

Old Testament Quotations within the Context of Stephen's Speech in Acts

Old Testament Quotations within the Context of Stephen's Speech in Acts

By

Juwon Kim

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Old Testament Quotations within the Context of Stephen's
Speech in Acts

By Juwon Kim

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2021 by Juwon Kim

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6161-5

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6161-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE	viii
ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	
1. Introduction.....	1
2. The Problem.....	1
3. Method	3
4. Structure.....	6
5. Context and Outline of Stephen's Speech.....	6
5.1 The context of Stephen's speech (Ac 6:1-8:1a).....	6
5.2 An outline of Stephen's speech (Ac 7:2-53)	7
CHAPTER TWO	10
THE ABRAHAM STORY (Ac 7:2-8)	
1. Introduction.....	10
2. Composition.....	11
2.1 God's calling to Abraham and the quotation.....	18
2.2 God's promise to Abraham and the quotation.....	25
3. Summary.....	34
3.1 The quoted text from Gn 12:1 in Ac 7:3	34
3.2 The quoted text from Gn 15:13-14 in Ac 7:6-7	35
CHAPTER THREE	36
THE JOSEPH STORY (Ac 7:9-16)	
1. Introduction.....	36
2. Composition.....	36
3. Interpretation of the Story by Luke.....	41
4. Summary.....	46

CHAPTER FOUR	47
THE MOSES STORY (AC 7:17-43)	
1. Introduction.....	47
2. Historical Background and Moses' Infancy (AC 7:17-22).....	48
2.1 Composition	48
2.2 Interpretation of the subsection by Luke	51
3. Flight into Midian (AC 7:23-29)	54
3.1 Composition	54
3.2 Moses refuted by a fellow Israelite and the quoted text from Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:27-28.....	56
3.3 Lukan method used for the quotation	57
3.4 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke	58
4. God's Calling (AC 7:30-34).....	63
4.1 Composition	63
4.2 Moses commissioned by God in holy ground and the quoted text from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 in Ac 7:33-34.....	66
4.3 Lukan method used for the quotation	69
4.4 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke	70
5. God's Sending (AC 7:35-37).....	74
5.1 Composition	74
5.2 Moses rejected by the Israelites and the quotation	77
5.3 Moses as a prophet like me and the quotation.....	82
6. Israel's Idolatry and God's Judgment (AC 7:38-43)	90
6.1 Composition	90
6.2 Israelite rejection of Moses again and the quotation	93
6.3 Israel's idolatry and the quotation	100
7. Summary.....	115
7.1 Summary of Ac 7:17-22.....	115
7.2 The quoted text from Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:27-28.....	116
7.3 The quoted text from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10 in Ac 7:33-34	116
7.4 The quoted text from Ex 2:14 in Ac 7:35.....	117
7.5 The quoted text from Dt 18:15 in Ac 7:37	118
7.6 The quoted text from Ex 32:1, 23 in Ac 7:40.....	118
7.7 The quoted text from Am 5:25-27 in Ac 7:42-43.....	119
CHAPTER FIVE.....	120
THE TEMPLE (AC 7:44-50)	
1. Introduction.....	120
2. Composition.....	120
3. God's Transcendence and the Quotation	125
3.1 The quotation from Is 66:1-2 in Ac 7:49-50.....	125

3.2 Luke's method used for the quotation	127
3.3 Lukan interpretation of the quotation	129
4. Summary	137
CHAPTER SIX	138
STEPHEN'S INDICTMENT (Ac 7:51-53)	
1. Introduction	138
2. Composition	138
3. Lukan Interpretation of the Section	141
4. Summary	144
CHAPTER SEVEN	145
SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSION	
1. The Text-Historical Aspect	145
1.1 Identification of quotations	145
1.2 Occurrences of quotations	146
1.3 Textual differences (between MT, LXX, and NT)	153
2. Lukan Methodological Aspect	155
3. Luke's Hermeneutical Aspect	158
3.1 Aspects of Luke's theology through his quotations	160
FURTHER READING	163
BIBLIOGRAPHY	176

PREFACE

The aim of this book is to contribute to ongoing studies on the Acts of the Apostles, particularly in the area of the manner in which the NT writer quotes and interprets the OT. Many scholars have studied the use of the OT in the NT, though few have investigated the explicit quotations in Acts. The discussion confines itself to an examination of the nine explicit quotations in Stephen's speech of Acts 7 which are identified with introductory formulae, i.e.: (7:3 from Gn 12:1; 7:6-7 from Gn 15:13-14; 7:27-28 from Ex 2:14; 7:33-34 from Ex 3:5, 7-8, 10; 7:35 from Ex 2:14; 7:37 from Dt 18:15; 7:40 from Ex 32:1, 23; 7:42-43 from Am 5:25-27; and 7:49-50 from Is 66:1-2).

The study first seeks to situate the quoted texts in their original context, after which attention is paid to their appearance in Stephen's discourse in Acts. Specific attention is given to the question of the presence of a possible independent Lukan *Textvorlage* which might underlie these quotations. To this end, firstly an overview of the differences between the pertinent OT textual traditions (e.g., MT, LXX, etc.), and the NT is provided. This clearly establishes the nature of the changes and modifications present in Luke's reading of his original material. Secondly and finally, the discussion seeks to provide an assessment of Luke's theological and hermeneutical framework, reflected within the OT quotations of Stephen's defense.

Above all, I should thank God my Father. His love and grace assisted me to complete this research. I must express my deep gratitude to my "Doktorvater", Professor G.J. Steyn. He introduced me to the discipline of studying 'the use of the OT in the NT' and challenged me to work critically and discerningly. Furthermore, he provided me with tireless care and kind consideration, sometimes as my brother or my friend. It was a great honour to study under him.

I will never forget the 2006 "NTSSA" (New Testament Society of South Africa) conference and "Deuteronomy in the New Testament" conference. Some contributors at these two conferences were willing to present their highly valuable academic comments on my study. Thus, I am thankful to Professors C. Breytenbach (Berlin), A.B. Du Toit (Pretoria), G.J. van der Watt (Radboud), S. Moyise (Chichester), M.J.J. Menken (Utrecht), and to my colleagues.

I am also greatly indebted to Professor Kyunam Jung, who is the president of the Kwangshin University. I was grateful for the sabbatical leave given to me by Kwangshin University for six months that allowed me to study at Perth Bible College, during which the final study of the book was completed. My appreciation is also to be extended to the staff of Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Most importantly, I wish to give deep thanks to my beloved wife, Jieun Park, because my work would not have been completed without her endless love, sacrificial support, and constant encouragement. I give thanks also to my daughter, Dain Kim, whom I love dearly.

