

## New Testament Quotations and the Textual History of the Septuagint

*Siegfried Kreuzer*

The main link between the Old Testament and the New Testament, not only on the level of text, are the quotations. The quotations from the Old Testament or Hebrew Bible, with exception of only a few words, are given in Greek, i. e. from the Septuagint. Besides the question of content and intention of these quotations and their basic importance for »the Septuagint as the Bible of the New Testament Church«,<sup>1</sup> there is the question of their form. Are the quotations taken from what we know as the Septuagint, or are there other forms of the text?

In a widely used textbook on the Septuagint, one finds the interesting and also somewhat cryptic remark: »These quotations diverge from the Masoretic text in 212 cases, whereas they differ from the Septuagintal text in only 185 cases.«<sup>2</sup> This statement raises a number of questions, esp., *What is »the Septuagint« and what is »the Masoretic text«*, and *Are there only two forms of the text?* The answer concerning the Masoretic Text (MT) seems simple: It is the Hebrew text as we have it in Codex Leningradensis and in the modern editions of the Biblia Hebraica. However, one should be aware that Codex Leningradensis is not the only Masoretic codex and that, in spite of its very faithful tradition, their text is not always identical with the Protomasoretic text from antiquity.

More complicated is the problem of the Septuagint text. Many times the critical editions are used as »the Septuagint«. But the textual tradition of the Septua-

---

<sup>1</sup> M. Müller, »The Septuagint as the Bible of the New Testament Church. Some Reflections,« *SJOT* 7 (1993): 194–207; see also M. Müller, *The first Bible of the Church. A Plea for the Septuagint* (JSOTSup 206 = Copenhagen International Seminar; Sheffield 1996); »Die Septuaginta als Teil des christlichen Kanons,« in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006* (ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; WUNT 219; Tübingen 2008), 708–727; »Die Septuaginta als Bibeltext in der ältesten Kirche. Graeca veritas contra Hebraica veritas,« in *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2012* (ed. W. Kraus and S. Kreuzer; WUNT 325; Tübingen 2014), 613–636. Especially in »Die Septuaginta als Teil des christlichen Kanons,« Müller has made aware of the complexities of the textual traditions and that it is no longer possible to talk about »the Septuagint« and defining deviations from today's standard text as changes by the author.

<sup>2</sup> N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek version of the Bible* (Leiden 2000 = Atlanta 2009), 324.

gint is manifold and modern editions depend on both the manuscripts available and the editorial principles used for the reconstruction of the text. Both factors are often overlooked or taken for granted. However, also using a diplomatic edition, usually a diplomatic edition of Codex Vaticanus, does not necessarily guarantee that this is »the Septuagint«, rather in the contrary.

Especially in view of the quotations in the New Testament, there is an additional problem. In most cases, the quotations are older than the oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint. Are not the quotations important witnesses to the textual tradition of the Septuagint? To say it briefly: It is a longstanding editorial principle in the critical edition to deny this question. The quotations in the New Testament – along with the scripture quotations by Josephus and the Old Latin texts (with their origin from the second century onwards) – have been pushed aside with the argument that agreements between these texts and Septuagint readings would have arisen by later cross influence: The New Testament would have influenced the Septuagint text and, on the other hand, the Septuagint text would have influenced the textual transmission of Josephus and of the Old Latin translation. It is clear that such assumptions do away with the possible relevance of early witnesses for the Septuagint while also increasing the differences between the Septuagint and the New Testament (and similarly, Josephus), because agreements in the textual form are considered secondary.

What I want to do in this paper is to make aware of some text-critical biases and assumptions that have been carried on for a long time and to present some new insights and options.

## 1 Introduction

As the question of the textual basis for research and discussion is heavily influenced by long standing traditions, let us start with a brief look at the history of printed editions of the Septuagint.

The first printed editions of the Septuagint date from the sixteenth century. The first ones were the Aldina from 1518, based on manuscripts available in Venice, and the Complutensian Polyglot with Hebrew, Latin and Greek text edited in Complutum near Madrid in Spain, produced 1514–1517 but published only in 1522. These editions basically have been diplomatic editions; however, we may assume that also some text-critical decisions have been made. The Aldina had several reprints throughout Europe, including Germany,<sup>3</sup> where it became

---

<sup>3</sup> *Divinae Scripturae nempe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti omnia, Graece, a viro doctissimo recognita et emendata, variisque lectionibus aucta et illustrata* (Frankfurt a.M. 1597). According to the preface, this edition was based on the Aldine edition via the edition of Johann Herwagen

important for the Protestant Bible translations, along with Switzerland, England and even in Eastern Europe.

However, for the centuries to follow, the most important and influential edition was the Sixtina, produced by initiative of the later pope Sixtus V and published in 1587. This edition was based on the Aldina but revised towards Codex Vaticanus, which was judged as the best manuscript available at the time:

Search was made in the libraries of Italy as well as in the Vatican for MSS. of the LXX., but the result of these enquiries satisfied the editors of the superiority of the great Vatican Codex (B = cod. Vat. gr. 1209) over all other known codices, and it was accordingly taken as the basis of the new edition.<sup>4</sup>

Unfortunately, we are not informed about the criteria for this »superiority«. Most probably the easy availability and also some »local patriotism« (or »dogmatic concerns«) may have been of influence. In any case, because of its adaptation to Codex Vaticanus, the Sixtina more or less was a diplomatic edition of Codex Vaticanus with some additions.

This situation continued down through the centuries. The main text of the editions of the Septuagint was a diplomatic edition of the Sixtina, i. e. basically Codex Vaticanus, with an ever growing text-critical apparatus as more and more manuscripts became known.

