophets (SCHMID, “Diplé,” 94).

¹⁵⁸ *ἀκούσατε*: E (08); *ἀκούσετε*: 1884. Also The Venerable Bede, *Retract. Act.*, CCSL 121:148, is aware of this variant (*In Graeco ita scriptum est: Audite...*).

¹⁵⁹ The copula is omitted in E 08 and 1884; ms. 1884 reads *θαυμάσετε* instead of *θαυμάσατε*.

¹⁶⁰ Vde. Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 476. Ms. 996 reads *θαυμάσετε* instead of *θαυμάσατε*.

¹⁶¹ Ms. 1827, further ms. 88 915, reading *ἐμβλέψατε* instead of *ἐπιβλέψατε*. According to SIFFER, “citation de Habaquq,” 502, *θαυμάσια* probably is omitted in order to achieve a fluid style. Perhaps Luke intended to avoid a Semitism (BARRETT, *Acts*, 652).

¹⁶² *L'* -407-613.

¹⁶³ In the textual tradition of Acts 13:41, *ἐγώ* sometimes is transposed to the first place (441 621 1842) or omitted (014S 180* 2298* 2805). The omission has no parallel in the Greek manuscript tradition of Hab 1:5.

¹⁶⁴ Vde. Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 476.

¹⁶⁵ In the context of Acts 13, it probably refers to God’s activity in the mission of Barnabas and Paul (SIFFER, “citation de Habaquq 1,5,” 503, referring to Acts 13:2; 14:26 where *ἔργον* also is used). Alternatively, it can refer to God’s work which he has done in Christ.

¹⁶⁶ Vde. Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 477.

ἐκδιηγῆται. All variants to this reading are witnessed in both Acts 13:41 and Hab 1:5.¹⁶⁷

Due to *καταφρονηταί* (this term refers not to non-Jews but to unbelieving Jews), the source text was important for Luke, but this reading has its analogy in 1QpHab II 5 where ראו בגוים instead of ראו הבוגדים is presupposed.¹⁶⁸ In the Lukan context this quotation “functions as a warning to the diaspora Jews and the God-fearers of Antioch in Pisidia not to repeat the mistake made by the Jerusalemites and their leaders.”¹⁶⁹

8.6. Acts 13:47/Isa 49:6

The variation between *τέθεικα* and *τέθηκα* in Acts 13:47,¹⁷⁰ and the divergences in the word order concerning *τέθεικά σε εις φῶς* (*τέθεικα φῶς σε* in D[05]c1 vs. *φῶς σε τέθεικα* in D[05]*), the dative *τοῖς ἔθνεσιν* instead of *ἔθνων* (D[05]) and the omission of *τοῦ* before *εἶναι*,¹⁷¹ seemingly are not relevant for the textual transmission of Isa 49:6. On the other hand, in the textual tradition of Isa 49:6 sometimes *δέδωκα* instead of *τέθεικα* is offered.¹⁷² This has no analogy in the textual tradition of Acts 13:47. The same is true for the addition *εἰς διαθήκην γένους* after *σε*.¹⁷³

The omission of *σε* after *εἶναι*, however, is witnessed in both textual traditions,¹⁷⁴ but that may be occasional. We may conclude that the textual traditions were transmitted independently from one another.

With the quotation of Isa 49:6, Luke ends the Pauline speech to Jews in Antioch. Barnabas and Paul “turn in their missionary work to evangelize

¹⁶⁷ ἐκδιηγῆσεται (Acts 13:41 according to 61 330 1241 1838; Hab 1:5 according to S* Q^c), ἐκδιηγῆται (Acts 13:41 according to D 88 103 326 441 467 621 915 1837; Hab 1:5 according to Q*-534); διηγῆται (180 2774; Hab 1:5 according to ms 544).

¹⁶⁸ FITZMYER, “Use of the Old Testament,” 535; STEYN, *Quotations*, 189. Jerome, *In Hab.*, CCSL 76 A:584, justifies the translation of the Septuagint by appeal to context.

¹⁶⁹ STEYN, *Quotations*, 193. The quotation of Hab 1:5^{LXX} in Acts 13:41 exacerbates the character of Paul’s charge.

¹⁷⁰ The verb *τίθημι* can justify the strong *ἐντέταλται* which characterizes the mission among non-Jews as a “command” of the *κύριος*. Due to the following quotation, this term does not refer to Jesus (correctly KOET, “Paul and Barnabas,” 107; STEYN, *Quotations*, 200; in early medieval times The Venerable Bede, *Expos. Act.*, CCSL 121:63), but to God.

