

Early Christian Quotations and the Textual History of the Septuagint: A Summary of the Wuppertal Research Project and Introduction to the Volume

Johannes de Vries and Martin Karrer

Jesus and his first followers were Jews. This speaks to the relationship they had to the Jewish scriptures. They would have had open access to the scrolls of the books that would later become the Septuagint or the Hebrew Bible, and they would have known a good portion of them by heart. That the first Christians quoted from Israel's scriptures should not, therefore, come as a surprise. What may surprise is the extent to which such citation can be found in the New Testament. The Wuppertal database¹ lists 449 quotations of 357 different verses from the LXX (without the disputed quotations, allusions and innumerable echoes) in 389 New Testament verses.

Jesus and his first followers would also have been familiar with Aramaic. But, it was Greek, which had been in use for centuries in the Eastern Mediterranean, that quickly became the Christian *lingua franca*. All the books of the New Testament and the neighbouring early Christian literature were composed in Greek. It follows that any textual analysis of Israel's scriptures as cited in the New Testament must begin with the Greek scriptural tradition. The Septuagint and the related textual forms deserve special attention, which, to be sure, includes their Hebrew and Aramaic "Vorlagen" or parallels.

At the end of the 20th century, a centre for the study of the Septuagint came into being in Wuppertal. In cooperation with the Universities of Koblenz and Saarbrücken (W. Kraus), it initiated a translation and annotation of the Septuagint. The work was conducted by an international team of scholars and included special methodological studies on related text-critical, historical and theological questions.² During the course of this work, the special relationship between the Septuagint texts and the early Christian quotations came into focus. Despite the

¹ See www.kiho-wb.de/lxx_nt.

² See Karrer, Kraus e.a. (2011) and the conference volumes of the international Wuppertal conferences from 2006 (Karrer, Kraus and Meiser [2008]), 2008 (Kraus, Karrer and Meiser [2010]), 2010 (Kreuzer, Meiser and Sigismund [2012]) and 2012 (Kraus and Kreuzer [forthcoming]).

recent discoveries of old manuscripts, the New Testament turns out to be the best source for analysing the text of Israel's scriptures.

Using the New Testament text in this fashion is, of course, not without often-significant difficulties. To begin, many of these quotations were cited by heart. Rote-learned texts certainly correspond to written textual forms, meaning that one can legitimately compare all kinds of quotations with the extant scriptures. One should not assume, however, that every Christian of that period was aware of the exact wording of the text as written down.

Even if it could be assumed that the early Christians intended to render the cited texts with precision, two challenging questions remain. First, what textual forms of Israel's scriptures did the early Christians use? Second, and perhaps more puzzling, was the LXX text (the source text) transmitted independently from the New Testament text or the text of other early Christian literature (the quotations), or were the two confused in the textual transmission which took place over the following centuries?

The Wuppertal research project summarized in the current volume took these questions as its starting point. This introduction will locate this project in the history of LXX research (I) and introduce related projects in Wuppertal (II) including the Wuppertal database (III). A brief sketch of the project's central findings follows (IV), along with a consideration of the *diplé* and of the source references in the margins of the codices (V) before suggesting ways in which the field of textual exploration might be broadened (VI). The introduction concludes with some suggestions regarding editorial work on the Septuagint (VII) and some preliminary answers derived from certain determinative findings (VIII).

I

The status of these quotations has significant bearing on the *textual research* conducted both *on the Septuagint* and *on the early Christian scriptures*. Viewed from the perspective of the LXX, did the early Christian quotations derive from the Old Greek or from later textual forms? Did the transmission of these Christian quotations influence the text of the Septuagint during the centuries in which the biblical canon was being formed? From the perspective of the early Christian literature, this question can be reversed. Did the quoted Septuagint texts prompt important alterations to the New Testament text and to the adjacent literature?

Both sides of the question are old and have been discussed for generations. To the first half of the 20th century, the material did not support confident conclusions. Most of today's famous biblical papyri and the discoveries in the Jewish desert remained unknown when E. Nestle and his followers created the leading reference edition of the New Testament (a combination of different

critical editions by Tischendorf, Westcott/Hort, Weymouth and B. Weiß), and when A. Rahlfs prepared his reference edition of the LXX. This lack of material naturally limited their critical perspectives. A. Rahlfs proceeded from the conviction that the New Testament had a significant influence over the Septuagint. As such, his reference edition of the LXX as well as his Göttingen edition of the Psalms preferred alternate readings to those found in the New Testament.³ Many New Testament scholars proceeded with the opposite assumption: the LXX had a decisive influence over the New Testament quotations. Consequently, the difference between the Septuagint and New Testament texts seemed to be more plausible than their similarity (any such similarity was considered more a consequence of later harmonization). Building from this assumption, different readings were often preferred in the respective editions of the Septuagint and New Testament.