I dedicate, with thanks, this publication to my mother (Chunja Kim) and my parents-in-law (Jinyong Park, Kwangsoon Jung).

ABBREVIATIONS

1. Apart from standard abbreviations, the following source was used:
Kilian, J 1987. *Form and Style in Theological Texts*. Pretoria: Unisa.

2. The following were added:

DBY	The Darby Bible
ELO	Unrevidierte Elberfelder
LUT	Revidierte Lutherbibel
LXE	LXX English Translation (Brenton)
PMV	Phillips and Moffatt Version
SCH	German Schlachter Version

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

Quotations of the OT in the NT are as old as the history of Christianity itself. They are not particularly different from the proper use of the Bible for the Christian preaching and teaching ministry in the Church today. Studies in this field are thus both important and necessary. Moreover, the significance of this field is further confirmed by observing the frequency of the use of OT quotations by NT writers.¹ Hill (1991:435) calculates that “approximately 32 percent ... of the New Testament is composed of Old Testament quotations and allusions” (cf. also Hill 1981:102-104).

Scholars do, of course, differ regarding the number of these quotations. Shires (1974:15) suggests that “there are at least 1,604 N.T. citations of 1,276 different O.T. passages.”² Sweet (1939:1516) and Kaiser (1985:3) calculate that there are some 300 explicit quotations from the OT in the NT. Nicole (1958:137) classifies the number into 250 explicit quotations and 45 instances depended directly on the OT. If what these scholars say is true, the influence of the OT on the language and contents of the NT must be considerable.

An indication of its importance can also be seen in the fact that this field of NT studies has been the focus of attention of many distinguished scholars. Porter (1997:79) argues that this study is “an active area of contemporary New Testament research.” Furthermore, according to Bock (1997:823-824), it is “one of the most debated aspects of NT study outside of the Gospels.”

2. The Problem

In relation to these facts, then, on what issues do NT scholars fail to agree? In the commonplace expression of ‘the use of the OT in the NT’,

¹ For various opinions, cf. Kaiser (1985:2-3).

² He (1974:122) adds that “[t]here are 260 chapters in the whole N.T., and only 12 of these contain no instance of a direct relationship of some form with the O.T.”

what is meant by the ‘OT’?³ Also, which terms are used to describe their various dependencies on the OT by NT authors? For the latter Porter (1997:80) has represented the terms as follows:

... citation, direct quotation, formal quotation, indirect quotation, allusive quotation, allusion (whether conscious or unconscious), paraphrase, exegesis (such as inner-biblical exegesis), midrash, typology, reminiscence, echo (whether conscious or unconscious), intertextuality, influence (either direct or indirect), and even tradition.

Hays and Green (1995:226-229) categorize the following four forms: direct citation, summaries of OT history and teaching, type-scenes, and allusions or linguistic echoes (or intertextuality). In this author’s opinion, it is still a competent classification, although Steyn (1995:2) claimed to be a category of the past:

(a) the influence on the *language* (grammar, style, etc.=exclusively linguistically orientated); (b) the manifestation of LXX material by way of the *explicit quotations* which were used (their *Textvorlage*, form, function, etc.=historical-critically orientated); and (c) the most difficult to determine scientifically, *implicit influence*, as seen in references, allusions, imitations and transpositions of broader motifs-which all contribute to the re-writing of a certain ‘event’ at a later stage in (church) history in a theological manner (hermeneutically orientated).⁴

With these comprehensive interests, the aim of this study is to investigate the topic related to the quotations from the OT in Ac 7, more specifically, the Old Testament quotations within the context of Stephen’s speech in Acts. Though many scholars have studied the use of the OT in the NT, and Luke-Acts amongst other NT books, few have investigated the explicit quotations in Acts.⁵ One such study is that of Steyn in his

³ Smith (1972:3) correctly indicates that “the phrase ... is an anachronism.”

⁴ Steyn (1995: 26) states that “one can detect six different categories of influence on the language and style of the author: (a) explicit quotations, introduced by clear introductory formulae; (b) direct phrases, without clear introductory formulae; (c) paraphrases, which are free versions of a foreign text; (d) references, being a single formulation from that tradition and being completely integrated into the presentation of the author; (e) allusions; and (f) scriptural terminology, being words, concepts, technical terms, titles, etc. To these may be added a seventh category, namely (g) ‘motifs’; that is, the imitation of larger structural patterns, tellings and traditions which are based on similar versions in the source texts.”

⁵ Many of the Lukan scholars regard this study from a Christological standpoint, including Bock referred to above (cf. also Jacobs 1967:177-196; Rese [1965]1969; Juel 1988). On the other hand, Evans & Sanders (1993) understand it as promise

book “*Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum*” (1995). The aim of the present study is to continue along those lines and to include Stephen’s speech alongside those of Peter and Paul.⁶

Firstly, this study wants to start with the question of the origin of the explicit quotations in Ac 7 and to determine the possible *Textvorlage* of the quotations in this chapter of Acts. Where do the quotations come from—the MT or the LXX, or neither? At the same time, did Luke get the quotations from oral or written traditions? Otherwise, could it be that he got them from his own materials?⁷ Secondly, as regards Luke’s handling of Scripture: Does Luke follow the texts accurately? If not, what are the changes that Luke makes? How did Luke apply the quotations within the new context (cf. Moyise 1994:133-143)?

Lastly, why does Luke quote and change the passages? What do the quotations from the OT passages imply about Luke’s understanding and theology? Hopefully, a cautious investigation of these quotations will yield some answers. This investigation will thus be driven by these three issues: *the origin of the quotations, the author’s methodology in using them and the author’s reason(s) for applying them.*

3. Method

Given the three issues referred to above, studies of the quotations from the OT in the NT have three main problems, best described as *text-historical, methodological and hermeneutical aspects* (Steyn 1995:31-37).

Firstly, the *text-historical aspect*⁸ will be handled with the question of

and fulfilment with Talbert (1984). Even though these attempts are remarkably pioneering and prominent, we should always be reminded of Stanton’s words ([1977]1992:68) that “the interpreter must allow his own presuppositions and his own pre-understanding to be modified or even completely reshaped by the text itself” (cf. also Gadamer 1975:465-466).

⁶ It is true that my research has been inspired and encouraged by G.J. Steyn who is my “Doktorvater,” especially by his doctoral thesis and lectures. Frankly speaking, it may fairly be said that this topic is due to his contribution, specifically because of his intention disclosed in the preface of his published dissertation that he wished to add a further study of the Septuagint quotations in Ac 7 and 15.