¹⁷¹ ms. 104.

¹⁷² B Q^{mg} L[’]-86^c-233; Theodoret, *In Jes.*, SC 315:80 (in lemma and commentary) This replacement has no parallel in Cyril of Alexandria, *In Jes.*, PG 70:1049b in the lemma.

¹⁷³ S O[’]-Qmg L[’]46-86^c-233 C 198 239’ 403’ 449’ 534 544.

¹⁷⁴ Acts 13:47 according to Ɔ45 43 6 206 429 52 636 945 1563 1704* 1739 1751 1875 1891 2298; Isa 49:6 according to 88 449’ (in agreement with the MT).

the Gentiles. Luke never again uses OT quotations in his narrative of Pauline evangelistic activity, save isolated instances¹⁷⁵ in chap. 15; 23; 28.

9. James's Speech

9.1. Acts 15:16/Amos 9:11

The introduction *μετὰ ταῦτα* in Acts 15:16 replaces *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ* in Amos 9:11 – the reference to “that day” would not make sense in the context of Acts.¹⁷⁶ Within the textual tradition of Acts 15:16, the rendering of the two verbs includes variants concerning the preposition which is combined with the verbum simplex to form a verbum compositum. Instead of *ἀναστρέψω*, also *ἀνατρέψω* (103 1448) or *ἐπιστρέψω* (D) or *ἀναστρέψωμεν* (617*) are witnessed; instead of *ἀνοικοδομήσω*, also *οἰκοδομήσω*¹⁷⁷ or even the exhortative subjunctive *ἀνοικοδομήσωμεν* (617^c) is found. The verb *ἀναστρέψω* and its variants¹⁷⁸ did not influence the textual tradition of Amos 9:11 which offers *ἀναστήσω* as the first verb.¹⁷⁹ On the other side, the double *ἀναστήσω* in Amos 9:11 is nowhere part of the textual tradition of Acts 15:16. In the following clause, the textual tradition of Acts 15:16 offers sometimes *κατεστραμμένα* instead of *κατεσκαμμένα*,¹⁸⁰ in a few manuscripts also *ἀνεσκαμμένα* (E[08] 1884) or *σκαμμένα* (014[*f] 88). Sometimes variants of this kind occur also in the tradition of Amos 9:11.¹⁸¹ Perhaps in order to avoid repetition, the New Testament text omits *καί*

¹⁷⁵ FITZMYER, “Use of the Old Testament,” 536. The evangelization of the non-Jews continues God’s broadening of salvation history already in Old Testament times (Luke 4:25–27; cf. MEISER, *Reaktion*, 284).

¹⁷⁶ It is unclear whether this refers to the end of time (NÄGELE, *Laubhütte*, 81–82), to Peter’s missionary success (SCHART, “Versions of Amos,” 172–173) or to the quotation of Amos 5:25–27 in Acts 7:42–43 (STOWASSER, “Am 5,25–27,” 63).

¹⁷⁷ 441 621 1842 2495; Jerome, *In Am.* 3:9.11, CCSL 76:345.

¹⁷⁸ The concept of God’s returning to his people is repeatedly witnessed in the prophetic texts of the Old Testament (cf. Zech 1:16; Jer 12:15 etc.). It seems impossible to name a distinct prophetic text for this idea (HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 24; KRAUS, “Septuagint in the New Testament,” 184).

¹⁷⁹ Perhaps Luke avoided *ἀναστήσω* in this context because this verb especially denotes the concepts of upraising prophets and Jesus’s resurrection (RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, 424, KRAUS, “Septuagint in the New Testament,” 184–185). In his comment on Amos 9:11, Jerome, *In Am.* 3:9.11, CCSL 76:149, and Julian of Eclanum, *In Am.* 2:9.11, CCSL 88:327, refer this passage indeed to Jesus’s resurrection and the growing up of the Church without discussing the differences between Amos 9:11^{LXX} and Acts 15:16.

¹⁸⁰ B 044 33 61 326 915 1409 1837 2344 L1188.

¹⁸¹ *κατεστραμμένα* (Ac-Q*), *κατεστρεμμένα* (106), *ἀνεσκαμμένα* L. Within the textual transmission of Acts 9:11, *αὐτῆς* after *κατεστραμμένα* is omitted in ms. 233*. This has no analogy in the textual tradition of Acts 15:16.

ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς¹⁸² and allocates some verbs in a distinct way to the objects. The second ἀνοικοδομήσω in Acts 15:16 is rendered as οἰκοδομήσω in Codex Ephraemi rescriptus.¹⁸³ In the following, some manuscripts add καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος καί, in accordance with Amos 9:11.¹⁸⁴ The verb ἀνορθώσω, throughout witnessed in Acts 15:16,¹⁸⁵ only once is part of the textual tradition of Amos 9:11 (ms. 764). In this case, the textual traditions of the source text and the quotation did not influence one another.

9.2. Acts 15:17/Amos 9:12

In Acts 15:17, ἄν sometimes is omitted in accordance with the Septuagint text of Amos 9:12.¹⁸⁶ Instead of ἐκζητήσωσιν, some manuscripts offer ἐκζητήσουσιν.¹⁸⁷ The future indicative occurs sometimes also in the textual tradition of Amos 9:12.¹⁸⁸ Within the textual tradition of Acts, ms. 1831 reads τοῦ λαοῦ μ[ου], instead of τῶν ἀνθρώπων; instead of κύριον, D (05) reads θεόν. Neither variant has any analogy in Amos 9:12 – there the addition of τὸν κύριον is witnessed.¹⁸⁹ This does not necessarily prove literary dependency but can also be explained as independent addition of an object for the verb. In the subordinated clause after, the relative conjunction and the personal pronoun at the end are offered in diverse variants. We can observe occasional analogues only in the case of ἄ¹⁹⁰ and ἐπ’ αὐτά.¹⁹¹ In

¹⁸² RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, 425.

¹⁸³ In the textual tradition of Amos 9:11, this has an analogue in Codex Venetus.

¹⁸⁴ 228 383 424 617 996, further (without καί) 2774. RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, 425, suggests a theological reason for the lack of these words in the original text: according to Luke, the kingdom of Jesus is not the same as the kingdom of David (similarly BARRETT, *Acts*, 725). That is possible but remains uncertain.

¹⁸⁵ It could reflect 2Reg 7:13; 16:26; 1Chr 17:12, 14, 24; 22:10 (BARRETT, *Acts*, 725).

¹⁸⁶ E(08) 35* 206 429 522 630 636* 945 1890 1704^c 1739 1751 1831 1884 1891 2200. On the other side, ἄν is witnessed in the textual transmission of Amos 9:12 (A'-49'' 36 130'-239).

¹⁸⁷ 321 1175 1838. Only the difference of the Septuagint from the Masoretic Text allowed the integration of this quote in Acts 15 (JOHNSON, *Midrash*, 18; MÜLLER, "Bedeutung der Septuaginta," 745).

¹⁸⁸ W Qc 86* 239 534, further (with addition of με) L'' (86^{mg})-613 C-68. Other variants offered in the textual tradition of Acts 15:17 (ἐκζητῶσιν 614 1412, ζητήσωσιν 2805) do not influence the transmission of Amos 9:12.

¹⁸⁹ A''-49'-198-407-456-534 86^{mg}. NÄGELE, *Laubhütte*, 163, emphasizes the tendency of correction towards the New Testament especially in the so-called Alexandrian text-type of the Septuagint. We can, however, argue the other way around: New Testament texts are witnesses of a textual strand existing already before their coming-into-being. The New Testament authors did not create a new text-form but used a text-form otherwise not known before from other manuscripts or early Jewish literature.

¹⁹⁰ Acts 15:17 according to ms. 429 522; Amos 9:12 according to L'-86^c-613.

the following, the textual transmission of Acts 15:17 offers variants concerning the article and the verb, but neither the omission of the article¹⁹² nor the variant ποιήσει (D*) instead of ποιῶν has analogues in the textual tradition of Amos 9:12. On the other side, the addition of ὁ θεός in some manuscripts of Amos 9:12¹⁹³ has had no apparent influence on Acts 15:17.¹⁹⁴

10. Paul's Excusing and Warning

10.1. Acts 23:5/Exod 22:27[28]

The Septuagint tradition fluctuates between the plural ἄρχοντας¹⁹⁵ and the singular ἄρχοντα¹⁹⁶; the dominant reading in the Luke text is the singular ἄρχοντα, perhaps in accordance with the situation (there is only one high priest mentioned¹⁹⁷). In the Latin textual tradition of Acts 23:5 tradition the plural *principes* is found occasionally.¹⁹⁸ Sometimes τοῦ is omitted in the text of Exod 22:27[28] (ms. 246) and σου is omitted within the transmission of Acts,¹⁹⁹ without consequences for textual development. Concerning the last two words of Exod 22:27[28], the tradition is divided; few but important manuscripts offer κακῶς ἐρεῖς²⁰⁰ (this does not have any parallel in the textual tradition of Acts), while other manuscripts offer ἐρεῖς κακῶς, which is also the word order in the text of Acts.