The available material increased profoundly in the 20th century. The value of New Testament papyri strengthened the criteria of “äußere Kritik” in New Testament textual criticism. The earlier consensus broke down in the field of the New Testament from the 1960s.⁴ About the same time, the old Hebrew and Greek texts discovered near the Dead Sea included an unexpected variety in the biblical text during the pre-Masoretic times. Henceforth, it became possible to explain the differences and similarities between the Septuagint and early Christian quotations in a number of different ways. Along with the need to analyse Christian quotation of Jewish texts, now the study of redaction needed to account for the use of unfamiliar strands of Septuagint transmission, correlations to editions of the Septuagint (esp. “kaige”), and the impact of the pre-forms of the so-called newer translations or the Hebrew text. Crosspollination of the later transmission of the Septuagint and New Testament also became less plausible. Doubts concerning the influence of the Christian quotations on the transmission of the Septuagint arose in Septuagint research in the late 1970s (R. Kraft, R. Hanhart).⁵

The last decades have witnessed a significant advance in these lines of inquiry. This prompted a project to pool and consolidate the new insights. The Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) sponsored the Wuppertal project on “The text of the Septuagint in early Christianity” from 2007 to 2011/12. The project was directed by *M. Karrer* (New Testament) and focussed on the LXX quotations in the New Testament in its early development. This was supplemented with an examination of the Christian literature of the 2nd century. *M.*

³ See paradigmatically Ps^{LXX} 13:3 and Ps 39:7 in Rahlfs (1931) and Rahlfs and Hanhart (2006).

⁴ See Aland and Aland (1989, 285): „die im allgemeinen gültige Faustregel, daß [...] ein AT-Zitat dem Septuagintatext anpassende Varianten sekundär sind, darf nicht rein mechanisch angewandt werden.“

⁵ Cf. Hanhart (1981) and Kraft (1978).

Karrer gives an overview of the differing aspects of this project in his opening contribution to the current volume.⁶

II

Wuppertal proved to be an excellent *home* for the project, even as it benefited from the presence of related projects. One such project examined the reception of *Septuagint texts in the Book of Revelation* (2007–2010, also directed by *M. Karrer*). The task differed from the quotation project, in that, though Revelation makes intensive use of Israel's scriptures, it avoids explicit citation. Thus, while the projects were necessarily distinguishable, there were clear and noteworthy hints as to the relevance of the Septuagint even in Revelation;⁷ the impact of the Greek Jewish tradition informed all strands of early Christianity. The findings of the Revelation project have been presented separately.⁸ One important result of the study, however, rested in recognizing the preliminary character of the present critical edition of Revelation. This prompted the development, once again in Wuppertal, of the *Editio critica maior* of Revelation.

In 2007, *S. Kreuzer* (Old Testament) initiated a further project in Wuppertal devoted to the *Antiochene text of the Septuagint*. This has received a second stage of funding for 2013–2015. The Antiochene (or Lucianic) text is widespread in the transmission of the Septuagint. Although Rahlfs considered it a product of the late 3rd century, its textual form appears to be older and therefore relevant for the New Testament.⁹

These projects were realized independently, but were undertaken with intensive cooperation. Their findings were first published in 2010.¹⁰ One pertinent result of the cooperation rested in the reconstruction of the Antiochene text (by *M. Sigismund*) using all the LXX passages quoted in the New Testament. This data is accessible free of charge online at: www.kiho-wb.de/lxx_nt. *S. Kreuzer* makes important observations concerning the Antiochene text in his contribution to the present volume by tracing it through the New Testament (quotations from the historical books, the Psalms and the Dodekapropheton).¹¹ The subject-matter is difficult. The perceptibility of the Antiochene textual form varies in different parts of the Septuagint, and New Testament textual research does not use the category of an Antiochene text at all. In short, the subject

⁶ A list of recent publications also appears there (*Karrer*, see below, p. 35f.).

⁷ See, e.g., de Vries (2010).

⁸ Cf. Labahn and Karrer (2012).

⁹ The studies were reopened by Barthélemy (1963, 127): “C’est essentiellement la Septante ancienne, plus ou moins abâtardie et corrompue.”

¹⁰ Karrer, Kreuzer and Sigismund (2010).

¹¹ One may add Ezek: see the complex text of Ezek 37:27 in 2 Cor 6:16.

demands further scrutiny. A stronger connection between Old and New Testament textual research would be helpful in this respect.

III

The Wuppertal quotation project was designed pursuant to the possibilities offered by electronic documentation and analysis. As such, the above-mentioned Wuppertal *electronic database* forms an integral part of the project as a whole. This database, accessible at www.kiho-wb.de/lxx_nt, provides free online access for two versions. First, a full text version (guest-login) provides all available information. Second, an easyview-function provides a simple overview of the core database. Both versions can be accessed either from the Old Testament (LXX, MT and Qumran fragments) or from the New Testament texts.

The database lists the New Testament quotations and the related texts from the Septuagint / Hebrew Bible based on the oldest available manuscripts (papyri and main codices up to the 4th and 5th century). It integrates the notations of the quotation markers (introductory formulas, diplés) and lists the parallels to the quotations from those scriptures additionally incorporated into the great codices of the 4th and 5th centuries (*Barn.*, *1/2Clem.*, *Herm.*). The original authors and editors of the main codices are represented in separate lines. The net result is a comprehensive tool for examining the origin of the Biblical canon, one which helps elucidate the textual development as it began with the oldest witnesses and concluded with the latest (sometimes Medieval) emendations.

