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ABSTRACT

It is the intention of this contribution to investigate the text form of the LXX Torah quotations that overlap between the works of Philo of Alexandria and the Acts of the Apostles. It forms part of a larger project which investigates the common use of a possible Old Greek Version by both Philo and the New Testament. Six cases are investigated of which five are present in Stephen’s Speech in Acts 7. There were no clear traces found of another Textvorlage of the Torah that was used by Luke and/or Philo in these cases. Luke’s quotations here resemble adaptations and interpretations already made in the Christian tradition by his time. Several cases show evidence of conflations and paraphrases of the quoted passages. Noteworthy, however, is that Philo’s text form and that of the reconstructed LXX text are very close in the cases investigated here. Where Philo notably differs from the reconstructed LXX text, Luke tends to represent a text form that is in closer alignment to that of the LXX than to that of Philo.

1. INTRODUCTION

In a recent study of the Septuagint (LXX) Vorlage(n) underlying the explicit quotations in the anonymous book “To the Hebrews”, it became clear that nearly all Hebrews’ quotations from the Torah (as well as the longer quotation from Prov 3:11-12 in Heb 12:5-6) were also to be found in the Corpus Philonicum – especially in Legum allegoriae III. Furthermore, apart from the overlap in occurrence, also the text form of all those explicit Torah quotations (allusions and references excluded), is in agreement with the form of the quotations as found in Philo – against those text forms of the...
Masoretic Text (MT) and the LXX (Steyn 2006:135-151). Both Hebrews and Philo together deviate from the readings of the MT as well as from the LXX witnesses.¹ This leads to some obvious questions: Did both Hebrews and Philo (independently?) know and use the same version of the Scriptures, i.e. a common earlier LXX version than that known to us today in its reconstructed editions? (Such a theory might actually even strengthen possible Alexandrian commonalities between the two). Furthermore, do we have here evidence of an earlier LXX text form? No wonder that the relation between the quotations in Philo’s works and the text form of the LXX had been a topic of interest in the past.²

Drawing on the conclusions of the study on Hebrews, it became obvious that the phenomenon ought to be investigated in the rest of the New Testament as well. It is the intention of this contribution to investigate those Torah quotations that overlap particularly between the Lukan literature and the works of Philo of Alexandria.³ This forms part of a more extensive project. Previous studies were already conducted regarding the overlaps between Paul’s letters to the Galatians (Steyn 2012:444-464), Corinthians (Steyn 2013a) and Romans (Steyn 2013b), as well as the gospels according to Mark and Matthew (Steyn 2013c).

The purpose of this investigation is merely to compare the text forms of the LXX Torah and its quotations in the Corpus Philonicum and the Lukan writings – here only Luke’s second work, the Acts of the Apostles. It is thus not the intention of this study to investigate the hermeneutical aspects of these quotations within their new contexts,⁴ neither to elaborate on their function within the arguments of Philo and Luke. The focus of this study is exclusively synoptic in nature, i.e. it is aimed at determining the differences and similarities between the text forms in order to establish whether a

¹ In the larger picture, D.T. Runia also pointed to the use of four texts in particular, namely Gen 2:2, Exod 25:40, Jos 1:5 and Prov 3:11-12, which are “so close to Philo that coincidence must be ruled out”. Runia refers particularly to Heb 13:5b, “a composite text derived from Jos. 1:5, Deut. 31:8 and possibly Gen. 28:15, which is cited in exactly the same form by Philo in Conf. 166” (Runia 1993:76).
³ The manuscript tradition of Philo’s works has been largely transmitted through the Christian tradition. This constantly poses the risk that Philo’s text had been influenced by the Christian tradition. This, in turn, calls for extreme caution in comparative studies such as here. For this investigation the text edition of P. Borgen, K. Fuglseth and R. Skarsten (2005) will be used.
⁴ For an investigation of this nature, see Steyn (1995).
common early LXX Textvorlage might be traced in Philo’s writings and those of Acts.