10.2. Acts 28:26–27/Isa 6:9–10

Within the beginning of the speech, the second imperative mostly is read as εἰπὼν, sometimes also as εἶπε. In Acts 28:26, ms 1852 offers ἀκούετε

¹⁹¹ Acts 15:17 according to ms. 429 522; Amos 9:12 according to *L'*. The omission of ἐπ' αὐτοῦς in C-68 has no analogy in the textual tradition of Acts.

¹⁹² Pap74 **κ*** B 044 1003 1162 1642*.

¹⁹³ W A' -49 III.

¹⁹⁴ We can ask whether Acts 15:18 (γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος) is influenced by Isa 45:21. The readings γνωστὰ and ἀκουστά (Isa 45:21) and the readings ἀπ' αἰῶνος and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (Isa 45:21) do not influence one another, notwithstanding the complex textual situation in Acts 15:18.

¹⁹⁵ B 15'-376 30-85-343'-730^c x 527.

¹⁹⁶ Sometimes the Lukan Greek text reads the dative ἄρχοντι (mss. 181 and 1875).

¹⁹⁷ Cf. also STEYN, *Septuagint Quotations*, 210; RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament*, 126. The thesis of another *Textvorlage* is not necessary. The function of the quotation is "to represent Paul as unquestioningly obedient to the OT" (BARRETT, *Acts*, 1062).

¹⁹⁸ Cf. https://download.uni-mainz.de/fb07-klassphil-nttf/Apostelgeschichte/Act%2023/Act%2023_05.pdf, consulted 25.09.2019.

¹⁹⁹ In the minuscles 61 326 1837.

²⁰⁰ B 58'-82 527. Ms. 127 offers κακῶς οὐκ ἐρεῖς.

instead of ἀκούσετε, but this has no analogue in the textual transmission of Isa 6:9; on the other hand, the variant ἀκούσητε in Isa 6:9²⁰¹ does not have an analogue in the textual development of Acts 28:26. There is also no cross influence of the minor variants concerning βλέψετε.²⁰² In the following, ἴδητε sometimes is replaced by εἶδητε in both textual traditions.²⁰³

In Acts 28:27, Codex Sinaiticus replaces ἐπαχύνθη by ἐβαρύνθη, but this does not have any effect on the textual transmission of Isa 6:10. In the textual tradition of Isa 6:10, the personal pronoun αὐτῶν after ὥσιν is omitted in S* 538; in the textual tradition of Acts 28:27, it is added in a strong minority of manuscripts²⁰⁴ including κ-S. In my opinion, it is therefore not sure, whether the omission in S* 538 in the rendering of Isa 6:10 is the result of an influence of Acts 28:27. In both traditions, a few manuscripts offer τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς instead of τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς²⁰⁵ – that can be an occasional analogy. The omission of the second αὐτῶν in a few manuscripts of Isa 6:10 (B 393) and the changing of αὐτῶν to αὐτούς in ms. 228 of Acts 28:27 are irrelevant for the following textual development as also the replacing of ἴδωσι by εἶδωσιν²⁰⁶ in the textual tradition of Acts 28:27. The analogous omission of καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν in some manuscripts of Acts 28:27 (κ 1874) and Isa 6:10 (377 407 534) is the effect of a homoioteleuton and does not justify any thesis of dependency. At the end of Acts 28:27, some manuscripts offer the indicative ἐπιστρέψουσιν instead of the Subjunctive ἐπιστρέψωσιν;²⁰⁷ this reading has its analogues also in the transmission of Isa 6:10.²⁰⁸ In the following, the textual tradition is divided between ἴσομαι and ἴσωμαι; in the textual tradition of Isa 6:10, the Subjunctive ἴσωμαι is witnessed only in a few manuscripts.²⁰⁹ This indicative in Acts 28:27 has been interpreted as a signal of God's favor to Israel.²¹⁰

²⁰¹ A'-710 V 22*-147-233 C³⁰⁹.

²⁰² In Acts 28:26, ms. 365 offers βλέπετε; in Isa 6:9, S 26-106 147-36*-93-233-456 377 read βλέψητε.

²⁰³ Acts 28:26 according to Pap74 E(08) 104 459 619 623 1152 1751 1884 2147; Isa 6:9 according to S V.

²⁰⁴ Cf. Strutwolf (ed.), *ECM*, 1081.