The New Testament text used in the database is linked to the New Testament Transcripts project in Münster. In this way, it benefits from the on-going work in the Münster “Virtual Manuscript Room” (nttranscripts.uni-muenster.de). Conversely, users of the New Testament transcripts can examine the Old Testament parallels via the Wuppertal site, along with critical information concerning the old versions (Latin, Syriac, Gothic).

One aspect of this project, however, deserves special attention. The definition of “quotation” is notoriously controversial. Recognizing this, Wuppertal database has developed a “middle way”; it combines three widely acknowledged aspects: the existence of a quotation marker in the text (New Testament); the use of a whole phrase from a pre-text (Septuagint or related text); and, the evidence of the old scriptoria (discernible by annotations and margins in the manuscripts).

As an electronic resource, the database can be edited as part of an on-going process. The database includes an open margin (the main criterion is the textual reference), giving users the freedom to question elements of the text or to add other quotations. In the future, new quotations and allusions may be added, along with newly discovered New Testament and Septuagint manuscripts. The database,

as it currently stands, is authoritative. But this possibility for addition permits the database to expand in conjunction with archaeological and textual discoveries.

These quotation markers deserve further attention, not simply as a means for interpretation, but as themselves indicators of textual relationships. These were in use long before the period of the New Testament (see *בְּכַתּוּב בְּסֵפֶר תּוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה* resp. *בְּכַתּוּב בְּתוֹרָה*, LXX *γέγραπται* in 2 Kgs / 4 Kgdms 14:6 and 2 Chr / Par 25:4) and spread in Qumran. Comparable phenomena, furthermore, exist in ancient Greek and Roman sources (e.g. Philo, *LA III 180* or Cicero, *off. 1 61*). These markers, in other words, indicate an awareness of pre-texts (received texts). A wide stylistic range of such markers are found within the New Testament; the authors utilize different semantic fields like writing, speaking, witnessing and sometimes very short signals (*ἔτι* or similar).

For the current volume, *D. Müller* assembled a list of the different markers. One should not overestimate the relevance of the quotation marks for the textual reliability of a certain citation.¹² And yet, a deeper examination of the quotation markers themselves promises more exact results. It should be noted in addition that *ἔτι* can be both a quotation mark and part of a quotation. Thus the italics indicating a quotation in the New Testament edition might, in a few places (esp. in Luke 4:10), need to be altered. In short, it is worth considering, not only the quotations themselves, but also their use in context.

IV

The Wuppertal project looked for every possible cross-reference between the New Testament and the Septuagint transmissions. With the progressive layering of the datasets, the textual phenomena increasingly came into focus. The end result reinforced the aforementioned shift in research since the 1970s: the New Testament had less of an influence over the Septuagint than the earlier scholars had assumed. The transmission of the books of the Septuagint and the New Testament occurred, in large measure, independently to at least the 5th and 6th centuries.

This relative independence can already be demonstrated by an examination of the full Bible Codices, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus and Alexandrinus (א, B and A):¹³

¹² E.g., recent research into the letters of Hebrews has shown that the use of the marker “God said” (or generally verbs of saying; Heb 1:5.6.7.13 etc.) did not indicate changes from the written to a freely spoken word, but a vivid actualization of the textually preserved written word of scripture. See the studies by Steyn (2011); Docherty (2009a: 2009b) and Walser (2012); more literature in Karrer (2013b).

¹³ C was a full Bible manuscript as well, but many leaves have been lost. Therefore, the comparison of quoted texts and quotations (Septuagint/New Testament) is limited. Cf. Karrer and de Vries (2012, 327–329).

the scriptoria of these codices had, at their disposal, both manuscripts of the quotations and the texts from which they were quoted. They encompassed the Septuagint and early Christian scriptures (the New Testament and selected texts from the later so-called Apostolic Fathers). But they did not harmonize these texts with each other. Neither did the later correctors of these codices, working over centuries, adapt the Septuagint and New Testament parts to each other. Instead, they consulted third manuscripts for their modifications.¹⁴ The evidence for such a conclusion is easily accessible in the Wuppertal database. The readings of the different hands (*prima manus* and correctors) are collected there (as indicated) and can be compared immediately using the *easyview*-function.

There seems, at first glance, to be an exception to this rule, however. *Stylistic corrections* sometimes occur in parallel in the Septuagint and New Testament. In these cases, at least, does the Septuagint influence the New Testament (or vice versa)?¹⁵ One plausible explanation, which presented itself during the course of research, holds that the scriptoria participated in the development of the Greek language and style. Parallel corrections in both the Septuagint and New Testament parts of a codex, in other words, only show the stylistic preference of a scriptorium. If this is the case, then such stylistic changes alone should not be considered decisive when evaluating the potential textual impact of the Septuagint on the New Testament (or vice versa).