2. DISTRIBUTION OF THE TORAH QUOTATIONS

Philo quotes the most from Genesis, then Exodus, then Deuteronomy, Numbers, and Leviticus. There are 11 explicit quotations from the Torah to be found in Luke’s Gospel and 19 in the Acts of the Apostles, thus totaling 30 Torah quotations in the Lukan literature. Ten of these also occur in the writings of Philo of Alexandria. Three of these ten are to be found in Jesus logia in Luke’s Gospel, whilst the remaining seven of the ten overlapping quotations occur in Acts – two of which are found in Peter’s second speech (Acts 3) and five of them in Stephen’s speech (Acts). One of these, the quotation from Exod 3:6/Exod 3:15, occurs in both Peter’s speech and in Stephen’s speech. This leaves us then with seven overlapping quotations, but only six cases to be investigated. It is striking that there are no Torah quotations that overlap between Philo and Paul’s speeches in Acts. In fact, with the exception of a possible quotation from Exod 22:27 in Acts 23:5, situated in Paul’s defense speech before the Sanhedrin, no quotations from the Torah are to be found in the Pauline speeches of Acts at all.

The fact that the overlapping quotations between Philo and Luke-Acts are situated in the speeches comes as no surprise, as it is long known that the explicit quotations are to be found almost exclusively in the speeches of Luke-Acts (Steyn 1995:24-30). Three of the ten cases overlap internally between Luke-Acts, as the quotation in Luke 20:37 (Jesus logion) occurs again in Acts 3:13 (Peter’s speech) and Acts 7:32 (Stephen’s speech). This leaves us ultimately with five cases to be investigated where there is an overlap between the Acts of the Apostles and the Corpus Philonicum – all of which appear in Stephen’s speech in Acts 7. However, several of the remaining twenty explicit Torah quotations in Luke-Acts also overlap with allusions and references in Philo, whilst several explicit Torah quotations in Philo again overlap with allusions and references in Luke-Acts. These will, however, not be discussed within the limited space of this contribution.

---

6 Acts 3:13, 25; 7:3, 6, 7, 18, 32.
7 Although Rese also considers this as an explicit quotation (1979:69), Swete, in turn, did not want to include it as a quotation (1900:388).
## Case 1: The quotation from Exod 3:6, 15 in Luke 20:37 (Jesus’ Speech), Acts 3:13 (Peter’s Speech) and Acts 7:32 (Stephen’s Speech)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exod 3:6</th>
<th>Exod 3:15</th>
<th>Philo Abr. 51</th>
<th>Philo Mut. 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν πρὸς Μωυσῆν</td>
<td>τότε γὰρ μου φησίν ὅνομά ἐστιν αἰώνιον.</td>
<td>κύριος ὁ θεὸς ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου.</td>
<td>Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν.</td>
<td>θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ.</td>
<td>θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>τοῦτο γὰρ μου φησίν ὅνομα αἰώνιον ...καὶ μνημόσυνον, ... γενεαῖς,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ</td>
<td>ὃς ἐγὼ λέγων· ἐγὼ</td>
<td>ὃς εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ</td>
<td>ὃς ἐγὼ εἰμί</td>
<td>ἐγένετο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὃς ἐγὼ λέγων· ἐγὼ</td>
<td>εὐγένειας</td>
<td></td>
<td>λέγει κύριον</td>
<td>φωνὴ κυρίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὃς θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ</td>
<td>ὃς θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ</td>
<td>ὃς θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ</td>
<td>ὃς ἐγὼ εἰμὶ</td>
<td>ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ο ἀλλὰ ζώντων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὐγένειας</td>
<td>ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ο ἀλλὰ ζώντων</td>
<td>ὃς ἐγὼ εἰμὶ</td>
<td>εὐγένειας</td>
<td>ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων σου, ο ἀλλὰ ζώντων</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two possible sections in LXX Exodus from which Luke’s quotations in Luke 20:37, Acts 3:13 and Acts 7:32 might have been taken from, namely LXX Exod 3:6 and/or Exod 3:15. The version of 3:6 has εἶπεν αὐτῷ and uses ἐγὼ εἰμι in reference to God introducing himself, as well

---

8 Cf., however, Barrett (2004:193): “…the words occur nowhere in the OT in precisely this form”. He draws attention (p.194) to Wilcox (1965:29, 34) who sees a possible Samaritan connection here.
as the genitive singular for ὁ πατήρ⁹ and for the second person personal pronoun συ. The version of Exod 3:15, however, has εἶπεν ὁ θεός and uses κύριος in reference to God referring to himself as well as the genitive plural for ὁ πατρός and for the second person personal pronoun. The Samaritan Pentateuch, as well as the Ethiopic and Boharic translations of Exod 3:6, also follow the genitive plural for ὁ πατρός and for the second person personal pronoun¹⁰ – similar to LXX Exod 3:15!