²⁰⁵ Acts 28:27 according to 5 1751 1838 L587; Isa 6:10 according to 565 410.

²⁰⁶ 374^{vid} E(08) 5 619 623 1729 1884.

²⁰⁷ A E(08) 044 048 81 181 228 1718 1729 1875 L1825.

²⁰⁸ S 26 V II-90-93-456. The reading ἐπιστρέψωσιν does not reoccur in the manuscript tradition of Acts 28:27.

²⁰⁹ V 36-46. Also in ancient Christian commentaries, the indicative ἴσομαι is witnessed but sometimes is not interpreted (both are true for Theodoret, *In Is.*, SC 276:270).

²¹⁰ KARRER, "‘Und ich werde sie heilen’," 270–271. BARRETT, *Acts*, 1245–1246, does not make a theological comment on ἴσομαι. On the other hand, Barrett does not interpret ἐπαχύνθη as divine passive; hardening is not in God's purpose. KOET, "Paul in Rome," 136, emphasizes that Paul "does not refer to rejection nor even to a turning away from his Jewish listeners."

The object of (missing) “seeing” and “hearing” in Acts 28:27 is cleared up in Acts 28:28 as σωτηρίον.²¹¹

11. Conclusion

Within this catalogue of evidence on major speeches in Acts, we are able to detect several different patterns:

1. Variants which are seldom witnessed in one textual strand (OT or text of Acts) have no influence on the textual transmission of the other text.

2. The fact that some morphological or grammatical variants are witnessed in both textual strands does not in itself prove any literary dependence. Sometimes they are the result of independent stylistic changing and hence are not witnesses to a variant reading in a Vorlage.

3. Sometimes Septuagint manuscripts harmonize their text with the New Testament quotation,²¹² sometimes New Testament quotations harmonize their text with the Old Testament source text.²¹³ In other cases, the diverging textual traditions do not influence one another but are stable, even in manuscripts which include both the Old and New Testament.²¹⁴ It does not seem possible to determine with certainty why the textual tradition remains

²¹¹ By including σωτηρία, “seeing” no longer means “watching” but “getting a share”. According to Luke, salvation begins for the individual in the conversion already demanded by the Baptist (Luke 3:8), which leads many to God (Luke 1:16).

²¹² Old Testament manuscripts or manuscript groups beyond Codex Alexandrinus and its group with distinct readings in accordance with the New Testament quotations are III (3x), 36 (3x), 239 (3x), 46 (3x), 613 (4x), 49 (4x) et al. Some of these manuscripts may reflect older tradition, other manuscripts witness a later development where the New Testament quotation influenced the transmission of the Old Testament text (KARRER/SCHMID/SIGISMUND, “Doppelwerk,” 259–260, on 26–86* within the A-group; iid., “Doppelwerk,” 263, 274 on ms. 534 which is characteristic of the harmonization of Old Testament texts to New Testament quotations in medieval times).

²¹³ Cf. FITZMEYER, “Use of the Old Testament,” 534. Very tentatively (!), we can say: New Testament manuscripts with *distinct* readings that accord with the Old Testament source texts are D(05) (as well-known), E(08) (4x), C (3x), in addition to some manuscripts with two distinct analogies to the Old Testament source texts (B(03) 61 69 81 180 181 365 614 630 1501 1751 2652. Of this list, 614 1501 2652 belong to the “Bezan trajectory” [GABEL, “Western Text,” 86]). This statistic does not include a reading in clusters of similar readings where I simply referred to ECM – such bulks suggest the dependence from one another but not a conscious harmonization to the Old Testament pretexts.

²¹⁴ Cf. already HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 12: The re-ordering of πρεσβύτεροι ... ἐνπνιασθήσονται ... νεανίσκοι ... ὄψονται (Joel 3:1) in νεανίσκοι ... ὄψονται ... πρεσβύτεροι ... ἐνπνιασθήσονται (Acts 2:17) is witnessed in no manuscript of Joel 3:1; on the other hand, no manuscript of Acts 2:17 offers the reading witnessed in the Old Testament source text. Cf. further KARRER/SCHMID/SIGISMUND, “Doppelwerk,” 262–264, on Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus.

stable or is changed.²¹⁵ The problematic thoroughgoing Christian anti-Judaism does not constitute such a criterion.