There was only one important exception: The edition by Johannes Ernestus Grabe, who in 1709–1720 published an edition of the Septuagint based on Codex Alexandrinus that had come to London just some decades before. Grabe undertook his work after he in 1705 (in the form of a letter) had published a treatise on the priority of Codex Alexandrinus in the book of Judges.<sup>5</sup>

The dominance of Codex Vaticanus became even stronger in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The edition of Holmes and Parsons<sup>6</sup> with its wealth of information is a diplomatic edition of Codex Vaticanus, with a rich apparatus, mentioning about 300 manuscripts. Also the Cambridge editions, both the smaller edition by Swete and the large but unfinished edition by Brooke, McLean

---

(Hervagius) (with a preface by Melanchthon) from 1545 and some comparison with the Complutensian Polyglot, the Antwerp Polyglot (1572) and the Sixtina.

<sup>4</sup> H. B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge 1900), 181.

<sup>5</sup> J. E. Grabe, *Epistola Ad Clarissimum Virum, Dn. Joannem Millium, ... Qua Ostenditur, Libri Judicum Genuinam LXX. Interpretum Versionem eam esse, quam Ms. codex Alexandrinus exhibet* (Oxford 1705). This treatise influenced the edition of Brooke, McLean and Thackeray (see n. 7), as they decided to stay also for Judges with Codex B as main text, but to render in the apparatus the full text of Codex A (and not only the variants). This in turn was evidently the reason for Rahlfs in his »Handausgabe« (see n. 8) to present also two versions of Judges, although with the difference that his A-text is not simply the text of Codex A but an eclectic text, while his B-text is Codex B.

<sup>6</sup> R. Holmes and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus* (Oxford 1798–1827).

and Thackeray, are exact diplomatic renderings of Codex Vaticanus (as far as it is extant).<sup>7</sup>

As is well known, the first modern critical editions of the Septuagint are the so called ›Handausgabe‹ by Alfred Rahlfs from 1935 (now slightly revised by Robert Hanhart in 2006), and the large Göttingen edition that started in 1931 with Rahlfs' Psalms edition.<sup>8</sup>

A critical edition is an edition where you get a text that the editor deemed to be the oldest text. For such an edition the editor collects and evaluates the manuscripts and he or she decides about the oldest text. That is exactly where the subjectivity of the editor comes in: How does he or she evaluate the manuscripts and their readings and what are the text-critical rules for the decisions?

Already in 1863, Paul de Lagarde, the famous pioneer in Septuagint studies, had mentioned three rules (he called them ›Axioms‹) for text-critical decisions in the Septuagint: »I. die manuskripte der griechischen übersetzung des alten testaments sind alle, entweder unmittelbar oder mittelbar das resultat eines eklektischen verfahrens: darum muss, wer den echten text wiederfinden will, ebenfalls eklektiker sein.« Axioms II. and III. give the rules for this eclectic procedure:

II. wenn ein vers oder verstheil in einer freien und in einer sklavisch treuen übertragung vorliegt, gilt die erstere als die echte. III. wenn sich zwei lesarten nebeneinander finden, von denen die eine den masoretischen text ausdrückt, die andre nur aus einer von ihm abweichenden urschrift erklärt werden kann, so ist die letztere für ursprünglich zu halten.<sup>9</sup>

These rules basically come down to the rule that the text which differs most from the Masoretic text is the oldest text and that the texts closer to MT represent a revision towards the MT. The rules imply that there was a development from a free translation towards an adaptation to the Hebrew text, and – a great idea in his time – that in some cases there probably existed other Hebrew text forms.<sup>10</sup>

Interestingly, Lagarde's student, Alfred Rahlfs, did not follow these insights. In the preface to his edition of Psalms he stated:

1) Wenn die drei alten Textformen zusammengehen, ist ihre Lesart i. d. R. aufgenommen. 2) Wenn die alten Zeugen gegen die jüngeren mit dem MT zusammengehen, untereinander aber uneins sind, ist i. d. R. die Lesart bevorzugt, die dem MT entspricht. 3) Wenn

<sup>7</sup> H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint I-III* (Cambridge, 1<sup>st</sup> edn. 1887–1894); A. E. Brooke, N. McLean and H. St. J. Thackeray, *The Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge 1906–1940).

<sup>8</sup> A. Rahlfs, *Psalmi cum Odis, Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Göttingensis editum 10* (Göttingen 1931, 1967<sup>2</sup>, 1979<sup>3</sup>).

<sup>9</sup> P. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig 1863), 3.

<sup>10</sup> This idea was not unknown in the nineteenth century. It was clear from the book of Jeremiah with its shorter form from the Samaritanus, esp. if it agreed with the Septuagint, and also from single readings if they could be explained by interchange of letters that were similar in Hebrew (like 7/7) but not in Greek. However the Qumran texts have demonstrated the pluriformity of the Hebrew text directly.

die alten Zeugen vom MT abweichen, aber die jüngeren mit dem MT zusammengehen, folgt der Text den alten Zeugen, da eine Korrektur nach dem MT durch Origenes und Lukian angenommen wird. 4) In zweifelhaften Fällen wird der Lesart von B + S der Vorzug gegeben, wenn diese übereinstimmen.<sup>11</sup>

Rahlfs may have attained these rules from his analyses, but certainly also from ideas he applied to his analyses. Anyway, rule 1 implicitly gives priority to Codex Vaticanus, which in many cases is close to the Masoretic text. Rule 2 explicitly favors the MT. Rule 3 is against MT, but the old witnesses are mainly Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, which many times go together and with the Hebrew text. Rule 4 once more favors Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus that are close to the Hebrew text.

Text-critical decisions are prompted by the rules used, but also by the evaluation of the manuscripts. In both regards, Rahlfs basically continued the established predominance of Codex Vaticanus and considered Codex Alexandrinus and other witnesses of lesser value.

Not explicitly mentioned here are two further rules applied by Rahlfs. One is that he put aside the New Testament quotations of the Septuagint because he explained agreements between the New Testament quotations and Septuagint manuscripts as being caused by secondary cross influence. In a similar way he devalued agreements of Septuagint manuscripts with Josephus or with the Old Latin.