The two occurrences in Philo’s works (Abr. 51; Mut. 12) where reference is made to this tradition are clearly closer to the version of LXX Exod 3:15 (than to the version of LXX Exod 3:6) as both of them contain the phrase τοῦτο μού ἐστιν ὄνομα αἰώνιον (although with slight variation) and Mut. 12 includes the reference to κύριος before ὁ θεός.¹¹ None of the two reconstructed versions of LXX Exodus 3, or those of Philo, include the definite article ὁ before θεός in reference to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.¹² However, codex Alexandrinus and a number of other manuscripts¹³ amongst the LXX witnesses do indeed include the definite article ὁ before θεός in reference to Abraham! Their text-critical weight in relation to Vaticanus and Sinaiticus should, however, be considered as secondary. Some variants amongst the Philonic witnesses omit καί before Ἰσαὰχ and Ἰακώβ. Its absence before Ἰσαὰχ is closer to the MT, Complutensic Polyglot and the Targumim.¹⁴

---

⁹ The Samaritan Pentateuch, however, reads the plural here – against the Hebrew, LXX, Vulgate, and Peshitta (Barrett 2004:361).


¹¹ “According to Mut. 11f. the divine name given to men is κύριος ὁ θεός. God also has a relative name by which men may call upon Him: ‘I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, this is my name for ever,’ Abr. 51, cf. Ex. 3:15” (Bietenhard 1967:264).

¹² Caution is here in order as “the presence or absence of an article does not make a substantive definite or indefinite” in Greek (Porter 1999:103).

¹³ These are 15-64*-72-376 C*-54 b 106 n x 121-527 z 18 76 130 424 509 799. They represent an extremely broad group of witnesses dating from the 10th century onwards and mainly consisting of hexaplaric signs and catenae. Due to limited space, refer to J.W. Wevers (1974:55-59) for detailed information.

Mark’s gospel, representing the earliest form of this reference in the gospel tradition, seems to be closer to the version of LXX Exod 3:6 as it explicitly uses the phrases εἶπεν αὐτῷ, and more importantly, also ἐγώ (omitted by codices D and W) in reference to God’s introduction of himself. Furthermore, the definite article ὁ appears now before θεός in reference to Abraham and with disagreement amongst some textual witnesses, in reference to Isaac and Jacob. Matthew’s version follows the Markan trajectory of the tradition with the addition of οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ ζώντων (cf. Mark 12:27; Luke 20:38), but expands on the quotation with the inclusion of εἰμι after ἐγώ as present in Exod 3:6 (LXX and MT).

Luke’s version in Jesus’ speech (Luke 20:37) shows closer similarities with the text form of LXX Exod 3:15 with its presence of κύριος (but in the accusative form16). Although there is disagreement in the manuscript tradition about the presence of the definite article, the preferred tradition excludes it with reference to Isaac and Jacob’s God – similar to the LXX Exodus traditions and the two occurrences by Philo. There is agreement in the manuscript tradition, however, about its presence with reference to Abraham. The text form of the quotation from LXX Exod 3:15, as it appears in Luke 20:37, resembles that of Philo’s Mut. 12.

Luke’s other versions in the speeches of Peter (Acts 3:13) and Stephen (Acts 7:32) are also closer aligned with the textual tradition of LXX Exod 3:15 due to their inclusion of the phrase ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων in the plural17 and the absence of the definite article ὁ before Isaac and Jacob’s God in Acts 7:32 (possibly also in Acts 3:13). The phrase ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων is transposed to the end of the quotation and contextually applied to its audience in Peter’s speech (Acts 3:13) with the ἡμῶν at its end. It remains, however, in its original position in Stephen’s speech (Acts 7:37) and is contextually applied with σου at its end. There is consensus in all the New Testament versions about the inclusion of the definite article ὁ before θεὸς Ἀβραάμ against the LXX Exodus versions and those of Philo, but disagreement in the manuscript tradition regarding its inclusion also before θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ and θεὸς Ἰακώβ.