V

A further significant observation supports this conclusion: the ancient scriptoria often marked quotations in the margin of the New Testament folios. For that purpose, codices of the full Bible adapted the old Alexandrian philological sign of the *diplé* (>) and sometimes enhanced the margins with *notes concerning the provenance of a quotation* (Isa etc.). Often, however, these *diplés* do not find equivalents on the cited pages of the Septuagint texts, and the notes of provenance include many errors. From this, one can draw two simple conclusions. First, the scriptoria were conscious of quotations in texts. Second, they followed convention in their notations and did not crosscheck the citations in the relevant texts and scriptures, i.e. they did not regard the codex as an entity.¹⁶

¹⁴ Most correctors worked in Sinaiticus (S1, ca etc.); see e.g. Heb 3:9 / Ps^{LXX} 94:9 Sinaiticus prima manus and ca (discussed in Karrer, [2013a, 575]).

¹⁵ Cf. some considerations by Karrer, Schmid and Sigismund (2008, 268–270) in the first phase of the Wuppertal project.

¹⁶ The Alexandrian background of the *diplé* has been explored since McNamee, *Marginalia*. The first Christian example, P. Oxy. 3.405 (Camb. MS Add. 4413), adds the *diplé* to a quotation from the New Testament (Matt 3:15–16) in Irenaeus, *haer.* III 9.3. Interestingly the codex Vaticanus may still use the *diplé* as an inner New Testament

The Wuppertal project broadened the study of the diplé. *M. Sigismund* and *U. Schmid* listed and described the diplés found in \aleph , B and A (2010).¹⁷ These diplés are selective and typically indicate quotations from the scriptures that became the Tenach in Israel.¹⁸ This labelling of Old Testament citations indicates the common ground of rabbinic Judaism and early Christianity in the ancient scriptures of Israel.

For the present volume, *A. Stokowski* has drawn up a more complete list of the diplés in Codex Vaticanus. The resulting conclusion is clear: the diplé was in use for centuries. In addition, a diplé sometimes marks the transition from quotation to interpretation. The quotation (and the diplé) indicates how the New Testament text was perceived.

A continuation of this approach would yield further results as the source references in the margins have not yet been sufficiently explored. A preliminary study of \aleph demonstrates its interest only in the Pentateuch (with an incorrect attribution of the quotation in Acts 3:25 to Deut), the Ps, Isa and Dodekapropheton (with incorrect attributions of Matt 2:6 to Isa and Acts 13:41 to Joel). Not even Jer or Ezek are mentioned.¹⁹ A comparison with notations in other New Testament codices may suggest a conceivably small common knowledge concerning the source of quotations.

Diplés appear also in later manuscripts.²⁰ One must, as such, examine the development of the diplé and the types of interests that directed the later replicas. Conversely, while diplés are missing from Septuagint texts, one can some-

reference in one single case, 2 Pet 1:17 (cf. Matt 3:17 parr. and 17:5 parr.; Schmid [2010c, 110]). However, Ps 2:7 may also be considered. One must be cautious when reflecting on the genesis of the sign in Christianity

¹⁷ See their contributions in Karrer, Kreuzer and Sigismund (2010, 75–152).

¹⁸ There is one remarkable exception: The scriptorium of B attaches the diplé to the quotation from Arat in Acts 17:28. Evidently, the scriptorium follows the quotation marker in the text (τινες [...] ειρηκασιν) and does not check the source text. Moreover, B reads *τινες των καθ ημας ποιητων* (“some of our poets”) against the hint at the non-Jewish Greek (“your” poet) in the main text. The reading of B is underlined by P⁷⁴. Thus the scriptorium indicates a broader development: Quotation formulas initiate the conviction that the following text is a quotation from one of “our” (Jewish/Christian) scriptures without demanding a check with the source text.

¹⁹ See the table in Schmid (2010b, 85–87).

²⁰ Sometimes a finding is really unexpected. Thus the newly described manuscript 1775 of Rev (a manuscript with an unknown commentary which is near to Andrew) integrates a quotation from Joel 3–4, marked by the diplé and a quotation formula *ταυτα λεγων ουτως Ιωηλ κεφ γ* (PageID 3640–3660) and a quotation from Ezek 38 marked by the diplé and the introduction *λογια του Ιεζε[χ]ηλ* (PageID 3740–3760). We are indebted to D. Müller, Wuppertal, for pointing out this passage to us.

times find other fascinating marginal notes worthy of further detailed study.²¹ All these approaches will enrich our knowledge of interrelationships between biblical texts.

VI

The results derived from examining the main codices (IV, V) found further confirmation when members and guests of the Wuppertal project²² investigated the *Septuagint and New Testament manuscripts and individual quotations*.