Rahlfs' idea was that the New Testament texts would have influenced the transmission of the Septuagint, and, on the other hand, that the Septuagint text would have influenced the transmission of the Josephus text. The result is that in the apparatus one finds many times a remark like »ex Mt« (influenced by Matthew) or »ex Rom« (coming from Romans), which at the same time means that this reading is judged as being secondary, even if there are other important witnesses as well.

A good example is Hebr 1:7, where part of Ps<sup>LXX</sup> 103:4/Ps<sup>MT</sup> 104:4 is quoted: The Masoretic text reads  $\text{טַּהַר לִפְנֵי שָׁמַיִם מְשַׁרְרֵי רִיחָוֹת מְלַאֲכָיו עֲשֵׂה שָׁמַיִם מְלַאֲכָיו}$ , »(God who is) making the winds his messengers, flaming fire his ministers«. In the Septuagint tradition there are two slightly different versions: One is an exact rendering of the MT:  $\acute{\omicron} \text{ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον.}$  In the apparatus of the Psalms-edition there is the following statement:

4 πυρ φλεγον] πυρος φλογα Bo Sa Lb  
A<sup>c</sup>(φλεγα!): ex Hebr. 17

Rahlfs follows Codex Vaticanus and others (his ›main tradition‹). Although the reading *pyros floga* is quite widespread in the Egyptian, in part of the Lucianic/Antiochene manuscripts, in the corrector <sup>c</sup> of Alexandrinus, and also in Hebrews,

<sup>11</sup> Rahlfs, *Psalms* (n. 8).

Rahlfs decided against it because it presumably is an influence from Hebr 1:7 (»ex Hebr. 1:7«).

Rahlfs was not the only one. Many contemporaries and successors tended to put aside the evidence from the New Testament and from Josephus and other early writers. This tendency can be found with many scholars of later generations and even until today.<sup>12</sup> However, these assumptions and procedures need to be examined and reconsidered, simply by themselves and now also because of new evidence.

## 2 New observations

There are several new observations that oppose those old assumptions.

1) One interesting observation concerns the codices themselves. In codices like Vaticanus, Sinaiticus or Alexandrinus there are specific signs (mostly so called diplés) that in the New Testament indicate a quotation from the Old Testament, i. e. Septuagint. Interestingly, if there is a difference between the quotation and the Septuagint, this difference is not smoothed out, although the scribes have been aware of the connection of the texts. This means that the Septuagint texts have not been adapted to the New Testament. This observation speaks strongly against the assumption of a cross influence and adaption of the texts.<sup>13</sup>

2) Most important also for our problem is the discovery of the Qumran texts. To make a long story short:<sup>14</sup> The Qumran texts in many cases showed that readings in the New Testament and esp. in Josephus many times have an old

<sup>12</sup> E. g. in the editions of the prophetic books by Joseph Ziegler one finds a strong bias towards a Greek text close to the Hebrew text.

<sup>13</sup> See J. de Vries and M. Karrer, »Early Christian Quotations and the Textual History of the Septuagint,« in *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity* (ed. J. deVries and M. Karrer; SCS 60; Atlanta 2013), 3–19, with conclusion no. 2 on page 14: »Rahlfs methodological preference of selecting LXX readings based on their difference from New Testament parallels is now obsolete.«

<sup>14</sup> For an early presentation of the discoveries and new insights, see F. M. Cross, »The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert,« *HTR* 57 (1964): 281–299. On the relevance of the Qumran texts for the evaluation of Josephus' biblical quotations and allusions, see E. E. Ulrich, *The Qumran text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula 1978); for an evaluation of the Greek manuscripts from the Judean desert, see id., »The Septuagintal Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value,« in *Septuagint Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (ed. G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars; SCS 33; Atlanta 1992), 49–80.

For presentation and discussion of the importance and of consequences for Septuagint studies, see e. g. the following papers in S. Kreuzer, *The Bible in Greek. Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint* (SCS 63; Atlanta 2015): »Towards the Old Greek. New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige-Recension),« 113–128; »Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, Kaige, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns,« 154–174; »Old Greek und Semi-Kaige: Zur Frage hebraisierender Bearbeitung in den Nicht-Kaige-Abschnitten der Samuel- und Königebücher,« 194–218; »B or not B?« The Place of Codex Vaticanus in Textual History and in Septuagint Research,« 277–297.

equivalent in the Hebrew texts from Qumran. As the Qumran texts were hidden in their caves, there could not have been a cross influence between the Qumran texts and later manuscripts of the Septuagint or of the writings of Josephus. Consequently, readings in Josephus are old and confirm readings in the Septuagint manuscripts, even if some of these manuscripts may be late, at least later than the famous codices. There is no reason to dismiss such readings. The same holds true for readings in the Old Latin text, which are from the second and third centuries and also many times differ from the large codices. Basically this means that we have to give up some old prejudices about specific textual witnesses and traditions and *that we have to evaluate the readings on text-critical grounds and by text-critical rules only.*

3) The biblical texts from Qumran and the Judean desert have brought to light yet another important fact. This is the pluriformity of the ›biblical‹ text in ancient Judaism that could be assumed also before (cf. above, fn. 10). But now it could be seen directly and also in its development towards the (proto-)Masoretic text.<sup>15</sup>

In regard of the Greek text, especially the Greek Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXII) has become important and led to the discovery of the so-called kaige-recension.<sup>16</sup> This recension basically is an adaptation of the Old Greek text of the Septuagint towards the Hebrew, which in the meantime more or less had become the Masoretic, or more correctly, the proto-Masoretic text. This adaptation was an adaptation by different words but especially in the outer form of the text, e. g. in word order or if there was a visible article or not. In some texts this isomorphic adaptation was very strong, like in the above mentioned Naḥal Ḥever scroll or in the B-text of Judges or in the so called kaige sections of Samuel and Kings. In other books it was less strict, but it worked in the same way. That is why I suggested to call these texts semi-kaige-texts.<sup>17</sup>

Now the interesting point is that this isomorphic revision of the Septuagint text started already in the first century BCE. This means that in the time of the New Testament there existed basically two forms of the Septuagint text: The original Old Greek text and texts that have been isomorphically revised towards a Hebrew reference text. The Old Greek text had spread out into the Jewish diaspora, mainly from Alexandria. The new texts spread out mainly from Jerusalem

---

See also J.-H. Kim, *Die hebräischen und griechischen Textformen der Samuel- und Königebücher. Studien zur Textgeschichte ausgehend von 2Sam 15,1–19,9* (BZAW 394; Berlin 2009).