It can thus cautiously be concluded that the Markan trajectory (Mark 12:26) – followed by Matthew (Matt 22:32) – is closer to LXX Exod 3:6, whereas the Philo (Abr. 51; Mut. 12) and Lukan trajectories (Luke 20:37; 15 See also Kilgallen (1986:488), Nolland (1993:966) and Marshall (2007:545).
16 “Lk 20:37 comments on this verse, so an accusative is used after λέγει” (Archer & Chirichigno 1983:15).
17 According to Pesch (1986:253), the plural refers to the part of the speech that deals with the “fathers” and stresses the continuity of the deeds of God.
Acts 3:13; 7:32) are closer to LXX Exod 3:15.\(^\text{18}\) If this is the case, then Luke adjusted his quotation – originally taken from the Markan material used in Luke 20:37 – to be closer to the same trajectory used by Philo of Alexandria.

**Case 2: The quotation from Gen 12:1-2 in Acts 7:3 (Stephen’s Speech)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Καὶ εἶπεν χύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν χύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ</td>
<td>εἶπε γὰρ φησιν χύριος τῷ Ἀβραὰμ</td>
<td>καὶ Ἀβραὰμ γυμνοῦται, ὅταν ἀκούσῃ</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου</td>
<td>ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου</td>
<td>ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου</td>
<td>ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου</td>
<td>ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου, καὶ δεῦρο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν ἀναγήσῃ σοι δεῦρο</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἣν σοι δεύσῃ καὶ ποιήσω σε εἰς ἑβνος μέγα</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν σοι δεύσῃ καὶ ποιήσω σε εἰς ἑβνος μέγα</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν σοι δεύσῃ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philo presents fairly extensive quotations of LXX Gen 12:1-2 in *Migr.* 1 and *Her.* 277, as well as a shorter quotation in *Leg.* 2,59. All three versions are in exact agreement with the LXX – apart from two differences:

- **a)** The first is his use of ἀπελθεῖ at the opening of his quotation in both *Migr.* 1 and *Her.* 277 instead of ἔξελθε in LXX Gen 12:1. The latter occurs, however, in *Leg.* 2,59 and is also used by Luke in Stephen’s speech in Acts 7:3.

- **b)** The second difference between the Philonic versions and LXX Genesis 12, is Philo’s absence of the ἃν which appears in Gen 12:1 between ἢν and σοι.

\(^{18}\) G. Schneider (1980:462), however, considers Acts 7:30-34 as referring to LXX Exod 3:1-10a. He states: “V 32a gibt Ex 3,6a wieder, freilich ohne εἰμι und mit der pluralischen Formulierung vom ‘Gott deiner Väter’, V 32b entspricht Ex 3,6b’.

\(^{19}\) Apart from Philo, is the particle ἃν also omitted by 15-72’ 319 and replaced by ἐάν in 509.
Luke’s account of the quotation, in turn, presents an abbreviated version of LXX Gen 12:1 by replacing the phrase ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου with δεῦρο and hence emphasizing the aspects of movement and obedience. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, however, also reads the equivalent of δεῦρο in Gen 12:1 so that it “should perhaps be regarded as a variant reading” (Barrett 2004:342). Luke, furthermore, uses εξελθε at the opening of the quotation – as LXX Gen 12:1 does, followed by Philo Leg. 2,59, but contra Philo’s ἀπελθε in Migr. 1 and Her. 277.

Case 3: The quotations from Gen 12:3; 22:18; 28:14 in Acts 3:25 (Peter’s Speech)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen 12:3</th>
<th>Gen 28:14</th>
<th>Philo, Migr. 1</th>
<th>Philo, Migr. 118</th>
<th>Philo, Migr. 122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐν σοί ἐνευλογηθῶνται τῆς γῆς.</td>
<td>καὶ ἐν σοί ἐνευλογηθῶνται τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου.</td>
<td>λέγει γὰρ ὅτι ἐν σοί ἐνευλογηθῶνται τῆς γῆς.</td>
<td>λέγει γὰρ ὅτι τοῦτο δὲ, ὡς ἐσχήκα, ἵσσονται ἐν σοὶ.</td>
<td>λέγει γὰρ ὅτι τοῦτο δὲ, ὡς ἐσχήκα, ἵσσονται ἐν σοὶ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 R. Pesch (1986:248) is of the opinion that Luke omits the phrase because it does not fit to the departure from Mesopotamia and the death of Terah in Haran. This might be true – unless Luke’s LXX Vorlage already omitted it. Furthermore, G. Schneider (1980:453) stated: “Ob der Verfasser der Rede Gen 12,1 ‘irrtümlich auf Abrahams ersten statt zweiten Auszug’ bezieht, ist nicht sicher. Eher führt er die Wanderung Abrahams bewußt von Anfang an auf Gottes Initiative zurück. Selbst biblische Texte übergehen bei Angaben über den Weg Abrahams die Zwischenstation Haran (Gen 15,7; Neh 9,7).”