⁷ It is clear that Luke has used his sources in the course of his writing of Luke-Acts, above all through the witness of the Gospel of Luke itself (Lk 1:1-4). For details, cf. Marshall (1970), especially chapters 2 and 3.

⁸ According to Steyn (1995:32-33), the problem is fairly intricate; Firstly, no one can too easily refer to *the* LXX. Moreover, the evangelists of the NT did not have accessible *a* Bible, or *the* Bible, in the sense that we possess it today. Secondly,

the origin of the explicit quotations in Ac 7 and the possible *Textvorlage* of the quotations in Ac 7. To investigate this aspect, the context of the speech, its structure, and the text itself are examined systematically in conjunction with observing the arguments associated with the analysis of the text.

Then, there is an assessment of the introductory formulae that indicate the explicit citations, which I will mention later. The text is scrutinized thoroughly at a text-historical level, along with comparisons between the MT, LXX, and Lukan versions. Any differences are arranged into classes of disagreements and appraised one case at a time. In this instance textual criticism will be emphasised.

The textual deliberation also observes how and where the OT reading is found elsewhere in the NT. It is here that assessments are given about whether a *Textvorlage* has been used or not. Later, this investigation will judge the methodological and hermeneutical aspects of the quotations drawn from the OT.

Then, it will deal with the characteristics of the changes that Luke made and the traditions that he used. It will thus be disclosed, if the latter is correct, whether Luke's source of Scripture comes from either early traditions or the LXX. Alternatively, we will have to choose whether another *Textvorlage*, which the author had for himself, could have resulted in the changes to the quoted texts, or whether Luke made these changes with his personal linguistic, stylistic, and grammatical preferences, bearing the hearers' context in mind.

Throughout this book I will use "stylistic" preference in the sense of Luke's own personal style of conveying his message, in his two volumes. At the same time, I will use "grammatical" intentions in the sense of his need to write in intelligible Greek within his context. I also hope to show how linguistic differences should be assigned to "stylistic" or "grammatical" intentions. The criteria used to make these judgements will be derived from many different scholarly views.

However, "stylistic" intentions will be used when the Lukan inclination to use particular and repeated writing styles throughout the speech, as well as the book of Acts, are revealed (e.g. sometimes frequent replacements of a word, transposition for emphasis, unique word order, etc., are used). In addition, I will use "grammatical" intentions when Luke's tendency to adjust to his new context (number, person, mood changes, etc.) is shown.

Secondly, at a *methodological level*, (what is meant here, is actually HOW Luke used his OT. Did he present a long quotation; paraphrase;

there are significant differences between *reconstructed* text editions (the LXX and the NT) and the MSS which the evangelists would have had in their hands.

where does he begin/end; where does he fit the quote/reference into his argument, etc.) it is important to scrutinize the passage in totality, that is, within context. Furthermore, the function of the changes in Acts will be somewhat implied within the context of Stephen's speech, but will become clearer at a *hermeneutical level*.

Thirdly, at a *hermeneutical level*, the function of those changes in Luke's writing will be explained within the context of Stephen's speech. Moreover, Luke's intention with reference to this function will be drawn out through the whole book of Acts as well as Ac 7. The examination concludes with an assessment of the hermeneutical and theological point of the quotations and the changes that Luke made. In this book I will use the two terms-hermeneutical and theological-in a similar sense, in order to present Luke's intention by which he made changes in the quoted text, even though the two are different.

I also hope to show how linguistic differences should be assigned to Luke's "hermeneutical" and "theological" intentions. I will use "hermeneutical" and "theological" intentions when Luke's ideological motif is seen by the changes that were probably made by him in the speech. For example, there are the addition of ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ in v. 7, recurring employment of the same quotation in v. 27 and v. 35, substitution of Βαβυλῶνος in v. 43, etc. It should be noted that the original meaning is not considerably altered by these changes.

The author chose this method as he believes it to be one of the best organised and systematically presented approaches to unraveling the use of the OT in the NT developed in the past decades. Discussion is limited to the explicit quotations that are identified with introductory formulae, when the terms of quotation, citation, or even the use of the OT in this research are used. This will delineate the area, as well as the terms of this research.

Given these terms, the following verses in Ac 7 will be under investigation: vv. 3, 6-7, 27-28, 33-34, 35, 37, 40, 42-43, and 49-50 in Ac 7.

Ac 7	v. 3	Gn	12:1
	vv. 6-7		15:13-14
	vv. 27-28	Ex	2:14
	vv. 33-34		3:5, 7-8, 10
	v. 35		2:14
	v. 37	Dt	18:15
	v. 40	Ex	32:1, 23
	vv. 42-43	Am	5:25-27
	vv. 49-50	Is	66:1-2

4. Structure

This study comprises seven chapters according to the flow of the narrative, which are designed as follows:

Chapter One, as *introduction*, explicates and describes the research problem, method, context, and supplies an outline for this study on OT quotations within the context of Stephen's speech in Acts.

Chapter Two examines the *Abraham Story*, which is the first account with two quotations from Genesis in the speech.

Chapter Three discusses the *Joseph Story*, which represents God's faithfulness, despite all Joseph's troubles.

Chapter Four presents the *Moses Story*—the longest section, with the most quotations (six) in the discourse—grouped into the following five subsections: Historical Background and Moses' Infancy; Flight into Midian; God's Calling; God's Sending; Israel's Idolatry and God's Judgement.

Chapter Five, as the last summary of the Israelite history in the speech, describes the *Temple*, along with a quotation from Isaiah.

Chapter Six concludes the discourse by investigating *Stephen's Indictment*.

Chapter Seven depicts the *synthesis and conclusion* arrived at from this study.

5. Context and Outline of Stephen's Speech

5.1 The context of Stephen's speech (Ac 6:1-8:1a)

In order to examine the text (Ac 7:2-53) here, it is necessary to demonstrate briefly the immediate context (Ac 6:1-8:1a).⁹ As a result of the murmurings of the Grecians, seven persons, who were chosen by the church under the direction of the apostles, are given the task to oversee the daily ministry to the poor; that none might be neglected, and that the apostles might give their attention to prayer and the ministry of the word of God (6:1-6). So the word of God greatly prevails (6:7). Stephen, full of God's grace and power, refutes those who disputed against him (6:8-10). They in turn bribe false witnesses, who falsely accuse Stephen of blasphemy against the law and the temple before the Sanhedrin (6:11-14). When all in the Sanhedrin see him, his face shines like the face of an angel (6:15).