1. It was observed that the *quotations in the New Testament* bear similarities to different branches of the Septuagint tradition. There are important reflections of the Old Greek (most of the quotations belong to that category) as well as some relevant evidence for the Antiochene text (Rom 11:4 / 3 Kgdms [1 Kgs] 19:18 etc.; c.f. above). Sometimes a “kaige”-text (see καί γε in Acts 2:18 and Joel 3:2) or preparations for the so-called newer translations can be identified (e.g. Symmachus Deut 32:35 with Rom 12:19; Heb 10:30).

2. The *first century text of the Septuagint* was even more varied than previously understood. *J. de Vries* examines the Codex Ambrosianus of the Septuagint (F) for the present volume. According to his observations, the Pentateuch text as represented by F bears greater similarity to the New Testament quotations than the Old Greek. Thus, the F-text was probably wide spread during the first century.

One may further compare some quotations common to both Philo and the New Testament.²³ For example, the rendering of Prov 3:12 in Philo (Philo, *Congr.* 177; cf. Heb 12:6 and *IClem.* 56:4 A) refers to wisdom literature. Following such observations, we must allow for a wide range of possible variants.

3. The *New Testament manuscripts* develop different peculiarities in rendering the quotations. For example, as *J. de Vries* second contribution demonstrates, the New Testament Papyrus 46 (P⁴⁶) exhibits advertent or inadvertent changes (harmonizations, transpositions, omissions etc.). By extension, the impact of the LXX on P⁴⁶ is very limited. As a test case, P⁴⁶ illustrates the independence of the textual transmission within the first centuries. *R.H. van der Bergh*, in addition, examines in two separate essays two New Testament codices: D and E. These deliver insights into the so-called Western text and the bilingual transmission of

²¹ Cf. the observations on Codex Chludov by *J. de Vries* in *Karrer and de Vries* (2012, 349–351).

²² The project was accompanied by workshops. Thus some contributions in the present volume go back to the conference “Textgeschichte und Schriftrezeption im frühen Christentum,” held in October 2011.

²³ A special interest of *Steyn* (2011). The parallels from Philo are documented in the Wuppertal database.

Acts up to the 6th century. These texts have their own special characteristics, notably that the influence of LXX readings increases to a small degree, though not decisively, in codex E.

While some readings in D and E parallel those in the LXX, in neither manuscript can a consistent revision according to the LXX text be identified. For D (only considering the quotations from the Minor Prophets), *R.H. van der Bergh* keeps the possibility open that the parallels developed independently. In the case of E, he argues that out of twenty-six quotations, four have been influenced by the LXX, while the remaining fifteen indicate no such relationship.

All in all, the findings confirm the general observation that the early New Testament transmission remained largely independent of the Septuagint.

4. Where textual problems threaten to overwhelm the discussion, an in-depth knowledge of the variety of the Greek text of Israel's scriptures is especially helpful. The present volume illustrates the importance of such through an examination of the *quotations found in Matthew*. *A. van der Kooij* and *H.-J. Fabry* master the peculiarities of these quotations²⁴ by outlining the various influences of *kaige* (the New Testament research previously spoke of Proto-Theodotion), Antiochene variants or further tendencies.

A. van der Kooij concludes, regarding the citation of Isa 42:1–4 in Matt 12:18–2, that it is a composition by the author of Matt using both the LXX (OG) and a *kaige* revision of Isa. While the author introduced several changes when compared to these two pre-texts, the often-held view that he was further influenced by the Hebrew text has to be rejected.

H.-J. Fabry's examination of Isa 8:23–9:2 in Matt 4:15–16 highlights how this deviates, in several respects, from the LXX text. These variants, however, are not paralleled by the later LXX revisions. *Fabry* compares the quotation with the Alexandrine text of Isa (as witnessed by Codex Alexandrinus and related manuscripts) and argues for a pre-Alexandrine text tradition, upon which Matt 4:15–16 is based.

Van der Kooij and *Fabry* both agree that the particular form of the Matthean quotations result from different Greek pre-texts (i.e., not the Hebrew MT).

5. As the interests of the authors and the characteristics of the quoted texts vary from case to case, *every very early Christian quotation must be examined individually*.²⁵

²⁴ The Matthean quotations often differ from the main text of the Septuagint; however, the deviations do not exhibit redactional features. This points to a textual form circulating in the late 1st century.

²⁵ Many examples were studied during the process of the project starting with the quotations in Acts (Karrer, Schmid and Sigismund [2008]) and Jer^{LXX} 38:31–34 in Heb 8:8–12 (U. Schmid in Karrer and Schmid [2010, 182f.]).

An internal discussion illustrated how this is in some instances, perhaps, an insoluble problem. *P. Egan* suggested at a conference in Wuppertal (published in 2012) that the quotations found in 1 Peter most likely reflect a Greek *Vorlage*, even if that *Vorlage* is not documented by an independent Septuagint manuscript.²⁶ In the present volume, *M. Vahrenhorst* disagrees. He proposes greater redaction undertaken by the author of 1 Peter. Not that “Peter changed Scripture,”²⁷ but, according to Vahrenhorst’s analysis, when 1 Peter renders scripture, it renders the meaning more than the wording.