21 Cf. Barrett (2004:342): “In Acts the omission of from thy father’s house was probably due simply to natural abbreviation; the thought was more or less implied by συγγένεια. δεῦρο has no equivalent either in the LXX or the MT.”

22 The same applies to several other LXX witnesses. These include M 17’-82-355-426 C b d 53-246 n s 46-370 y z 54 59 509 730 – as well as Basilius Seleuciensis 104; Chrysostom passim; Cyrillex Alexandrinus I,165; Eusebius 6,9; Theodoretus Cyrensis 3,760; Latin, Ethiopic, Arabic, Aramaic and Boharic translations (or δευρω 52* 53 n 343’ 121-318).

23 Conzelmann (1987:52), however, pointed out that “…in Acts the departure, rather than from Haran, is from Ur, from which Abraham’s father must also depart (cf. vs 4).” Referring to the thesis of Wilcox (1965:26-7), he correctly states that “It is not necessary to understand this as dependent upon the Palestinian Targum tradition”. Emerton, too, argued that the similarity might be coincidental (1968:286).

24 Apart from the texts listed here in the synopsis, is Gen 12:3 also quoted in 1 Clem 10:3 and Jub. 12:23 (McLean 1992:21).
Steyn Torah quotations common to Philo of Alexandria and the Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>προευηγγελεστα τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὅτι</td>
<td>λέγων πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ: καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου</td>
<td>εὐλογηθήσονται</td>
<td>[ἐν-]ευλογηθήσονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</td>
<td>πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</td>
<td>πάσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gen 18:18 (Allusion 26:4)</th>
<th>Gen 26:4-5</th>
<th>Philo, Her. 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>καὶ δώσω τῷ σπέρματι σου</td>
<td>δώσω σοι καὶ τῷ σπέρματι σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου</td>
<td>πάσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην,</td>
<td>πάσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην, καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν ὑπήκουσεν Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ σου</td>
<td>τῆς ἐμῆς φωνῆς, καὶ ἐφύλαξεν τὰ προστάγματα μου καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα μου καὶ τὰ νόμιμα μου.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is striking that there are two versions of the tradition here, which confirm that the same tradition might have circulated in more than one

25 Koch pointed out that Paul agrees here with the oldest text form of the LXX by reading also ἐνευλογηθήσονται and not εὐλογηθήσονται as codex A does (1986:52).
26 Wevers (1993:164) does not agree with Soisalon-Soininen (1987:126) that “an instrumental use of ἐν for persons is impossible in Greek” and he finds the statement to be “overly absolutistic”. He interprets ἐν then here instrumentally and concludes “(T)hat ‘all the tribes of the earth shall be blessed ἐν σοί’ then means that Abram through the ἔθνος μέγα which will become will be the source of blessing for all the tribes of the earth in the future”.
27 The absence of τῆς γῆς here might either be the result of Paul’s elective or conflated form of quoting the passage, or it might reflect its absence in codex Alexandrinus in Gen 22:18.
29 The 3rd pers. αὐτῷ is replaced with the 2nd pers. σοι 761 458 or σὺ 458. Cf. Wevers (1974).
version from an early stage. The first version, or trajectory, of the tradition is found in LXX Gen 12:3 (with an allusion in 28:14), followed by Philo in Migr. 1, 118, and 122. The second version, or trajectory, of the tradition is found in LXX Gen 22:18 and 26:4-5 (with an allusion in Gen 18:18), followed by Philo in Her. 8 and by Gal 3:8.33 This latter version reads πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.34 Also the quotation in Acts 3:25 is closer to the second version in its text form which omits ἐν σοί. It reads, however, αἱ πατριαί in the place of αἱ φυλαί and transposes the phrase ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου, moving it in front of the quotation before ἐνευλογηθῶσαν, which resembles Gen 22:18 the closest (Rese 1979:71-3).35

It is interesting that the NT authors preferred the second version of LXX Gen 22:18 and 26:4-5 with the more universal terms “nations”36 (τὰ ἔθνη, Gal 3:8)37 and “families/clans” (αἱ πατριαί, Acts 3:25)38 in order to adapt their quotation to the new contexts for which they are writing.39 The object of the blessing moved here from the Jewish tribes to a broader audience.