<sup>15</sup> For the development see e. g. S. Kreuzer, »From ›Old Greek‹ to the recensions. Who and what caused the change of the Hebrew reference-text of the Septuagint?«, in *Septuagint Research. Issues and challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed. W. Kraus and G. Wooden; SCS 53; Atlanta 2006), 225–237; now in Kreuzer, *Bible in Greek* (n. 14), 64–77.

<sup>16</sup> D. Barthélemy, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila. Première Publication Intégrale du Texte des Fragments du Dodecapropheton 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 Rabinat Palestinien* (VTSup 10; Leiden 1963).

<sup>17</sup> Kreuzer, »Old Greek und Semi-Kaige« (n. 14).

and by the time (i. e. for the next decades and centuries) superseded the Old Greek texts. This is the reason why in many cases we find the oldest texts, so to speak, on the edges of the »Septuagint area«: The Antiochene text in the north, the Old Latin (i. e. its Vorlage) in the west, and the Sahidic/Coptic text (i. e. its Greek Vorlage) in the south.

To illustrate it with a biblical story: We may wonder which kind of Isaiah scroll the so called Ethiopian eunuch or court official from Acts 8 was carrying home from Jerusalem. And we may also wonder which form of the Septuagint text was used by the different authors of the New Testament writings.

With this question and with the insights explained so far we now turn to some examples.

### 3 New Testament quotations as witnesses to the text of the Septuagint

#### 3.1 Hebr 1:7

Let us first take up the above mentioned quotation of Ps 103:4 in Hebr 1:7: For  $\text{טְהִלֵּי שֹׁמַר}$ , the flaming fire, in »(God who is) making the winds his messengers, *flaming fire* his ministers« there are two renderings in Greek.

4 πυρ φλεγον] πυρος φλογα Bo Sa L<sup>b</sup>  
A<sup>c</sup>(φλεγα!): ex Hebr. 17

*Pyr flegon* is the exact rendering of the Hebrew text with Masoretic vocalization. The other reading, *pyros floga* which was also widespread, means God makes the *flame of the fire* his ministers. This also is an exact rendering of the Hebrew, i. e. of the consonantal text, just reading  $\text{בְּהִלֵּי}$  as a noun,  $\text{בְּהִלֵּי}$  flame.

Both readings make good sense and are good Greek. There is no real reason to change the word order except one: Isomorphic adaptation to the Masoretic text, which consequently means that the other text is the Old Greek.

If this is correct, the quotation in Hebr 1:7 is the oldest witness to the Old Greek of this part of Ps 103:4. The other witnesses for this reading are typically from beyond the center: The Egyptian texts in the south and the so called Lucianic or better Antiochene Text from Syria and Asia Minor, and the old witness used by the corrector <sup>c</sup> in Alexandrinus. On the other hand, the isomorphically adapted and therefore secondary reading became the dominant text form in the codices.



### 3.2 Rom 9:13

The second example is from the letters of Paul: a quotation from Dodekapropheton, i. e. Mal 1:2,3 in Rom 9:13. MT reads יָהֵבֵהּ אֶת־אֶבְרָם וְאֶת־עֵשָׂו יָשָׂנְאֵהוּ, »I loved Jacob and Esau I have hated«. Both Rahlfs in his ›Handausgabe‹ and Ziegler in the Göttingen edition<sup>18</sup> read ἠγάπησα τὸν Ἰακώβ, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα, which is the exact rendering of the Hebrew text. The quotation in Rom 9:13 is almost the same, but with a difference in word order: τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαὺ ἐμίσησα.

Certainly Paul could have changed the word order, but why should he move the word ἠγάπησα to second place, and Jacob (who has no theological importance for Paul) to the first place? Beyond that he introduces his quotation with καθὼς γέγραπται, »as is written«, which also indicates an exact quotation. It is a minor and only formal difference; however, this shows that there is no theological or semantic reason for the change of the word order except an adaption to the Hebrew word order. This means that the widely testified reading in the Hebrew word order represents the revised text of the Septuagint, and that the quotation in Rom 9:13 is the oldest witness to the Old Greek Septuagint text. At the same time, this observation shows that Paul still could use the Old Greek, i. e. original text of the Septuagint.

### 3.3 Rom 11:4

Another interesting case concerns the only occurrence of the name of the God Baal in the New Testament, which is found in Rom 11:4. It is a quotation from 1 Kings 19:18. Strangely, Baal there is used with a female article, although Baal without doubt is a male god. The most plausible explanation is that the female article indicates that the very name of Baal should be avoided and that one should read αἰσχύνῃ, the shame (cf. Hebrew *baal* > *boshæt* in Ischbaal > Ischboschæt).<sup>19</sup> This phenomenon can be found in the historical books from Judg 2:13 onwards and also in other books, esp. Jeremiah. In the kaige-recension this reading was changed back to the male article. This is also the case in 1 Kings 19:18, although this is not in the kaige section. The female article and with it the Old Greek is preserved only in the Antiochene manuscripts.