The discussion is of general relevance. No investigation of the manuscripts alone solves the question of whether the New Testament authors intended to render with precision the cited texts. Any interpretation must keep the various options open. One can read *M. Millard’s* investigation of Hab 2:4 in the New Testament from this perspective.

M. Millard combines textual criticism, exegesis and theology. He outlines the textual form and the perception of Hab 2:3–4 (2:4b) in different traditions and manuscripts, considering *inter alia* the readings of the MT and LXX (Codices A and B, 8HevXIgr), but also the reception in the Qumran scrolls (1QpHab), the NT (Heb, Paul) and the Babylonian Talmud (Makkot 24a).

VII

The detailed investigations into the manuscripts and their quotations support the main finding of the Wuppertal project. *The transmission of the Septuagint and the early Christian scriptures can and must be examined independently from each other.*

On the one hand, clear consequences follow. This conclusion supports the separation of the textual research on the Septuagint and New Testament in Göttingen (Septuaginta-Unternehmen; constructing two apparatuses etc.) and Münster (New Testament edition; electronically based). On the other hand, this separation makes the perceived intersections all the more challenging:

1. The manuscripts of the LXX and the New Testament include also *the stylistic development of the Greek language*. It would, as such, be helpful to denote where the stylistic form of a quoted text and a quotation differs due to editorial preferences and not to the readings of the manuscripts (e.g. *προωρώμην* Ps^{LXX} 15:8 / *προορώμην* Acts 2:25).²⁸ Several alleged differences between the modern editions of the Septuagint and New Testament result from these simple stylistic decisions.

²⁶ Egan (2012, *passim*).

²⁷ Egan (2012) asked “Did Peter change scripture?”

²⁸ Cf. Karrer and Schmid (2010, 173f.).

Whereas the critical edition of the LXX reconstructs a prototype from the 3rd or 2nd century B.C., the New Testament edition prefers a 1st-century Koine prototype. A simple harmonization of stylistic differences would, as such, be equally misleading. However, should the editorial teams develop some agreed tool for governing stylistic matters, this might better facilitate the identification of specific individual problems.

2. Rahlfs' methodological preference of selecting LXX readings based on their difference from New Testament parallels is now obsolete. This overestimation of the influence of the New Testament quotations over the transmission of the LXX means that every one of his *reconstructions of the quoted texts must be rechecked*. In some cases, the Old Greek will need to be revised. In other cases, textual variants attested by the New Testament are, indeed, secondary to the Old Greek, but still older than the New Testament. They are not, as Rahlfs suggested, due to the activity of a New Testament author.²⁹

It would be equally imprudent, however, to assume no redactional activity in the early Christian quotations. The textual history must be checked and the reconstruction of every quotation and its source undertaken separately. This improvement of Rahlfs' text has already begun. The later volumes of the Göttingen edition differ from Rahlfs' reference edition in many instances.³⁰ Certainly, some cases still provoke discussion,³¹ but the task should not be overestimated. *K. Heider* has compiled lists of the passages in which the editions (Rahlfs and Göttingen) refer to the New Testament. These lists are included in the current volume to stimulate further research.

3. Recognition of the textual variety of the LXX and its independent transmission *increases the text critical value of the early Christian receptions of LXX texts*. Many variants in Christian quotations can be seen to correspond to the differing strands of the foregoing LXX transmission. It further stands to reason that the early Christian authors would use a later textual form, especially in the 2nd century.

The present volume illustrates well the variety of reception common at that time. *H.E. Lona* and *M.J.J. Menken* examine the range of textual and interpretative problems in 1 Clement's and Barnabas' use of the LXX.

M.M. Menken reflects on the literary dependence between early Christian authors and the development of traditions within early Christian scriptural interpretations. In

²⁹ The Wuppertal project described both phenomena exemplarily with Ps^{LXX} 13:3 and Ps^{LXX} 39:7–10: see Karrer (2010) and Karrer, Schmid and Sigismund (2010).

³⁰ The Göttingen edition deviates from Rahlfs' readings for different reasons. All deviations within quoted passages are listed in Karrer (below, p. 50 note 92) and in Millard et al. (pp. 153–168).

³¹ Kraft (1978, 208.220–223), e.g., questioned several decisions in Ziegler's edition of Isaiah (Göttingen 1939).

several instances, the similar reception of scripture in *Barn.* and the NT can be explained with a shared tradition. In other passages, the dependence of the author of *Barn.* on different NT authors can be shown.³²

H.E. Lona lists all 79 quotations from the LXX in *IClem.* (= 28% of the whole book), 16 of which are also found in the NT. He discusses the most important of these 16 quotations, focusing particularly on those from the Pss, Gen and Isa.³³ He concludes that *IClem.* usually used the LXX in a particular and independent manner. Taken together, Lona regards Codex A as the strongest witness for these passages, with several singular readings preserving the oldest text of *IClem.* And, in two instances, possibly even a lost Septuagint reading.

M. Meiser criticises Justin's multi-faceted encounter with the Septuagint, and yet detects traces of the Antiochene text. *F. Albrecht* investigates Justin's reception of the Dodekapropheton in more detail and confirms the affinity of this corpus to the kaige-text.