4. This does not mean that we are unable to detect particular tendencies within single manuscripts. Some manuscripts have been the basis for ongoing debates, whereas for other manuscripts further research is required. To state a distinct tendency in a manuscript, however, presupposes methodologically at a first stage that readings are not due to the influence of harmonization or obvious stylistic improvement.²¹⁶

5. Differences between the Old Testament pre-text and the New Testament quotation sometimes are discussed within exegetical literature. In some cases this confirms the stability of the divergent textual traditions,²¹⁷ in other cases it allows a glimpse of a distinct exegetical tradition.²¹⁸ However, often ancient Christian commentators follow the commented text without referring to the counterpart in the Old or New Testament.²¹⁹

6. In some New Testament manuscripts, quotations are marked, but this does not necessarily lead to a harmonization with the source text. We observe this lack of harmonization even in codices which contain both Old and New Testament.²²⁰

²¹⁵ In general, it is difficult to state any tendencies beyond those of individual manuscripts. In minuscule 33, Luke 10:27 and Acts 7:32, 37, 40 are accommodated to the Septuagint text, but not Luke 23:46. In the same minuscule, but also in E 1739 **Byz**, the repetitions of θεός before Ἰσαακ and Ἰακωβ are omitted in Acts 3:13 but added in Act 7:32. These examples show the limit of what we can know.

²¹⁶ To give just one example: in Isa 6:10 according to ms 538, αὐτῶν after ὥσιν is omitted. That does not automatically reveal a tendency to harmonize the Old Testament text with the New Testament quotation. Within the textual tradition of Acts 28:27, αὐτῶν is indeed often omitted but it is also often read (cf. Strutwolf [ed.], *ECM*, 1081). Only a full collation of this manuscript could enable us to make such a statement.

²¹⁷ This is true, e.g., for the difference between Βαβυλῶνος (Acts 7:43) and Δαμασκοῦ (Amos 5:27).

²¹⁸ Cf. the debate of the numbering of Psalm 2 as Psalm 1.

²¹⁹ Commenting on Acts 2:17–21, John Chrysostom, *Hom. Act.* 5.1, PG 60:50f., and Ps.-Oecumenius of Tricca, *In Act.*, PG 118:69a (in the lemma, the author does not comment these phrases) adhere closely the word order of the text of Acts 2. Theodoret, *In Joel*, PG 81:1653a, follows the word order of Joel.

²²⁰ SIGISMUND, “Diplé,” 151. – I warmly thank Margaret Mitchell for improving my English.

Bibliography

Sources and Translations

- Wevers, John W. (ed.), *Deuteronomium*, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 3/2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1977).
- Rahlfs, Alfred (ed.), *Psalmi cum Odis*, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1931, ²1967, ³1979).
- Ziegler, Joseph (ed.), *Duodecim prophetae*, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1943, ²1967, ³1984).
- , *Isaias*, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum 14 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht ²1967, ³1983).
- Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior*, ed. by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Vol. III, Acts of the Apostles, eds. Holger Strutwolf et al., Part 1.1 Text Chapter 1–14 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017).
- Athanasius of Alexandria, *Expositiones in Psalmos*, PG 27:59b–590a.
- Augustine, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, cura et studio D. Eligius Dekkers/Jean Fraipont, Vol. 1: Ps. 1–50, CCSL 38 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1956=1990); Vol. 2: Ps. 51–100, CCSL 39 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1956=1990).
- Bede, The Venerable, *Expositio in Actus Apostolorum*, ed. Max Ludwig Wolfram Laistner/David Hurst, CCSL 121 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1983), 1–99.
- , *Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum*, ed. Max Ludwig Wolfram Laistner/David Hurst, CCSL 121 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1983), 101–163.
- Cassiodorus, *Expositio psalmorum*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, Vol. 1: Expositio psalmorum I–LXX, CCSL 97 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953).
- Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentarius in Prophetas Minoras*, PG 71; PG 72:9a–364d.
- , *Commentarius in Isaiam prophetam*, PG 70:9a–1450c.
- , *Explanatio in Psalmos*, PG 69:717a–1276b.
- Didymus of Alexandria, *Fragmenta expositionis in Psalmos*, PG 39:1155a–1622a.
- Diodor of Tarsus, *Commentarii in Psalmos*, Vol. I, Commentarii in Psalmos I–L, ed. Jean-Marie Olivier, CCSG 6 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980).
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *In Psalmos*, PG 23; PG 24:9a–76c.
- Euthalius Diaconus, *Actuum Apostolorum Editio*, PG 85:627a–664d.
- Hilarius of Poitiers, *In Psalmos*, ed. Patrick Descourtieux, Tome 1, SC 515 (Paris: Cerf, 2008).
- Jerome, *Commentarioli in Psalmos*, ed. Germain Morin, CCSL 72 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1959).
- , *Commentarii in Prophetas minores*, ed. Marcus Adriaen, CCSL 76/76A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969).
- John Chrysostom, *Homiliae in Actus Apostolorum*, PG 60:13–384.
- , *Orationes VIII adversus Iudaeos*, PG 48:841–942.
- , *Homilia in Drosidam martyrem*, PG 50:683–694.
- Julian of Eclanum, *In Amos Prophetam*, eds. Lucas De Coninck and Maria Josepha D’Hont, CCSL 88 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977), 260–329.
- Ps.-Oecumenius of Tricca, *Commentarius in Actus Apostolorum*, PG 118:29a–308b.
- Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Expositio in Psalmos*, PG 66:647b–696d.