When Stephen is required to answer before the Sanhedrin (7:1), he indicated how God called Abraham and promised Canaan to him and his

⁹ According to van der Watt (2002:10-11), interpreters must consider the preceding and following passages.

seed (7:2-8); how Joseph was sold by his brothers, and how Jacob with his family went down to Egypt (7:9-16); that, as they were oppressed by the Egyptians, Moses was born and brought up by Pharaoh's daughter (7:17-22); that trying to rescue Israel he was rejected and fled to Midian (7:23-29); that at Sinai God called him for his people (7:30-34); that eventually he was sent to be their ruler and deliverer (7:35-37), although they refused to obey him and made an idol, so God's judgement resulted from the work of their hands (7:38-43); that they had the tabernacle of the Testimony, until Solomon built the house (7:44-47), however, as said by the prophet, the Most High does not live in houses made by men (7:48-50). He fearlessly accuses the nation of imitating the resistance of their fathers who persecuted and killed the prophets, and he charges them with murdering Christ in disobedience of their own law (7:51-53). Being cut to their hearts, they hurry to stone him. While seeing a vision of Christ and calling on him to receive his spirit and pardon his murderers, he dies (7:54-60).

5.2 An outline of Stephen's speech (Ac 7:2-53)

Scholars differ regarding the outline of Stephen's speech.¹⁰ For

¹⁰ Bihler (1963:vii) separates this speech into three parts:

- I. Die Geschichte Israels von Abraham bis Moses (2-37)
 - A. Die Abrahamsgeschichte (2-8a; 8b=transition)
 - B. Die Josephsgeschichte (9-16; 17-19=transition)
 - C. Die Mosesgeschichte (20-37)
- II. Israel's Abfall: Gotzendienst und Tempelbau (38-50)
 - A. Der Gotzendienst (38-43)
 - B. Der Bau des Tempels (44-50)
- III. Der Schuld Israels (51-53)

Richard (1978:38-140; 1979:257) shows a fourfold division:

- I. History of the Patriarchs (2-16)
 - A. Story of Abraham (2-8)
 - B. Story of Joseph (9-16)
- II. History of Moses (17-34)
 - A. Hebrews in Egypt (17-19)
 - B. Moses prior to the Sinai Event (20-29)
 - C. Theophany and Mission (30-34)
- III. Thematic Section (35-50)
 - A. Moses and the Fathers (35-41)
 - B. God and the Fathers (42-50)
- IV. Invective against Audience (51-53)

Fitzmyer (1998:365) separates this speech into five parts, apart from the introduction and conclusion:

- Introduction (2a)

example, Kilgallen (1976^a:ix-xii) divides the speech into five sections:

- I. The Abraham Story (2-7)
- II. The Joseph Story (8=transition; 9-16)
- III. The Moses Story (17-43)
- IV. The Temple (44-50)
- V. Conclusion (51-53)

Kilgallen's outline is appropriate for the flow of narrative within the speech. However, it is necessary to include v. 8 in Abraham's story, which plays a transitional role between Abraham's story and Joseph's story. The fact that Abraham became the father of Isaac and circumcised him must be seen "against the background of God's promise" to Abraham (Combrink 1979:9; cf. Richard 1978:54-59; 1979:257; Marshall 1980:131; Kistemaker 1990:243-244; Barrett 1994:331). Furthermore, it shows, that v. 8 needs to be incorporated in the Abraham story, through the words *ἔδωκεν* (in v. 5 and v. 8) and *οὕτως* (in v. 6 and v. 8), where we see the direct link in the story of Abraham.

Pointing out the speech's rhetorical character, Dupont (1985:167), on the other hand, divides the speech in accordance with the model of a classical defence speech:¹¹

- I. *exordium*: statement of praise to addressees (2a)
- II. *narratio*: statement of facts (2b-34)
- III. *argumentatio*: statement of proofs and arguments (35=transition; 36-50)
- IV. *peroratio*: summary conclusion (51-53)

Part I. Story of Abraham (2b-8a)

Part II. Story of Joseph (8b=transition; 9-16)

Part III. Story of Moses (17-19=transition; 20-38)

Part IV. Israel's First Falling Away (39-40=transition; 41-43)

Part V. Israel's Second Falling Away (44-50)

Conclusion: Stephen's Indictment (51-53)

For various and different ways to outline Stephen's speech, see also Bruce ([1951]1987:137-163), Schneider (1980:446-447), Roloff (1981:118), Krodel (1986:139). Noticeably, Kennedy (1984:121-122) alone incorporates the last section (vv. 54-60) as an integral part of Stephen's speech.

¹¹ For the outline according to the criteria of ancient rhetoric, cf. Penner (1996:358-366). He delineates as follows: A. *Exordium* (6:8-7:1); B. *Narratio/Partitio* (7:2-8); C. *Probatio* (7:9-53); D. *Peroratio* (7:54-60). Cf. also Seland (1995:233-235); Wolfe (1993:278-280).

However, Dupont's suggestion here is questionable, in spite of its value, because it does not fit the changes of subject found in Stephen's speech. This study needs to be investigated according to the flow of narrative rather than the principle of rhetoric.

From these four examples (including footnote 10, but except for Dupont's), one can recognise what the commonly identified aspects of the speech are, namely: the Abraham story (2-8), the Joseph story (9-16), and the final indictment against the listeners (51-53). Clearly, most of the discrepancies result from the classification of the part in vv. 17-50. It is not easy to decide where the Moses story ends and the Temple story begins since there is the employment of a Mosaic element (the tabernacle) as a hinge from which the argument of the Temple starts. It is most plausible to obtain an expected split at v. 44 owing to the inner constancy of the section from a literary perspective, as I will mention later (e.g. the continuous use of the rhetorical τοῦτον (x2) in v. 35 and οὗτός [ἐστίν] (x3) in vv. 36-38, and the link of the final οὗτός in v. 38 with ᾧ in v. 39 which leads a piece on the theme of Israel's idolatry and God's judgement in vv. 38-43).