M. Meiser compares Justin's scriptural quotations with the NT. He concludes that, at least in some instances, Justin was influenced by the NT text of LXX quotations; he even suggests that Justin already knew Luke-Acts. He restates the observation that Justin was acquainted with some Antiochene variants. Even though Justin might have used testimonia, he knew the entire LXX writings and had access to at least most of them.

F. Albrecht studies the reception of scripture in the writings of Justin Martyr using two test cases: *Dial.* 103:4 (Hos 10:6) and *Dial.* 53:3/*Apol.* 35:11 (Zech 9:9). The text quoted in *Dial.* 103:4 (Codex Parisinus Gr. 450) features the particle $\gamma\epsilon$ ($\chi\alpha\lambda\gamma\epsilon$). While the modern editions usually attribute this to the later textual history, Albrecht argues that Justin used a $\chi\alpha\lambda\gamma\epsilon$ -revision of Hos; thus, the particle is indeed part of the oldest text of *Dial.* 103:4. For Zech 9:9, Justin also used a pre-text which differed from the main tradition. Furthermore, *Apol.* 35:11 he regards as influenced by Matt 21:5.

It would appear that the quotations from the 2nd century onwards are less relevant for the knowledge of the Septuagint than are the quotations in the Jewish Hellenistic and New Testament writings. Nonetheless, Albrecht retains these later quotations for good reason as they both highlight the textual history of the Septuagint and sometimes retain old readings.

In view of these clarifications, it is somewhat astonishing that the critical Septuagint edition failed to account for a stimulating reception-text. *F.R.*

³² Dependencies: *Barn.* 5:12 on Matt 26:31/Mark 14:27 [Zech 13:7]; *Barn.* 12:10 on Matt 22:44/Mark 12:35/Luke 20:42f [Ps^{LXX} 109:1]; *Barn.* 13:7 on Rom 4:3,11,17 [Gen 15:6; 17:4]; *Barn.* 15:4 on 2 Pet 3:8 [Ps^{LXX} 89:4]; possibly also *Barn.* 12:4 on Rom 12:1–7 [Isa 65:2]; *Barn.* 15:3–5 on Heb 4:4 [Gen 2:2].

³³ Cf. esp. *IClem.* 16 (quoting Jes 53:1–12) and *IClem.* 36 (quoting Ps^{LXX} 2:7f.; 109:1; 103:4).

Prostmeier treats the most relevant example: Theophilus of Antioch cites Gen 1–3 extensively in ‘Ad Autolyicum’. These chapters are lost in \aleph and B. Nevertheless, *J.W. Wevers* neglected Theophilus when developing his Genesis edition.³⁴ *Prostmeier* discusses the reception history of Theophilus in modern research, the textual evidence for his corpus, the text of Gen 1–3 in *Autol.* and the textual criticism of Gen 1–3 in general. He suggests that Theophilus might have preserved a very old textual form, which might offer a better understanding of the beginning of the Septuagint.

VIII

We started with questions, and now we can give some preliminary answers. First, were the early Christians aware of the written wording of the cited scriptures? Given the variety of quotation, we must concede that not all of them were. Yet, many of them used the quoted texts consciously and carefully.

Second, what textual forms of Israel’s scriptures did the early Christians use? The answer gives an insight into the social reality. The followers of Jesus learned the quotations in a Jewish environment and borrowed scrolls from Jewish neighbours. They used all the extant textual forms of their time: old manuscripts representing Old Greek, later manuscripts showing the influences of kaige tendencies etc., and variants then in circulation and which were later picked up by the so-called newer translations. Our early Christian texts reflect the textual knowledge of their time.

Third, were the original texts in the Septuagint and the quotations derived from them in the New Testament transmitted independently, or were they confused in the textual transmission which occurred over the following centuries? The answer is as clear as it is significant: The Septuagint and New Testament scriptures were transmitted independently of each other for a surprisingly long period. Typically, the New Testament quotations did not influence the Septuagint text and vice versa. These general observations are not without exceptions. But these exceptions can be identified and thus separated from the main strands of the transmission. As a consequence, the early Christian quotations bear a greater authority, not only for interpreting them in the Christian context, but also for locating them in the textual history of the Septuagint. They contribute to our understanding of the Septuagint, beginning with Old Greek and continuing up to Roman times.

³⁴ Wevers (1974) and Wevers (1993).