<sup>18</sup> *Duodecim prophetae* (ed. J. Ziegler; Göttingen <sup>3</sup>1984), 328.

<sup>19</sup> This was suggested already by A. Dillmann, »Über Baal mit dem weiblichen Artikel,« *Monatsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin*, Sitzung vom 16. Juni 1881, Berlin 1882: 601–620. See also the explanation *Septuaginta-Deutsch* (ed. W. Kraus and M. Karrer; Stuttgart 2008<sup>2</sup>), 248 note to Judges 2:13.

Rom 11:4	1Kings/3 Kgdms 19:18 Ant <sup>ed</sup>	1Kings/3Kgdms 19:18 B = Rahlfs
<p><sup>4</sup> ἀλλὰ τί λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ χρηματισμός; κατέλιπον ἑμαυτῷ ἑπτακισχιλίουσ ἀνδρας, οἵτινες οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῆ Βάαλ.</p>	<p><sup>18</sup> καὶ καταλείψω ἐξ Ἰσραηλ ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν πάντα τὰ γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ἔκαμψαν γόνυ τῆ Βααλ, καὶ πᾶν στόμα ὃ οὐ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ</p> <p>αὐτῷ] αὐτῆ 127</p>	<p><sup>18</sup> καὶ καταλείψεις ἐν Ἰσραηλ ἑπτὰ χιλιάδας ἀνδρῶν πάντα γόνατα ἃ οὐκ ὄκλασαν γόνυ τῷ Βααλ καὶ πᾶν στόμα ὃ οὐ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ</p>

Unfortunately, Rahlfs did not mention the reading in his edition,<sup>20</sup> but it is clearly shown in the Brooke, McLean and Thackery edition (see n. 7). Looking just at Rom 11:4 and 1 Kings 19:18, one could argue that Rom 11 influenced the Antiochene manuscripts, but it is impossible that this single reading in Rom 11:4/1Kings 19:18 spread out to the historical books and to Jeremiah. Therefore, Rom 11:4 is the oldest witness to the Old Greek reading of Baal with the female article. And, once again, it shows that – at least in Romans – Paul used the Old Greek text, and in this case, that he probably also shared the practice to read αἰσχύνῃ, shame, instead of Baal.

### 3.4 Hab 2:4b

A very interesting example is the quotation of Hab 2:4b because it is taken up in different texts: Rom 1:17; Gal 3:11b, and Hebr 10:38. Hab 2:4 is one of the most debated scripture quotations in the New Testament. Already in early Jewish exegesis, there was some discussion about the meaning of the text, not the least because there are some problems in the original Hebrew and also in the Greek text. However, our subject is the history of the text only and not all the interesting theological questions.

<sup>20</sup> Similarly in A. Rahlfs, *Der Lucianische Text der Königebücher, Septuagintastudien III* (Göttingen 1911 = 1965), although he discussed the other variants in 1 Kings 19:18, but explained them as result of later cross influence.

## 3.4.1 Hab 2:4b in Rom 1:17

Hab <sup>MT</sup> 2:4b	Hab <sup>LXX Ra/Gö</sup> 2:4b	Röm 1:17	8HēvXII	Aquila
יְהוָה מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם קָרָא וַיֹּאמֶר :יְהוָה	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.	εν αυτω και δι]ΚΑΙΟΣ EN ΠΙΣΤΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΖΗΣΕΤ[ατ <sup>21</sup>	... εν αὐτῶ·και δίκαιος εν πίστει αυτοῦ ζήσεται

In Qumran, only two words are attested from the first half of the verse. In 1QpHab vers 4b is missing; in Mur XII the whole verse is missing. In the Greek text it is remarkable that it presupposes a personal suffix of the 1st person singular instead of the 3rd person. Probably it also read **ו** instead of **ב**. **ב/ו** but also **ו** get mixed up easily. If Dietrich-Alex Koch says: »Der LXX-Übersetzer, der offensichtlich diesen (= proto-MT) Wortlaut bereits voraussetzt, war daher gezwungen, vom vermuteten Sinn auszugehen«,<sup>22</sup> this could be said about the whole verse as well. As the Septuagint translator in general worked very carefully, the differences of the preposition and the pronoun most probably go back to the Hebrew Vorlage. Beyond that it is not certain that the proto-MT is the oldest reading. The different text forms may reflect early Jewish (and rabbinic) discussions about the correct understanding and relation of justice and faith.

That the personal pronoun was missing in the Hebrew text is not impossible (haplography of **ו** and change from **ו** to **ה**) but less probable. Rather it seems that Paul has left it out in order to generalize the statement.

For the Greek text, the Dodekapropheton scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (cf. above) is important. With εν αυτω και δι]ΚΑΙΟΣ EN ΠΙΣΤΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΖΗΣΕΤ[αι, it corresponds exactly to MT, which is not surprising in view of the general character of this manuscript. If the reconstruction of the text in the lacuna before δι]ΚΑΙΟΣ with εν αυτω και is correct, the ὁ δὲ δίκαιος in Paul's text would demonstrate that he still had the Old Greek text and not yet kaige. The reconstruction in the scroll is very probable because according to its isomorphic character it must have rendered the **י** from קָרָא with και, but it remains a reconstruction. However, it is supported by the Aquila-text which reads εν αὐτῶ·και δίκαιος εν πίστει αυτοῦ ζήσεται, and also by Symmachus, from which only ὁ δίκαιος τῆ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει ζήσει exists, but where also the »δέ« before δίκαιος is missing.

For our question of textual history the result is that Paul in Hab 2:4b most probably used the Old Greek version and not yet the isomorphic-Hebraizing (kaige-) text form.

<sup>21</sup> The text from Naḥal Ḥever is presented in the way as it is printed in B. Ego et al., eds., *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3B; Leiden 2005).