- , *Expositionis in Psalmos Iuliano Aeclanensi interprete in Latinum versae quae supersunt*, eds. Lucas De Coninck and Maria Josepha d’Hont, CCSL 88A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977).
- Theodoret, *Commentarius in Duodecim Prophetas*, PG 81:1545b–1988a.
- , *Commentaire sur Isaïe*, Tome 1: (Sections 1–3) introduction, texte critique, traduction et notes par Jean-Noël Guinot, SC 276 (Paris: Cerf, 1980); Tome 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.
- Theophylact, *Expositio in Acta Apostolorum*, PG 125:495a–848c.

Secondary Literature

- AEJMELAEUS, ANNELI, “Faith, Hope, and Interpretation: A Lexical and Syntactical Study of the Semantic Field of Hope in the Greek Psalter,” in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint. FS Eugene E. Ulrich*, eds. Peter W. Flint and Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam, VTSup 101 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 360–376.
- BLUMHOFER, CHRISTOPHER M., “Luke’s Alteration of Joel 3.1–5 in Acts 2.17–21,” *NTS* 62 (2016): 499–516.
- BUTTICAZ, SIMON D., *L’identité de l’Église dans les Actes des apôtres: de la restauration d’Israël à la conquête universelle*, BZNW 174 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2011).
- DOCHERTY, SUSAN, “‘Do you Understand what you Are Reading?’ (Acts 8:30): Current Trends and Future Perspectives in the Study of the Use of the Old Testament in the New,” *JSNT* 38 (2015): 112–125.
- ELLIOTT, J. KEITH, “An Eclectic Textual Study of the Book of Acts,” in *The Book of Acts as Church History: Text, Textual Traditions and Ancient Interpretations*, eds. Tobias Nicklas and Michael Tilly, BZNW 120 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2003), 9–30.
- BARRETT, CHARLES KINGSLEY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the apostles*, ICC (London/New York: T&T Clark International, 1998).
- FITZMYER, JOSEPH, “The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, SBL.SP 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 524–538.
- GÄBEL, GEORG, “‘Western Text,’ ‘D-Text Cluster,’ ‘Bezan Trajectory,’ or What Else – A Preliminary Study,” in *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior*, ed. by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Vol. III, Acts of the Apostles, eds. Holger Strutwolf et al., Part 3. Studies (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 83–136.
- GUNKEL, HERMANN, *Die Psalmen übersetzt und erklärt* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- HOLTZ, TRAUGOTT, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, TU 104 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968).
- JOHNSON, LUKE TIMOTHY, *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2002).
- KARRER, MARTIN, “‘Und ich werde sie heilen’. Das Verstockungsmotiv aus Jes 6,9f. in Apg 28,26f.,” in *Kirche und Volk Gottes. FS Jürgen Roloff*, eds. Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus and Otto Merk (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 2000), 256–271.
- KARRER, MARTIN, ULRICH BERNHARD SCHMID, and MARCUS SIGISMUND, “Das lukianische Doppelwerk als Zeuge für den LXX-Text des Jesaja-Buches,” in *Florilegium Lovaniense. Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García*