My suggestion for a division of the speech would be the following:

2- 8	The Abraham Story
9-16	The Joseph Story
17-43	The Moses Story
17-22	Historical Background and Moses' Infancy
23-29	Flight into Midian
30-34	God's Calling
35-37	God's Sending
38-43	Israel's Idolatry and God's Judgement
44-50	The Temple
51-53	Stephen's Indictment

CHAPTER TWO

THE ABRAHAM STORY (AC 7:2-8)

1. Introduction

Abraham is portrayed as “the first Jew (i.e. Hebrew, *Juwon Kim*), to whom God gave the covenant with the rite of circumcision to mark it” (Watson 1996:42). The commencement of the speech with his story is thus quite appropriate since Stephen’s hearers, or his accusers, are the Jews (Ac 6:12-15). Dahl (1976:77) also rightly indicates that “In Stephen’s speech the Jewishness of Abraham is not concealed but emphatically pronounced.” Calvert-Koyzis (1997:2) agrees with this opinion when he says that “Luke’s affinity with Hellenistic Judaism is seen most clearly in Acts 7:2-8” (cf. also Dahl 1966:142). Noticeably, those Abrahamic accounts not seen as necessary to the Stephen discourse are excluded. Elements omitted include: “Abraham in Egypt, Abraham and Lot, the battle with the kings, Hagar and Ishmael, the three men and the destruction of Sodom, and, most remarkable of all, the sacrifice of Isaac” (Dahl 1976:71).

This reveals that Luke’s selective summary of Abraham’s story is as a result of his theological intention. He concentrates on the following accounts: When Abraham was in Mesopotamia, God called him to leave for the land which God would show him; after four-hundred-years of slavery in Egypt, his descendants will return to the promised land and truly worship God. Appropriately, these accounts go along with Luke’s quotations from Genesis. Investigation of the quotations, at length, here serves to understand properly this section as the first part of Stephen’s defense.

2. Composition¹²

This section starts with the charge against Stephen by the high priest,¹³ “Are these charges true?” (εἰ ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχει; v. 1b). If this was a formal court case the high priest should not have tried a direct interrogation that requested the accused person to sentence himself.¹⁴ The use of ἔχω with an adverb is commonly repeated in Acts (see 12:15; 15:36; 17:11; 21:13; 24:9, 25). The charges that are brought relate to the Law and the Temple, two of the most highly revered elements of the Jewish faith life.

Before starting his speech, Stephen calls the audience “Brothers and fathers” (Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ καὶ πατέρες, v. 2a). The vocative Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ is fairly frequent in Acts (Ac 1:16; 15:7, 13; 22:1; 23:1). In addition, similar beginnings are seen in Acts: ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι (Ac 2:14); ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται (Ac 3:12; 13:16); ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι (Ac 17:22). Other occurrences also appear in Ac 1:11; 2:22, 29, 37; 5:35; 7:26; 13:15, 16, 26, 38; 19:35; 21:28; 28:17 and 4 Macc 8:19. According to Fitzmyer (1998:222), “the combination of ἄνδρες with another noun in apposition was a common mode of address in Greek oratory: ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι (Demosthenes, *Olynthiac* 1.1,1.10; Lysias, *Or.* 6:8); ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται (Josephus, *Ant* 3:189).” Here ἀδελφοὶ also implies that both Stephen (speaker) and Jews (listeners) are the same children of πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ.

It is noticeable that only here and Ac 22:1 add καὶ πατέρες after Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοὶ. Paul also speaks to the Jews like this in Ac 22:1. According to Schrenk ([1967]1977:977) “father” is a mark of respect that is employed particularly for the rabbi. It is true to assume that the verbal skill used here is indicative of a person speaking Greek (Haenchen 1971:278). For Kilgallen (1976^a:122), this opening “fits admirably into the style of Acts.”

¹² The outline of my composition closely follows Combrink’s (1979:30-35) excellent structural analysis as a facet of his exegesis of Ac 6:8-8:3, except for a division of section G (Ac 7:35-38). Louw (1973:104) understands the cola as the most important elements in this analysis, “for they, and their clusters, reveal the actual structure” of the whole discourse.

¹³ Witherington (1998:264) assumes it may still have been Caiaphas, when Jesus was in court. If Caiaphas was really the high priest, he might be likely to condemn the disciple-Stephen, instead of the teacher-Jesus, and consequently to damage the reputation of the recent Jesus’ movement from the religious Jews’ viewpoint (Bruce [1951]1987:98, 144).

¹⁴ As for this point, cf. the venerable argument by Abrahams ([1924]1967:132-137).

Next, Stephen attracts their attention by shouting “listen to me!” (ἀκούσατε,¹⁵ v. 2b). Within this episode of Stephen’s, it is noteworthy that ἀκούσατε in Ac 7:2 closely matches Ἀκούοντες in Ac 7:54. Then Stephen replies to the high priest’s charges. (a) “The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham while he was still in Mesopotamia, before he lived in Haran” (Ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης ὥφθη τῷ πατρὶ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ὅντι ἐν τῇ Μεσοποταμίᾳ πρὶν ἢ κατοικῆσαι αὐτὸν ἐν Χαρρὰν, v. 2c). (b) “and God said to him, ‘Leave your country and your people, and go to the land I will show you’” (καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν **ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ [ἐκ] τῆς συγγενείας σου, καὶ δεῦρο εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι δείξω**, v. 3).

This set phrase Ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης is found nowhere else in the New Testament. It simulates the same expression ‘the God of glory’ (ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης) in Ps 28:3 (LXX) which translated the Hebrew expression **יְהוָה לְבָרָכָה**¹⁶ of the MT (Ps 29:3). The original setting of this set phrase is a victory hymn to the Lord whose glorious and holy voice reverberates right through heaven, all of nature, and the temple.

At the beginning of the speech, however, this set phrase conceivably emphasizes the transcendence of the God who does not dwell in a temple built with human hands. Besides indicating God’s transcendence, the set phrase Ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης functions as a bracket of the whole Stephen narrative with δόξαν θεοῦ in Ac 7:55.

In the Abraham story (vv. 2-8), the divine subject Ὁ θεός is accompanied by nine verbs as follows: ὥφθη (v. 2), εἶπεν, δείξω (v. 3), μετώκισεν (v. 4), ἔδωκεν, ἐπηγγείλατο (v. 5), ἐλάλησεν (v. 6), κρινῶ (v. 7), ἔδωκεν (v. 8). Enclosed with Ὁ θεὸς τῆς δόξης πατρὶ ἡμῶν finally aims to place Stephen himself in continuity with earlier devout Jews, for example Abraham, Joseph, Moses, the prophets, and Jesus (see Ac 7:11-12, 15, 38-39, 44-45; contrast 7:51-52).