<sup>22</sup> D.-A. Koch, »Der Text von Hab 2,4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament,« *ZNW* 76 (1985): 68–85, 72.

3.4.2 *Hab 2:4b in Gal 3:11b*

Hab <sup>MT</sup> 2:4b	Hab <sup>LXX Ra/Gö</sup> 2:4b	Gal 3:11b
:יְחִיָּהּ בְּאִמּוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה׃	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται.	ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

Also for this verse our subject is not the theology of the letter or the message of the specific verse but only the textual form of the quotation. The interesting point is that here the *δέ* is missing. If Galatians had been written several years after Romans, one could deliberate whether Paul in this case used the younger text (which in the meantime might have become known to him or which was available at the place where he wrote the letter) with the above mentioned isomorphic adaptation to the Hebrew (i. e. with the omission of *δέ* and insertion of *καί*). But as Galatians was written several years before Romans, this is improbable. The omission of *δέ* is rather to be explained from the context and especially from the introduction of the quotation. After the statement »Now that no one is justified by the Law before God is evident«, Paul does not continue with a contrast but with the proof from scripture for which he quotes Hab 2:4b »that the just shall live by faith«. This corroboration from scripture cannot be introduced by a »but«, even if the *δέ* is a mild »but« only. The omission of *δέ* therefore goes back to Paul and is caused by his argumentation and the syntax. It is not a matter of textual history of the Septuagint.

3.4.3 *Hab 2:4b in Heb 10:38*

Hab <sup>MT</sup> 2:4b	Hab <sup>LXX Ra/Gö</sup> 2:4b	Hebr 10:38
:יְחִיָּהּ בְּאִמּוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה׃	ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου ζήσεται.	ὁ δὲ δίκαιός μου ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται

In Heb 10:38 the quotation of Hab 2:4 is slightly different: While generally being the same, the personal pronoun is placed with *δίκαιος*: »But my righteous one shall live by faith«. The context is a promise of salvation for those who belong to God. God will save »his righteous one(s)« because of faith. The passage is extensively discussed in the commentaries and also in Koch's study on the quotations in the New Testament. We do not need to deal with the details. It suffices to quote Koch who, in view of 10:36–39, especially the quotation in v. 38, states:

Hab 2,3f. dient in Hebr 10,37f. als abschließende Begründung für die Ermahnung zur *ὑπομονή*, die in 10,32 mit der Erinnerung an frühere Bewährung einsetzt und in 10,36 klar formuliert wird: *ὑπομονής γὰρ ἔχετε χρεῖαν ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσθητε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν*. Als Schriftbegründung fügt der Verf. das Hab-Zitat an, das er in 10,39 abschließend in seinem paränetischen Ertrag (Gegenüberstellung von *ὑποστολή*

und πίστις) knapp zusammenfaßt. Dieser paränetischen Verwendung entsprechen nicht nur die Wahl des Zitatenausschnitts, sondern auch sämtliche Textabänderungen (...).

[B]ei Verwendung des ursprünglichen LXX-Wortlauts war die hier vorliegende Abänderung unumgänglich. Dabei ist der Verf. relativ zurückhaltend vorgegangen, indem er μου nicht ersatzlos strich, sondern lediglich voranstellte, so daß jetzt von der Glaubensstreue ›meines (!) Gerechten‹ die Rede ist.<sup>23</sup>

This means that the author of Hebrews uses Hab 2:4 to confirm what he has said in order to comfort and exhort his readers/listeners. In doing so he adapts the quotation to his context, but in spite of all the freedom he takes, he is doing this quite cautiously (»relativ zurückhaltend«).

Part of this quite cautious procedure is that he keeps the δέ before δίκαιος. For our question concerning the history of the text, this means that the author of Hebrews also (like Paul) still used the unchanged Old Greek text.

### 3.5 Rom 9:25f.

Another interesting quotation is of Hos 2:1 and 2:25 in Rom 9:25 f. because it is also taken up in 1 Peter 2:10.

#### 3.5.1 Hos 2:1 and 2:25 in Rom 9:25f.

In this case Paul quotes two similar passages from Hosea. Both announce future salvation for Israel. The textual tradition is complex, which also can be seen by the fact that Rahlfs and Ziegler have reconstructed it differently.

Hos <sup>MT</sup> 2:1b	Hos <sup>LXX Ra</sup> 2:1b	Hos <sup>LXX Gö</sup> 2:1b	Röm 9:26
וְהָיָה בְּמִקְוֵם אֲשֶׁר- יֹאמַר לְהֵם לֹא-עֲמִי אֲהֵם יֹאמַר לְהֵם בְּנֵי אֶל-הָיָה:	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὐ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος.	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὐ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος.	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὐ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζώντος.

While Ziegler, in the Göttingen edition (= Gö), followed the manuscript group around Codex Vaticanus (B Q C), Rahlfs (= Ra) followed Codex Venetus, Codex Alexandrinus und the Lucianic/Antiochene Text (together with the Old Latin and the Armenian text).

It is striking that both text forms change in their translation of אֲהֵם from ἐρρέθη to κληθήσονται, which does not allow using αὐτοῖς for אֲהֵם. Consequently it is missing in Ra and the A-V-Ant group, while in Gö and the B-Q-C group,<sup>24</sup> אֲהֵם is taken up by καὶ αὐτοὶ. The unexpected καὶ could go back to 1

<sup>23</sup> Koch, »Text« (n. 22), 76f.

<sup>24</sup> אֲהֵם is attested in 4QXII<sup>d</sup> (even if partially reconstructed), cf.: Ego et al., eds., *Minor prophets* (n. 21), 4f.

instead of לָ (in 4QXIId the לָ is not sure). In any case, this text form very closely follows the Hebrew text (as we know it).