Philo preserved thus both trajectories of the tradition: the LXX Gen 12:3 version in his Migr. 1,118, 122, and the LXX Gen 22:18; 26:4-5 version in

33 Ellis (1957:124) is of the opinion that this “reference is to Scripture as a whole” and points to the fact that “Repetitions of the promise are given twice in the hitpael (Gen. 22.18; 26.4), which has a reflexive connotation (‘bless themselves’). But the Niphal ḫḇḥ (Gen. 12.3; 18.18; 28.14) has only the passive signification ‘to be blessed’, and Paul’s rendering, as an interpretation, is proper even for the others”. He thinks, furthermore, that “Gal. 3.8 (in) the NT and LXX ‘be blessed’ would, on the basis of statistical probability, better represent the Hebrew if it were reflexive rather than passive” (p. 140). He finally considers Gal 3:8 as belonging to those quotations that are “at variance with the LXX and the Hebrew where they agree” (pp. 150, 152).

34 See Soisalon-Soininen (1987:194-6) for a discussion of its concord with a plural verb.

35 It is unclear whether this is a free citation from memory or a conflation. For an extensive discussion of the quotation of Acts 3:25, see Steyn (1995:153-7).

36 So, similar, Koch (1986:163): “Erst durch die Abänderung mit Hilfe von Gen 18,18 enthält Gen 12,3 die für Paulus erforderliche Zusipzung: die Geltung des Abrahamegens nicht nur für die neutral als αἱ φυλαί bezeichnete Menschenheit allgemein, sondern ausdrücklich für die ἔθνη”.

37 Cf. Gaston (1987:104): “‘that God would justify the Gentiles from faithfulness’ (3:8) is contained in Torah. This must be taken very seriously” (p. 81). Furthermore, “Paul is speaking explicitly about the situation of Gentiles in the enveloping verses 8 and 14” (My emphasis, GJS).


his *Her.* 8. Paul, in turn, presents a conflated quotation by fusing together elements from the two versions of LXX Gen 12:3 and Gen 22:18; 26:4-5. Luke’s version in Acts 3:25, however, is closest to LXX Gen 22:18; 26:4-5 as well as to Philo’s *Her.* 8. Thus again, it is interesting to note that Luke clearly follows the second trajectory of the tradition, different to Paul who seems to merge the two.\(^{41}\)

**Case 4: The quotation from Gen 15:13 in Acts 7:6 (Stephen’s Speech)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβράμ. Γινώσκων γνώσῃ δὲ ἀλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς</td>
<td>τῇ γραφῇ φάσκων ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ. … γινώσκων γάρ φησι γνώσῃ, δὲ ἀλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς</td>
<td>ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁτι πάροικοι ἐσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐν γῇ ὑπὸ ἕνα ὑπὸ ὑπὸ ἕνα ὑπὸ ἕνα ὑπὸ ἕνα</td>
<td>καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτοὺς</td>
<td>καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν ἐτῆς τετρακόσια.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τετρακόσια ἐτη.</td>
<td>σου ἐν γῇ ὑπὸ ἕνα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philo’s quotation in *Her.* 266-7 is, apart from the parenthetic introductory formula γάρ φησί, in exact agreement with LXX Gen 15:13. Luke’s quotation in Acts 7:6, however, creates the impression of a *reference* to the passage, i.e. a “retelling” in the form of an *indirect* quotation, rather than an explicit quotation. This becomes particularly clear in Luke’s change of the second person singular pronoun σου to the third person singular pronoun αὐτοῦ in Stephen’s speech. Acts 7:6 presents some further differences when compared to the versions of LXX Gen 15:13 and Philo’s *Her.* 266-7:

a) **Transpositions:** Πάροικον is transposed after τὸ σπέρμα and before ἐν γῇ; ἐτη is transposed from its position after τετρακόσια to a position before τετρακόσια.