Μεσοποταμία stands for the fuller Greek expression Συρία Μεσοποταμία which denotes the northern region of Syria situated between the Euphrates and the Orontes Rivers. However, later Hellenistic writers from the fourth century onwards broadened the application of the name to encompass the whole Tigris Euphrates Valley (Bruce [1951]1976:161), possibly pointing to the area in which Ur was located. It would also have been roughly compatible with the territory of the ancient Assyrians and Babylonians, specifically that of the latter’s territory, to which Jews had

¹⁵ The verb ἀκούσατε occurs frequently in Acts, especially in speeches (Ac 2:22; 13:16; 15:13; 22:1).

¹⁶ For a repudiation of the opinion that it is any reference to the Jewish doctrine of the Shekinah, see also Abrahams (1925:11-88).

been exiled under Nebuchadnezzar in the sixth century B.C. (Josephus, *Ant* 15:39).¹⁷ The ruins of a Jewish synagogue have been discovered at Dura Europos (Rostovtzeff 1938:100-130).

Χαρράν was situated in the north-west of Mesopotamia, in Amorite country, to the east of Canaan; it was a key trade centre, the 'fertile crescent' routes from Egypt to Persia and from Babylonia to Asia Minor (Fitzmyer 1998:369). According to Gn 11:31 and 12:1-4, God called Abraham after the move to Haran. But Stephen here affirms that God had called Abraham in Mesopotamia before he stayed in Haran (see also Ac 7:4a; Philo, *Abr* 62;¹⁸ Josephus, *Ant* 1:154; contrast Philo, *MigrAbr* 177). Some scholars consequently assert that God called Abraham twice (Bruce [1951]1987:146; Marshall 1980:135; Kistemaker 1990:240; Witherington 1998:266).

Since, however, it is clear from Gn 15:7 and Neh 9:7 that God called Abraham out of Ur, it can convincingly be taken for granted that a divine call came to him there before he lived in Haran. Kilgallen (1976^a:42) claims that "[t]heologically, ... Stephen chose this tradition (Gn 15:7) rather than that of 11:21-12:5 because he wanted to show his listeners that the call to a new land (to worship God) was at the very root of Abraham's earlier migration."

This problem, however, seems to be solved correctly by examining the Hebrew syntax. Gn 12:1 starts with a *waw* consecutive. From Gn 11:10 there is a long string of *waw* consecutives heading towards the birth of Abraham in v. 26. Gn 11:27 cuts this string with a *waw* disjunctive, resulting from interposition (Watts 1964:24). This indicates the commencement of the episode of Terah and his descendants which carries on until his death in Gn 11:32. In view of the fact that vv. 27-32 form a complete unit, concentrating on Terah, Gn 12:1 must link back to Gn 11:26 and be the coherent continuance of the story being presented there. Furthermore, in Gn 12:1 the phrase "your country, your relatives, and your father's house" is never applicable to Haran. That is because Haran is not Terah's house neither is it Abraham's country or the place in which his relatives live. This phrase thus corresponds only to Ur.¹⁹

In Gn 12:1 (LXX) the introductory formula is as follows: καὶ εἶπεν κύριος τῷ Ἀβραμ. In this phrase, εἶπεν is aorist in tense. In Gn 12, when the account continues in v. 4, ἐπορεύθη is aorist as well. The deed depicted

¹⁷ Unless otherwise referred to, Whiston's translation (1987) is used for Josephus's works.

¹⁸ Unless otherwise referred to, Yonge's translation (1993) is employed for Philo's works.

¹⁹ For the detailed argument, cf. Koivisto (1982:42-69).

by εἶπεν goes before that of ἐπορεύθη in time. In a situation where one aorist goes before another in time, the former is to be considered as a consummative pluperfect (Brooks & Winbery 1979:99). Gn 12:1a was thus rightly translated “And the Lord *had said* to Abraham” in NIV, KJV, DBY. In the end, this shows clearly that the call of Abraham came in Ur, as is mentioned above.

(c) “So he left the land of the Chaldeans and settled in Haran” (τότε ἐξελθὼν ἐκ γῆς Χαλδαίων κατώκησεν ἐν Χαρράν, v. 4a). It is necessary to note that at this point Stephen’s speech is continued by the verb ἐξέρχομαι which occurred in the previous verse.

(d) “After the death of his father, God sent him to this land where you are now living” (κακέιθεν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ μετώκησεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταύτην εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε, v. 4b). The second historical discrepancy appears here concerning Terah’s age (cf. Koivisto 1982:70-89). Terah was 70 years old when Abraham was born (Gn 11:26). Then he lived 205 years and died in Haran (Gn 11:32). According to Gn 12:4, Abraham was 75 years old when he set out from Haran. However, in relation to Ac 7:4, Terah would only be 145 when Abraham left Haran.

Some scholars (e.g., Mare 1971:19; Gloey 1910:236) would like to rearrange the sequence of Terah’s sons, Abraham, Nahor, and Haran. They suggest that Abraham was Terah’s youngest son, born 60 years after Haran, whom they thought to be Terah’s eldest son. This answer looks questionable. Terah would have been 130 years old when Abraham was born, but Abraham finds it “incredible that he himself should beget a son at 99” in Gn 17:1, 17 (Alford [1877]1976:69). Others (e.g., Wilcox 1965:28-29; Kahle 1947:143-144; Munck 1967:285; Scobie 1973:391-400) propose that Stephen adhered to a Samaritan tradition. In the Samaritan Pentateuch, Gn 11:32 says that Terah dies not at 205 but at 145 years of age. Philo (*Abr* 78) also offers Terah’s lifetime as 145 years. But since no Greek manuscript with this reading exists, this proposition remains only hypothetical (Richard 1977:196-197, 207-208).

Bruce (1987:41) advocates that the intention for the inclusion of this problematic expression in Ac 7 is a dependence on an aged rabbinic tradition that was produced to release Abraham from the brutal deed of leaving his old father. The rabbinic tradition revealed in Gn R 39:7 is as follows:

Now what precedes this passage? “And Terah died in Haran [which is followed by] Now the Lord said to Abraham: Get thee.” R Isaac said: “From the point of view of chronology a period of sixty-five years is still required. But first you may learn that the wicked, even during their lifetime, are called dead. For Abraham was afraid saying, ‘Shall I go out and bring dishonour upon the Divine Name,’ as people will say, ‘he left his father in his old age and departed?’ Therefore the Holy One, blessed be He, reassured him: ‘I exempt thee from the duty of honouring thy parents, though I exempt no one else from this duty. Moreover, I will record his death before thy departure.’ Hence, “And Terah died in Haran” is stated first, and then, “Now the Lord said to Abram, etc.”