LITERATURE

- Aland, Barbara and Kurt Aland. ²1989. *Der Text des Neuen Testaments*. Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelgesellschaft.
- Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. ²⁷1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece. Begründet von Eberhard und Erwin Nestle*, Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelgesellschaft.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. 1963. *Les Devanciers d'Aquila : Première Publication intégrale du text des fragments du Dodécaprophéton trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du Rabbinat palestinien*. VTS 10. Leiden: Brill.
- Docherty, Susan E. 2009a. *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews: A Case Study in Early Jewish Bible Interpretation*. WUNT II 260. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- 2009b. The Text Form of the OT Citations in Hebrews Chapter 1 and the Implications for the Study of the Septuagint. *NTS* 55:355–365.
- Egan, Patrick T. 2012. Did Peter Change Scripture? The Manuscript Tradition of Greek Psalm 33–34 and 1 Peter 3:10–12. Pages 505–528 in *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte*. Edited by S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser and M. Sigismund. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hanhart, Robert. 1981. Das Neue Testament und die griechische Überlieferung des Judentums. Pages 293–303 in *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Edited by F. Paschke. TU 125. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- cf. Rahlfs and Hanhart (²2006)
- Karrer, Martin. 2010. LXX Psalm 39:7–10 in Hebrews 10:5–7. Pages 126–146 in *Psalms and Hebrews. Studies in Reception*. Edited by D.J. Human and G. Steyn. LBS 527. New York et. al.: T & T Clark.
- 2013a. Die Rezeption der Septuaginta im entstehenden Christentum. Das Wuppertaler Forschungsprojekt. Pages 569–586 in *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010*. Edited by Melvin K.H. Peters. SBL.SCS 59. Atlanta: Brill 2013.
- 2013b. Die Schriften Israels im Hebräerbrief. *ThLZ* (forthcoming).
- Wolfgang Kraus et al. 2011. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*, 2 vol. (I Genesis bis Makkabäer, II Psalmen bis Daniel). Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelgesellschaft.
- Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Meiser, eds. 2008. *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten: Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Siegfried Kreuzer and Marcus Sigismund, eds. 2010. *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. ANTF 43. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- and Ulrich Schmid. 2010. Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament and the Textual History of the Bible – the Wuppertal Research Project. Pages 155–196 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Ulrich Schmid and Marcus Sigismund. 2008. Das lukanische Doppelwerk als Zeuge für den LXX-Text des Jesaja-Buches. Pages 253–274 in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*.

- Edited by H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn and M. Vervenne. BETHL 224. Leuven u.a.: Peeters.
- Ulrich Schmid and Marcus Sigismund. 2010. Textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu den Zusätzen in LXX Ps 13 und 95. Pages 140–161 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27. Juli 2008*. Edited by M. Karrer, M. Kraus and M. Meiser. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
 - and Johannes de Vries. 2012. Die Schriftzitate im ersten Christentum und die Textgeschichte der Septuaginta: ein Wuppertaler Forschungsprojekt. Pages 311–357 in *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*. Edited by J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp. VT.S 157. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Kraft, Robert A. 1978. Christian Transmission of Greek Jewish Scriptures: A Methodological Probe. Pages 207–226 in *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: FS Marcel Simon*. Edited by A. Bénoit et al. Paris: De Boccard.
- Kraus, Wolfgang, Martin Karrer and Martin Meiser, eds. 2010. *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27. Juli 2008*. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- and Siegfried Kreuzer, eds. *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D)*. WUNT. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck (forthcoming).
- Kreuzer, Siegfried, Martin Meiser and Marcus Sigismund, eds. 2012. *Die Septuaginta – Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte. 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010*. WUNT 286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kreuzer: cf. Karrer and Kreuzer and Sigismund (2010), Kraus and Kreuzer (forthcoming).
- Labahn, Michael and Martin Karrer, eds. 2012. *Die Johannesoffenbarung: Ihr Text und ihre Auslegung*. ABG 38. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- McNamee, Kathleen. 1977. *Marginalia and Commentaries in Greek Literary Papyri*, PhD. Ann Arbor: UMI.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. 1931. *Psalmi cum Odis*. Vol. 10 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum 10*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- and Robert Hahnhart. ²2006. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Vol. 2: *Libri poetici et prophetici*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Schmid, Ulrich. 2010a. Die Diplé: Eine Einführung. Pages 77–81 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- 2010b. Diplés und Quellenangaben im Codex Sinaiticus. Pages 83–98 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
 - 2010c. Diplés im Codex Vaticanus. Pages 99–113 in: *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Sigismund, Marcus. 2010a. Die Diplé als Zitatmarkierung in den „großen“ Unzialcodices – Versuch eines Fazits. Pages 149–152 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen*

- Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- 2010b. Formen und Verwendung der Diplé im Codex Alexandrinus. Pages 115–143 in: *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
 - Steyn, Gert J. 2011. *A Quest for the Assumed LXX Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews*. FRLANT 235. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 - Vries, Johannes de. 2010. Ps 86^{MT}/Ps 85^{LXX} in Offb 15,4b: Anmerkungen zum Text von Psalter und Johannesoffenbarung. Pages 417–422 in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*. Edited by M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund. ANTF 43. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
 - Walser, Georg. 2012. *Textual and Contextual Background of the Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews*, Diss. Leicester (publication in preparation).
 - Wevers, John W. 1974. *Genesis*. Vol. 1 of *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentus Graecum*. Edited by A. Rahlfs. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
 - 1993. *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*. Atlanta: Scholars Press
- and the contributions to the present volume.