---

40 Barrett is of the opinion that v.25 is a conflation of Gen 12:3, 18:18, and 22:18 (2004:212).
b) **Substitutions:** σου is substituted for αὐτοῦ; ἰδίᾳ is substituted for ἀλλοτρίᾳ; and αὐτοὺς for αὐτό.

c) **Omission:** The LXX phrase αὐτοὺς καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτοῦ is absent in Acts 7:6 which makes the quotation (sic! reference) shorter than LXX Gen 15:13. Philo already ends his quotation with the words ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ so that it remains unknown whether his LXX version included or excluded this phrase.

None of the LXX or Philonic witnesses support any of these differences in Acts 7:6 – which largely confirm the differences in Acts to be due to Luke’s interpretative hand and / or citation from memory. But the absence of the “repetitious” (Marshall 2007:558) ταπεινώσουσιν–phrase is an interesting feature in the light of the MT.42 The Hebrew also lacks one of the elements listed, although not the same one:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek equivalent of MT</th>
<th>Actual LXX translation</th>
<th>Acts 7:6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πάροικον ἔσται</td>
<td>πάροικον ἔσται</td>
<td>πάροικον ἔσται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δουλώσουσιν</td>
<td>δουλώσουσιν</td>
<td>δουλώσουσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κακώσουσιν</td>
<td>κακώσουσιν</td>
<td>κακώσουσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταπεινώσουσιν</td>
<td>ταπεινώσουσιν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This points to closer alignment of Acts 7:6 with the LXX tradition than with the MT tradition.

---

42 **“und sie werden sie erniedrigen: Die LXX hat drei gegenüber nur zwei Verben im MT, möglicherweise aufgrund von Doppelübersetzung der zweiten Verbform”** (Karrer & Kraus 2011:185).
Case 5: The quotation from Gen 15:14 / Exod 3:12 in Acts 7:7 (Stephen’s Speech)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἔπειν δὲ ὁ θεὸς</td>
<td>ἔπειν δὲ ὁ θεὸς</td>
<td>λέγεται γάρ·</td>
<td>διδάσκεται χρησμῷ·</td>
<td>καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ὃ ἐὰν δουλεύσωσιν, κρινῶ τοῦτοι·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὸ τὰῦτα</td>
<td>καὶ τὸ τὰῦτα</td>
<td>τὸ δὲ ἔθνος ὃ ἐὰν δουλεύσωσιν κρινῶ·</td>
<td>ζητεῖ μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξελεύσωται δὲ μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς.</td>
<td>ἐξελεύσωται δὲ μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς.</td>
<td>μετὰ δὲ τὰῦτα</td>
<td>καὶ λατρεύσετε τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ τῷ τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτω.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philo’s quotation of LXX Gen 15:14 in Her. 272 is virtually identical, except for his use of ἐὰν in the place of ἔὰν. The same applies to his brief quotation (reference?) of LXX Exod 3:12 in Fug. 140. Turning to Luke’s quotation in Acts 7:7, there is little doubt that he presents a conflated quotation by using LXX Gen 15:14 for the first part of his quotation and Exod 3:12 for the second part.43 Apart from the parenthetic introductory formula ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν, which divides the first quotation in two, and his preference for καὶ instead of δὲ, is the rest of this first part of Luke’s quotation identical to that LXX Gen 15:14. Luke then adds for the last part of his quotation a phrase from LXX Exod 3:12: καὶ λατρεύσουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτῳ (and shall worship me in this place) – which replaces δὲ μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς (with great possessions) of Gen 15:14. The quoted phrase from Exod 3:12 is, however, not identical to the LXX text. It is contextually and theologically reinterpreted by Luke in the mouth of Stephen when the second person plural λατρεύσετε becomes third person plural λατρεύσουσίν; the reference to τῷ θεῷ is replaced with the first person μοι (cf. ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν in the Gen 15:14 part of the quotation); and when δρεῖ becomes τόπῳ.44 These differences are