- Martínez, eds. Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne, BETL 224 (Leuven: Peeters) 2008, 253–274.
- KAUHANEN, TUUKKA, “Using Patristic Evidence: A Question of Methodology in the Textual Criticism of the LXX,” in *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies Helsinki, 2010*, ed. Melvin K.H. Peters, SBL.SCS 59 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), 677–690.
- KIEL, NIKOLAI, “‘Neue’ Varianten in den Kirchenväterzitaten,” in *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior*, ed. by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Vol. III, Acts of the Apostles, eds. Holger Strutwolf et al., Part 3. Studies (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 39–67.
- KILGALLEN JOHN J., *The Stephen Speech. A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7,2–53*, AnBib 67 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976).
- KOET, BART J., “Paul and Barnabas in Pisidian Antioch: A Disagreement over the Interpretation of the Scriptures (Acts 13,42–52),” in ID. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, StNAux 14 (Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1989), 97–118.
- , “Paul in Rome (Acts 28:16–31): A Farewell to Judaism?,” in ID. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, StNAux 14 (Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1989), 119–139.
- KRAUS, WOLFGANG, “The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Am 9:11–12 as Test Case,” in “*Translation Is Required*”: *The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, ed. Robert J.V. Hiebert, SBL.SCS 56 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2011), 171–190.
- LIM, TIMOTHY H., “Qumran Scholarship and the Study of the Old Testament in the New Testament,” *JSNT* 38 (2015): 68–80.
- MEISER, MARTIN, “Das Alte Testament im lukanischen Doppelwerk,” in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, eds. Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus, BWANT 153 (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 167–195.
- , *Die Reaktion des Volkes auf Jesus. Eine redaktionskritische Untersuchung zu den synoptischen Evangelien*, BZNW 96 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1998).
- MÜLLER, MOGENS, “Die Bedeutung der Septuaginta für die Entfaltung neutestamentlicher Theologie,” in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz*, eds. Martin Meiser et al., WUNT 405 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 730–756.
- , “Die Lukasschriften und die Septuaginta,” in *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*, eds. Siegfried Kreuzer and Martin Meiser and Marcus Sigismund, WUNT 286 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 465–479.
- NÄGELE, SABINE, *Laubhütte Davids und Wolkensohn: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Amos 9:11 in der jüdischen und christlichen Exegese*, AGJU 24 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).
- NOTLEY, R. STEVEN, “The Kingdom of Heaven Forcefully Advances,” in *The Interpretation of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity. Studies in Language and Tradition*, ed. Craig A. Evans (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2000), 279–311.
- PIETERSMA, ALBERT, “A Commentary on Psalm 15 in Greek: Text-Production and Text-Reception,” in *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 523–542.
- RESE, MARTIN, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, StNT 1 (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969).
- RUSAM, DIETRICH, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, BZNW 112 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2003).
- SCHAPER, JOACHIM, *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*, WUNT II 76 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).

- SCHART, AARON, "The Jewish and the Christian Greek Versions of Amos," in *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, SBL.SCS 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 157–177.
- SCHMID, ULRICH BERNHARD, "Diplé 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/New York: de Gruyter, 2010), 83–98.
- SIGISMUND, MARCUS, "Die Diplé als Zitatmarkierung in den 'großen' Unzialcodices. Versuch eines Fazits," in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament. Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, eds. Martin Karrer, Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund, ANTF 43 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2010), 149–152.
- SIFFER, NATHALIE, "La citation de Habaquq 1,5 en Actes 13,41," in *Die Septuaginta – Geschichte, Wirkung, Relevanz*, eds. Martin Meiser et al., WUNT 405 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018), 496–507.
- SIFFER-WIEDERHOLD, NATHALIE, "Psalm 15[16]," LXX.E II 1532–1533.
- STEYN, GERT JACOBUS, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum*, CBET 12 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995).
- 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.
- STRUTWOLF, HOLGER, "Der Text der Apostelgeschichte bei Irenäus von Lyon und der sogenannte 'Westliche Text'," in *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior*, ed. by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Vol. III, Acts of the Apostles, eds. Holger Strutwolf et al., Part 3. Studies (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 149–185.
- UTZSCHNEIDER, HELMUT, "Flourishing bones – The Minor Prophets in the New Testament," in *Septuagint Research. Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden, SBL.SCS 53 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 273–291.
- SCHMITT ARMIN, "Ps 16,8-11 als Zeugnis der Auferstehung in der Apostelgeschichte," *BZ* 17 (1973): 229–248.
- THACKERAY, HENRY ST. J., *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909).
- WACHTEL, KLAUS, "Text-Critical Commentary," in *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior*, ed. by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Vol. III, Acts of the Apostles, eds. Holger Strutwolf et al., Part 3. Studies (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 1–38.
- , "On the Relationship of the 'Western Text' and the Byzantine Tradition of Acts – A Plea Against the Text-Type Concept," in *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior*, ed. by the Institute for New Testament Textual Research, Vol. III, Acts of the Apostles, eds. Holger Strutwolf et al., Part 3. Studies (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 137–148.
- WEVERS, JOHN WILLIAM, *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*, SBL.SCS 39 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- , *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SBL.SCS 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).