Rahlfs on the other hand accepted the text of the A-V-Ant group, evidently following the rule, already formulated by Lagarde (see above, at fn. 9), that the oldest text is the one which is most distant from MT, which in our case also includes Paul's quotation. Strangely, there is an additional ἐκεῖ, which has no equivalent in the Hebrew text (at least as we know it). Evidently, this takes up בְּמִקוֹם from the first half of the verse. While probably the Hebrew expression indicated the contrast, i. e. »instead of ...«, <sup>25</sup> in the Greek text it is understood locally (ἐν τῷ τόπῳ), which is taken up by ἐκεῖ. Even if this ἐκεῖ would go back to some Hebrew Vorlage reading an additional עָשׂ, ἐκεῖ represents a text form that is different from MT and – as not revised towards MT – most likely also older. <sup>26</sup>

This means that Paul at this place quotes a reading which is older and closer to the Old Greek, if not the Old Greek itself. <sup>27</sup> Evidently, the other reading of Hos 2:1b is younger and adapted to the Hebrew/proto-Masoretic text (with the deletion of ἐκεῖ and addition of the personal pronoun).

Of interest – not yet at this point but for the next passage – is the variant to the second הֵאמַר לְהֵאמַר in 4QXIId, namely יֹמַר. This reading indicates an active form of the verb »he speaks«.

Hos <sup>MT</sup> 2:25	Hos <sup>Ra/Gö</sup> 2:25	B-V-407 u. a.	Rom 9:25
וְהִקְמַתִּי אֶת־לֵאלֹהֵי רַחֲמָה וְאֶמְרָתִי לְאֵלֵי עַמִּי עַמִּי־אֲתָהּ הִיא יֹאמַר אֱלֹהֵי	καὶ ἐλεῆσω τὴν Οὐκ ἠλεημένην καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ λαῶ μου Λαός μου εἶ σύ, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρεῖ Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἶ σύ.	αγαπησω την ουκ ηγαπημεην	καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν ουκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην·

Both, the text of Rahlfs and the text of the Göttingen edition are very close to the Hebrew text. וְאֶמְרָתִי is rendered by ἐρῶ, i. e. by the same verb as at the beginning

<sup>25</sup> In this sense e. g. H. W. Wolff, *Hosea* (BK XIV/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn <sup>3</sup>1976), 27: »Statt daß man zu ihnen sagt ...«. Differently E. Bons, J. Joosten and S. Kessler, *Douze Prophètes* (Osée A 23/1), Paris 2002, and – on basis of the Hebrew text – the *Neue Zürcher Bibel* (2007) »An einem Ort, wo ...«.

<sup>26</sup> Understood locally, this would refer to the place where Hosea lived. ἐκεῖ would then refer to the same area, i. e. Samaria and the Samaritans. This would also fit to the following expectation of a new unification: »And the sons of Judah and the sons of Israel will be gathered together, and they will appoint for themselves one leader« (v. 2). Basically καὶ αὐτοὶ also expresses the same idea.

<sup>27</sup> This is also the result in J.-H. Kim, »Zu den Textformen der neutestamentlichen Zitate aus dem Zwölfprophetenbuch,« in *Der antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und Bedeutung* (ed. S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund; DSI 4; Göttingen 2013), 163–178, 173: »Meines Erachtens ist die ältere Textform von Hos 2,1b im antiochenischen Text bezeugt und auch im neutestamentlichen Zitat erkennbar.«

of 2:1b. This again allows the dative. Different from that, Paul uses καλέσω as *verbum dicendi* and so brings together the renaming of the children under one verb. In this way, also the promise of mercy is expressed by renaming.

As the Pauline reading and the readings in the Septuagint manuscripts are different, we can observe that – contrary to some generalizing views – the New Testament reading has not influenced the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint.<sup>28</sup>

Considering the three different readings, one observes that the readings accepted in Ra and Gö are the ones that are closest to MT. Contrary to them the B-V-407 group reads ἀγαπήσω. For V-407 and (in the same sense) also in the Old Latin, this can be found in 1:6, 8, 9 (cf. the apparatus in Gö). Evidently, this is a distinct and also older translation with a freer rendering, while on the other hand ἐλεήσω exactly renders the Hebrew verb.

Rom 9:25 apparently is the rendering most different from the Hebrew text. However, Hos 1:4, 6, and 9 each time (and without variants) has κάλεσον. Therefore, Paul's καλέσω can be understood as taking up that verb, while the designation as (οὐκ) ἠγαπημένη (contrary to ἠλεημένη) takes up the above mentioned older textual tradition.

For Rom 9:25 therefore, one should not assume an otherwise unknown textual form of Hos 2:25. It rather is Paul's own wording by which he takes up the context and leads it to the actual quotation from Hos 2:1b in the next verse. In doing so, Paul uses the older wording with αγαπᾶν, i. e. the wording of the original Septuagint.

At this point we may refer to the above mentioned form יֹמֵר, »he says« in 4QXII<sup>d</sup>. This certainly refers to God as subject. The active formulation (instead of the *passivum divinum*) supports Paul's introduction of the quotation with καλέσω. I would not contend that Paul necessarily knew this reading, but at least it shows that also before Paul the *passivum divinum* had been expressed in the active sense with God as subject, and that either he did the same or that he relied on such an understanding and textual tradition.