Lake and Cadbury (1933:70) conclude correctly that Stephen followed the interpretative techniques of his day that had little consideration for accurate calculation (Cf. also Longenecker 1981:340; Philo, *MigrAbr* 176-177; Josephus, *Ant* 1:154).

The word μετακίζω is appropriate for this context; it means “to lead settlers to another abode” (Liddell et al. [1940]1968:1121). At the end of v. 4, witnesses D E pc mae add καὶ οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν (ἡμῶν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν D).

Stephen’s reply is continued: (e) “But God gave him no inheritance here, not even a foot of ground” (καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός, v. 5a). The expression οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός may be an echo of Dt 2:5 (γὰρ μὴ δῶ ὑμῖν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός), which has nothing to do with Abraham. Here it means that Abraham did not possess any of the promised land, namely all that Abraham bought was God’s promise (Davies 1974:270). It is true that Abraham bought the field and the cave of Machpelah near Mamre in Canaan for a burial site (Gn 23), but Stephen appropriately disregards this; a burial ground is not considered inhabitable land, nor is it seen as a sign of a forthcoming residence.

(f) “But God promised him that he and his descendants after him would possess the land, even though at that time Abraham had no child” (καὶ ἐπηγγέλματο δοῦναι αὐτῷ εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτὴν καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτόν, οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου, v. 5b). The phrase καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτόν might refer to either Gn 17:8 (καὶ δώσω σοι καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σέ τὴν γῆν ἣν παροικεῖς πᾶσαν) or Gn 48:4 (καὶ δώσω σοι τὴν γῆν ταύτην καὶ τῷ σπέρματί σου μετὰ σέ), although Steyn (1995:30-31) pointed out only one source (Gn 48:4) of the OT for Ac 7:5, as will be shown below.

According to Steyn (1995:30-31), this phrase is very similar to an accurate OT reading, and is habitually mistaken for an explicit quotation, however, there are other similar cases in Acts.²⁰ Concerning these cases, Steyn says (1995:30)

... without any introductory formula or any other clear indication that they were meant to be explicit quotations, and could have been meant either to be explicit quotations or only references presented in 'Biblical words'. This group must be distinguished clearly from the first, because it would be almost impossible to ask here any questions on a possible *Textvorlage* which might underlie them.

This expression of God's promise is also made several times in Gn 12:7; 13:15; 15:18-20; 24:7. In Acts this is the first reference to it (see also Ac 7:17; 13:32; 26:6).

The negation of ὅντος by means of οὐκ more easily than μή results from the impression that is "the proper negative for a statement of a downright fact" (Moulton 1908:232). Within the NT, this fact is used for illustrating the power of Abraham's faith in the promise of God, despite the ostensible hopelessness of its fulfilment (see Rm 4:16-22).

(g) "God spoke to him in this way: 'Your descendants will be strangers in a country not their own, and they will be enslaved and mistreated for four hundred years. But I will punish the nation they serve as slaves,'" (ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ὅτι ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν ἑτὴ τετρακόσια καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἐὰν δουλεύουσιν κρινῶ ἐγώ, vv. 6-7a). Another problem on number arises here as compared with the chronological report in Gl 3:17. There the period between the promise to Abraham and the conferment of the Law is 430 years, which surely depends on Ex 12:40.

Some scholars (Haenchen 1971:279; Marshall 1980:136; Kistemaker 1990:242) solve this difficulty by arguing Stephen's indifference to accurate numbers, mentioning the round number in Gn 15:13. On the other hand, within the text of Ex 12:40, the reading of the MT shows 430 years as Israel's sojourn 'in Egypt', but the reading of the LXX describes this sojourn as being both 'in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan'. Also, the later rabbinic tradition suggests that the interval of 430 years

²⁰ For three similar expressions from the Psalms, see Ps 89:21=Ac 13:22; Ps 146:6=Ac 4:24; Ps 146:6 (once more)=Ac 14:15, and for six similar expressions from the Torah, see also Gn 48:4=Ac 7:5; Ex 1:8=Ac 7:18; Ex 3:6=Ac 3:13; Ex 3:6, 15=Ac 7:32; Ex 20:11=Ac 14:15; Ex 21:4=Ac 7:27, 35.

expanded from Isaac's birth to the day of the exodus (Strack & Billerbeck 1961:668-671).

(h) "God said, 'and afterward they will come out of that country and worship me in this place'" (ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξελεύσονται καὶ λατρεύουσίν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ, v. 7b). (i) "Then he gave Abraham the covenant of circumcision" (καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην περιτομῆς, v. 8a). The reference to circumcision in Stephen's speech appears only once. Circumcision was to be the sign of the covenant between Abraham and God (Gn 17:9-14; see also Joseph, *Ant* 1:192; Jub 15:28;²¹ contrast BibAnt 15:25-34; Philo, *Abr* 111-166). The covenant assured God's promise that God would be the God of Abraham and his offspring, while, on the human's side, obedience to the ritual of circumcision was the sign of promise to God. Consequently, the mentioning of circumcision becomes a model of the submission of the forefathers of Israel (see also v. 51).

(j) "And Abraham became the father of Isaac" (καὶ οὕτως ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, v. 8b). Lake and Cadbury (1933:72) comment that the adverb οὕτως in v. 8b is emphatic. (k) "and circumcised him eight days after his birth" (καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ²², v. 8c).

(l) "Later Isaac became the father of Jacob," (καὶ Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακώβ, v. 8d). (m) "and Jacob became the father of the twelve patriarchs" (καὶ Ἰακώβ τοὺς δώδεκα πατριάρχας, v. 8e).²³ Lake and Cadbury (1933:72) consider the word πατριάρχας in Acts as to be its first occurrence in Greek literature (see Ac 2:29; 7:9; Heb 7:4), since the used word to describe Jacob's twelve sons is not found anywhere in earlier existing Greek literature, as I will discuss later. Isaac, Jacob, and the twelve patriarchs in v. 8 are introduced so as to make a movement to the story of Joseph (9-16). Kilgallen (1976:45-46) and Bihler (1963:vii) therefore regard v. 8 as a transition, as discussed earlier, though the two viewpoints are a little bit different.

²¹ Unless otherwise referred to, the two volumes edited by Charlesworth (1983; 1985) are used for the OT Pseudepigrapha.

²² For the detailed explanation from the OT, see Gn 21:4 ("When his son Isaac was eight days old, Abraham circumcised him, as God commanded him.").