Case 6: The quotation from Exod 1:8 in Acts 7:18 (Stephen’s Speech)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exod 1:8</th>
<th>Philo, Conf. 72</th>
<th>Acts 7:18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀνέστη δὲ</td>
<td>ἀνέστη γάρ φησί</td>
<td>ἄχρι οὐ ἀνέστη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βασιλεὺς ἐτερὸς</td>
<td>βασιλεὺς ἐτερὸς</td>
<td>βασιλεὺς ἐτερὸς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον, δς οὐκ</td>
<td>ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον, δς οὐδὲ τὸ πανύστατον καὶ νεώτατον αἰσθητὸν ἀγαθὸν</td>
<td>ᾔδει τὸν Ἰωσήφ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ᾔδει τὸν Ἰωσήφ.</td>
<td>ᾔδει τὸν Ἰωσήφ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Philo’s quotation from Exod 1:8 in *Config.* 72 is longer and contains the expansion οὐδὲ τὸ πανύστατον καὶ νεώτατον αἰσθητὸν ἀγαθὸν, which is absent in both the LXX and in Acts 7:18. Luke’s version is thus closer to the LXX than to that of Philo. Acts 7:18 is connected with 7:17 by means of the ἄχρι οὗ. The fact that the Western text lacks ἐπ’ Αἴγυπτον, might be the original here as “there would be a tendency to assimilate to the LXX” (Barrett 2004:352; cf. Schneider 1980:458).

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The explicit quotations from the Torah that overlap between Philo of Alexandria and the Acts of the Apostles are to be found in speeches of Peter and Stephen. Scripture, in this case the Torah, is thus quoted and interpreted by these authoritative figures in the Lukan writings. Differences between Luke’s version and that of the LXX and Philo are minute and few in number. However, the following were observed:


---

45 “Abgesehen von dem einleitenden ἄχρι οὗ ist V 18 Zitat von Ex 1,8 LXX” (G. Schneider 1980:458).
Secondly in the cases of Acts 3:13 and 7:32 due to their inclusion of the phrase ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων.

- **Case 2:** Luke presents an abbreviated version in Acts 7:3 of LXX Gen 12:1 by omitting the phrase ἐκ τοῦ οίκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου, but including δεῦρο and hence emphasizing the aspects of movement and obedience. This might be due to his application of this passage in a new context, but it does not exclude the possibility of his Vorlage already lacking it (cf. the evidence of Targum Jonathan and several LXX witnesses). Luke is only closer to LXX Gen 12:1 with its inclusion of ἄν before σοι δείξω which lacks in Philo, but Philo’s versions contain much longer sections from the LXX source text and are, apart from the absence of ἄν, identical to the text form of LXX Gen 12:1-2.

- **Case 3:** Philo preserved both trajectories of the tradition, LXX Gen 12:3 as well as LXX Gen 22:18; 26:4-5. Paul, in turn, presents a conflated quotation by fusing together elements from the two versions. It is interesting to note that Luke clearly follows the second trajectory of the tradition – with two striking differences: the transposition of the phrase καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου in relation to LXX Gen 22:18 (and 28:14) and Luke’s unique choice of αἱ πατριαί instead of αἱ φυλαί by the LXX and Philo (or τὰ ἔθνη by the LXX, Philo and Paul).

- **Case 4:** Although probably intended as a quotation, Acts 7:6 seems to be rather a paraphrase by Luke than evidence of another existing textual version of Gen 15:13. None of the LXX or Philonic witnesses support any of these differences in Acts 7:6 – which largely confirm the differences in Acts to be due to Luke’s interpretative hand and / or citation from memory.

- **Case 5:** There is little doubt that Luke presents a conflated quotation in Acts 7:7 by using LXX Gen 15:14 for the first part of his quotation and Exod 3:12 for the second part. He has a clear theological reinterpretation in mind, influenced by LXX Exod 3:12, by including the phrase καὶ λατρεύσουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ (and worship me in this place) instead of the ὦδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς (with great possessions) of LXX Gen 15:14 and Philo.

- **Case 6:** Luke’s version in Acts 7:18 is closer to the LXX Exod 1:8 than to that of Philo’s Conf. 72 which includes the phrase οὐδὲ τὸ πανύστατον καὶ νεώτατον αἰσθητὸν ἀγαθόν.

---

46 Cf. the introductory formula: ἐλάλησεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ὅτι. So also G. Schneider (1980:454).
There were no clear traces found of another Textvorlage of the Torah that was used by Luke and/or Philo in the cases above. Luke’s quotations in these instances resemble adaptations and interpretations already made in the Christian tradition by his time. A number of cases show evidence of conflations and paraphrases of the quoted passages. Noteworthy, however, is that Philo’s text form and that of the reconstructed LXX text are very close in the cases investigated here. Where Philo notably differs from the reconstructed LXX text (cases 2 and 6 above), Luke tends to represent a text form that is in closer alignment to that of the LXX rather than that of Philo.
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