<sup>28</sup> In view of the quotations in 1 Peter K. Jobes, »The Septuagint Textual Tradition in 1 Peter,« in Kraus and Wooden, eds., *Septuagint Research* (n. 15), 311–333, speaks about »The apparent lack of influence by the quotations in 1 Peter on the Greek manuscripts of their sources« (332). This is also the result in M. Vahrenhorst, »Der Text der Septuaginta in den Zitaten des 1. Petrusbriefes,« in de Vries and Karrer, eds., *Textual History* (n. 13), 259–275: »Zuweilen kommt es nun vor, dass in der Überlieferung des LXX-Textes Varianten begegnen, die dem Text der Schriftreurse im NT entsprechen. In der älteren Forschung hat man solche Phänomene in der Regel als Korrekturen interpretiert, durch die die Abschreiber der LXX den Text bewusst oder unbewusst an den Wortlaut angepasst haben, der ihnen aus dem NT vertraut war. (...) In jüngster Zeit wird ein anderer Interpretationsweg erwogen. Man fragt, ob es nicht auch denkbar wäre, dass die neutestamentlichen Autoren einen Text verwendeten, der nicht dem heute bevorzugten Text der LXX, sondern eben dem in den Varianten bezeugten entspricht. Der Text der neutestamentlichen Schriftreurse stünde dann in einer Texttradition mit dem Text der Varianten, und beide gemeinsam wären dann Zeugen für einen anderen oder älteren LXX-Text« (260).

### 3.5.2 1 Peter 2:10

For comparison it is interesting to look at the other quotation of Hos 1 f. in the New Testament, which is found in 1 Peter 2:10: οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες. This scripture reference – just as the other scripture references in 1 Peter – is not an exact quotation and is not introduced as. However, it takes up the above mentioned passages (from Hos 1:6, 9 to 2:1, 25) and integrates them in the argumentation. The use of ἠλεημένοι and ἐλεηθέντες (as opposed to ηγαπημεν etc., cf. above), i. e. the exact rendering of **קחל**, shows, however, that now the younger text form of the Septuagint is used. This observation agrees with the fact that 1 Peter is several decades later than the letter to the Romans, and it shows that indeed the New Testament reflects the development of the Septuagint tradition.

### 3.6 Dan 7:13

Dan 7:13 is the famous passage about the Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven and coming to the Ancient of Days. As is well known, there are two versions of the Greek book of Daniel, the Old Greek version, as found in  $\mathfrak{P}^{967}$ , in Ms 88, and in the Syrohexapla, and the so-called Theodotionic version, which was revised towards the Hebrew and Aramaic text.

The Theodotionic version renders the Aramaic text quite exactly: καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιοῦ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασεν. The other text form has an interesting difference: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο καὶ ὡς παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν παρῆν.

The important point is the difference between ἕως and ὡς and the difference with the article. In the one case, the Son of Man comes *unto* the Ancient of Days, in the other reading, he comes *like* an Ancient of Days, i. e. like an old one. In the first case, there are two heavenly beings; in the other case there is just one heavenly being. Now this certainly is not a change made by Christians because they had no problem with the Son of Man as heavenly being besides God. But two heavenly beings contradicted the monotheistic tendency of the Septuagint and posed a problem in Judaism as we easily understand and as is demonstrated by later Jewish discussions.

So the reading with ὡς as witnessed in  $\mathfrak{P}^{967}$  certainly is the original reading and the reading with ἕως is secondary – as the Theodotionic text is in general.

In the New Testament, the texts of the Synoptic Apocalypse (Mark 13:26; Matt 24:27, 30; Luke 21:27) are indifferent for our question; they just emphasize in unison the coming of the Son of Man for the final judgment. However, there seems to be an echo in the Apocalypse of John. In Rev 1:13 and 14 the Son of Man is described as old with white hair. Most probably this reflects the Old Greek



of Dan 7:13, with the Son of Man coming *as* an ancient of days.<sup>29</sup> Interestingly, the author of the Apocalypse – in the far West of Asia Minor – used (or had in mind) the Old Greek, while the authors of the gospels shared the later Greek – or earlier Aramaic? – tradition.

By the way, this Old Greek reading indirectly had a far reaching influence on Christian theology and iconography throughout the Middle Ages: Many times, Christ has been presented as an old man, sitting on his throne, when coming for judgment (see the following picture).



Christ as (old) Son of Man, coming for judgment  
(Tympanon at the entrance of St. Stephen's cathedral,  
Vienna ca. 1250; photo: Archive S. Kreuzer)

#### 4 Conclusions

- 1) We have to give up old assumptions about some texts and manuscript groups, and we have to evaluate them without prejudice.
- 2) We have to weigh the texts according to text-critical rules. This basically means to look for the oldest reading and to explain how the changes came about.
- 3) We have to take seriously that already early in the transmission of the Septuagint, i. e. from the first century BCE, there were two versions of the Septuagint: The original »Old Greek« translation and a later, isomorphic revision of the Greek text towards the then-authoritative Hebrew text (including its reading tradition) and according to early Jewish hermeneutics. (As the original Septuagint is different from book to book, also the isomorphic revision has some variety, from strict kaige to semi-kaige, but the common factor is the isomorphic adaptation towards the Hebrew [or Aramaic] reference text.)

<sup>29</sup> To my knowledge J. Lust, »Dan 7,13 and the Septuagint,« *EvT* 54 (1978): 62–69, was the first to recognize this connection. See now also S. Kreuzer, »Papyrus 967: Its Significance for Codex Formation, Textual History, and Canon History,« in Kreuzer, *Bible in Greek* (n. 14), 255–276.

- 4) The New Testament quotations of the Septuagint participate in and reflect the change from the Old Greek to the dominance of isomorphically revised texts.
- 5) The New Testament quotations not only reflect the development of the Septuagint, but as such they are also most important witnesses to the text of the Septuagint and its development. In most cases they are even the oldest witnesses. They should no longer be dismissed or devaluated in Septuagint studies.
- 6) At the same time this means that in spite of changes and adaptations by the New Testament authors,<sup>30</sup> the quotations in the New Testament generally have undergone less change and are more accurate than usually believed.

---

<sup>30</sup> Certainly one always has to check if a variant may be caused by the intention of the author, as it is done in the examples given above. But this does not contradict the basic situation and the fact that in many cases there are ›diagnostics‹ (even if as little as the  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  in the quotations of Hab 2:4b) that allow some conclusions.