²³ For the birth of Jacob's twelve sons, see Gn 29:32-35; 30:6, 8, 11, 13, 18, 20, 24; 35:18 (Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Dan, Naphtali, Gad, Asher, Issachar, Zebulun, Joseph, Benjamin).

2.1 God's calling to Abraham and the quotation

2.1.1 The quotation from Gn 12:1 in Ac 7:3

2.1.1.1 Other occasions of the quotation

Although a vague reference to Gn 12:1 may be implied in Heb 11:8, this quotation is not found as an explicit quotation anywhere else in the NT. This is the first time that the explicit quotation appears here in the NT.²⁴

2.1.1.2 The introductory formula (Ac 7:3a)

The explicit quotation from Gn 12:1 is identified by an introductory formula in Ac 7:3a (καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν), as has been pointed out (Kilgallen 1976^a:125). According to Steyn (1995:27-28), this formula that is used to indicate an explicit quotation is one of two main ways-γράφω²⁵ or λέγω²⁶-of introducing explicit quotations in Acts. Through the location or place-ὁ προφήτης²⁷-from which the text is derived, the explicit quotation is used quite a few times in Acts. In that case, there are three additional occasions seemingly adopted from the Psalms-(βίβλος) ψαλμοί²⁸ or Δαυίδ²⁹-and Torah-Μωϋσῆς.³⁰

²⁴ The reference is also found in certain extra-canonical literature, e.g., Philo, *MigrAbr* 1, 16, 19, 20, 21 and *RerDivHer* 56; Jub 12:22-23; Clement(Rm), *1 Clem* 10:3.

²⁵ It comes to 7 times out of the 26 explicit quotations (see Ac 1:20 (presenting two citations from Psalms); 7:42; 8:32; 13:33; 15:15; 23:5).

²⁶ Including Ac 7:3, it comes to 19 times out of the 26 explicit quotations (see Ac 2:16, 25, 34; 3:21-22, 25; 4:25; 7:3, 6, 27, 33, 35, 37, 40, 48; 13:34, 35, 40, 47(?); 28:25).

²⁷ It comes to 6 times of the 9 times that the Prophets are cited (see Ac 2:16; 7:42, 48; 13:40; 15:15; 28:26).

²⁸ For its occurrence as introductory formula in Acts, see Ac 1:20 (presenting two Psalms citations); 13:33.

²⁹ For its use as introductory formula in Acts, see Ac 2:25, 34; 4:25.

³⁰ For its employment as introductory formula in Acts, see Ac 3:22(Dt); 7:35(Ex); 7:37(Dt).

2.1.1.3 Establishing and describing the textual differences

NT(NA27)	LXX	MT
Ac 7:3b	Gn 12:1b ³¹	Gn 12:1b
ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου	ἔξελθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου	לֵךְ-לְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ
καὶ [ἐκ] τῆς συγγενείας	καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας	וּמִמּוֹלַדְתְּךָ
σου,	σου	
	καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου	וּמִבֵּית
	τοῦ πατρὸς σου	אָבִיךָ
καὶ δεῦρο		
εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι	εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι	אֶל-הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אֶרְאֶךָ:
δείξω.	δείξω	

2.1.1.3.1 Textual differences between MT and LXX

There are no major differences between the MT and the LXX on this point. The LXX reading accordingly signifies here a comparatively faithful or literal translation of the Hebrew. In accordance with this, it must be stated that it is not clear that the author of Acts (and/or his tradition) made use of the Greek and not the Hebrew, or *vice versa*. Here he could have employed either the LXX or the MT.

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

In comparing the readings of the LXX and Acts, the quotation in Ac 7:3 corresponds closely with the LXX version of Gn 12:1 (cf. Fitzmyer 1998:370). Nevertheless, there are also two major, as well as one minor deviation visible in Ac 7:3, compared to the LXX: (1) Two major changes- (i) the omission of καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου and (ii) the addition of καὶ δεῦρο; and (2) one minor change-the omission of [ἐκ] within only two MSS.

(a) Omissions

[1] The omission of [ἐκ] before τῆς συγγενείας σου

The LXX and all MSS of Acts have ἐκ before τῆς συγγενείας σου-except B D.

³¹ Unless otherwise referred to, the LXX version edited by Wevers (1974) is used for the Greek translation of Genesis.

[2] The omission of καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου after τῆς συγγενείας σου

The phrase καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου after τῆς συγγενείας σου is omitted by Luke. Both the MT and the LXX, however, have the phrase.

(b) Addition

[3] The addition of καὶ δεῦρο before εἰς τὴν γῆν

The reading of the NT adds the words καὶ δεῦρο before εἰς τὴν γῆν. Both the MT and the LXX, however, omit these words.

2.1.2 Lukan method used for the quotation

(a) Omissions ([ἐκ]; καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου)

Firstly, some comments on the omission of ἐκ. The LXX and all MSS of Acts have ἐκ before the phrase τῆς συγγενείας σου, except in the case of B and D. Most scholars do not make mention of the omission of ἐκ before τῆς συγγενείας σου (cf. Archer & Chirichigno 1983:5; Arnold 1996:311-312; Bruce [1951]1976:162; Conzelmann 1987:52; Fitzmyer 1998:370; Haenchen 1971:278; Richard 1978:41-43).

Although the omission is attested to in only a few witnesses (B and D), an alternative reading is presented in the margin of Westcott/Hort, and NA25. This is because the addition of the term is supported by the vast majority of MSS (P⁷⁴ & A C Ψ 33 1739 M lat sy Ir^{lat}). Of particular significance is the attestation to the term in the more important MSS such as P⁷⁴ and &.

Secondly: καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου. Although both the LXX and the MT retain this phrase after τῆς συγγενείας σου, it does not appear in the equivalent NT reading. Wilcox (1965:26-7) has suggested that the absence of the term forms "... a point of contact between a Targumic tradition and a text in Acts." However, the parallel with the late Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, is merely accidental (cf. Conzelmann 1987:52). According to Fitzmyer (1998:370), the reason for the omission, lies in the question of why Abraham departed from Haran.

The other possible reason for the omission of this phrase in Acts, lies in Luke's retention of the phrase καὶ [ἐκ] τῆς συγγενείας σου, which appears prior to the omitted portion. It can be suggested that the essential meaning of the omitted phrase is still retained in the text of Acts, due to the retention of the prior phrase, which essentially says much the same thing (cf. Koivisto 1982:57, Barrett 1994:342). Interestingly, in their translation of Philo's *On Abraham*, Colson et al. (1935:62) unite the two