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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

The problem addressed in this thesis first emerged from an assignment in a Greek exegesis course at seminary. Having just completed two semesters each of Biblical Greek and Hebrew, I anxiously pursued areas of application and critical understanding. My first exegetical quandary involved the analysis of Septuagint word usage and context for understanding the meaning of certain Greek terms in the New Testament. I was frustrated with several factors regarding the assignment, such as not ever having heard of the Septuagint, along with the discovery that while my desire to incorporate Old Testament material with New Testament study was granted, it would be without using the Hebrew I had slaved over in previous classes. I naturally doubted the legitimacy of the assignment, questioning why and how the LXX could help illumine the New Testament. Although I completed the requirements for the exercise, I was dissatisfied with the explanation given for the relation between the LXX and the New Testament.

Throughout my pursuit of an integrated understanding of Biblical studies, the value of the study of this particular issue became more pronounced. Pieces in the chain of understanding that link the LXX to the New Testament (200 years, textual variants, etc.) were missing. But also, further thought led me to realize the scope of the problem. One must attempt to understand the New Testament writers’ hermeneutic along with the general Old Testament interpretation methodology of that period. Also involved is the "alphabet soup" jumble concerned with manuscripts and textual variations for each of the Masoretic Text (MT), LXX
and New Testament. Another issue of personal concern is the nature of translation and the question of scriptural authority and clarity of meaning beyond the Hebrew Old Testament and Greek New Testament. Knowing that I had a thesis to present, this study proved to be most comprehensive and worthwhile. Klyne Snodgrass agrees, "Serious study requires the use of Hebrew, Greek and Aramaic . . . Do not think that this is an exercise in tedium, however, for the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament also engages a person in hermeneutics, exegesis and theology study that in many cases will require adjustment of previous conclusions."¹

Having chosen this study, because of its breadth, an essential step was to narrow the subject matter. The Pauline corpus, due to its size and the frequency of Old Testament references, provides the best basis for the study of Old Testament quotations in general. "In fact, the thought and language of the Old Testament, and its quotations, enter so essentially into St. Paul’s epistles that if one were to remove the Old Testament references from them, they could be condensed into a few brief but well nigh unintelligible chapters."² Still, Paul’s Old Testament use leads to an enormous range of study. Along with the original problems of determining what influence the LXX had on the New Testament writings, my own personal interest in Bible translation led to a final narrowing of the study to only involve the textual background of the quotes.

Discerning the text employed, to the best of one’s ability, is foundational to the study of Paul’s Old Testament.


Testament hermeneutic and quotation use. Textual study further involves issues of textual authority, translation method, and language use and development. This study will therefore focus on the Old Testament texts of the Pauline quotations, critiquing the foundations and implications of the consensus belief that the Septuagint was the Old Testament text behind Paul's quotations.

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The objective of this thesis is to examine the hypothesis that the Greek translation of the Old Testament (Septuagint, LXX), while providing significant insight into the New Testament writers' use of the Old Testament, was not the primary version from which the apostle Paul derived his Old Testament quotations.

**REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

**Pauline Quotations**

The discussion of the Old Testament in the New Testament is a broad and popular pursuit. However, the narrower field of the textual background of Paul's quotations is quite lacking. Modern study in this field, concerning textual issues, dates back to the previous century. At that time, three authors wrote major works which independently attempted to synthesize the fields of Old Testament textual study and criticism, the debate concerning what constitutes an Old Testament reference and how a quote was used, along with the potential for uncovering answers surrounding the relation of the Old Testament to the New. These authors, David Turpie, Crawford
Toy, and Franklin Johnson broke ground in the debate of whether the LXX was the source of the Old Testament quotations for the New Testament writers.

David M. Turpie is recognized as having compiled the first significant textual research in an entire volume in The Old Testament in the New.\(^3\) Certainly much of the textual discussions back in 1868 have been eclipsed now; Turpie held the MT as the only standard, and the viability of the LXX depended entirely on whether it correctly or uncorrectly translated the Hebrew. But the foundation was laid for the view of LXX primacy in Pauline quotations.

Crawford Toy follows suit in this conclusion. He begins his work with the statement, "The quotations in the New Testament, from the Old Testament, are never made immediately from the Hebrew, but always from the Greek or the Aramaic version."\(^4\) Toy's thesis is based on a very scientific approach of analyzing each quotation according to its Old Testament reference in the various textual sources. Quite separately, Franklin Johnson undertook the approach of both analyzing the method and the source of the quotation, comparing the New Testament to its contemporary religious and secular literature. Johnson sought to answer the question of why translation was not made directly from the Hebrew. Although he agrees with the conclusion of the LXX as Paul's primary text, Johnson's intention was to demonstrate that the New Testament writers were not slaves to the LXX. He appealed to the popularity of the Greek text, stating, "The writers of the New Testament quoted from the Septuagint because it was the only written version of


their time."  

These volumes established the obvious impact the LXX had on the New Testament writers and their quotations, but H. B. Swete's milestone work on the LXX provided better textual understanding for the issues involved. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek provided a more realistic and scientific view of the LXX than what the earlier New Testament scholars had incorporated in their volumes. Swete only mildly pursues the Old Testament quotations of Paul; Swete does not intend to supplant the New Testament researchers since it is not his primary field. He states, "Not the Old Testament only, but the Alexandrian version of the Old Testament, has left its mark on every part of the New Testament, even in chapters and books where it is not directly cited." This work fails to provide the factual foundation for such a general statement. Still, Swete's turn of the century volume gave the clearest initial picture into text-critical issues involving the LXX.

Since the discovery of more manuscripts, fragments and the Qumran lode of textual evidence, along with the refinement and specialization in the field of textual criticism, much previous research and most related assumptions have been proved erroneous. The most modern comprehensive work in the field has come from E. Earle Ellis. In Paul's Use of the Old Testament, he begins with Paul's biblical background as foundational for understanding his quotations, writings and hermeneutic. "Whether he is

\footnotesize


7 Ibid., 404.

giving a dogmatic proof, an analogy or an illustration, or merely using language with which to clothe his own thoughts, the OT appears frequently throughout the Pauline epistles." Thus Ellis demonstrates the Old Testament foundation of the Pauline corpus. Paul's Old Testament text(s) are thereby seen to be integral in his Old Testament use. Included in Ellis' work is a table of the Old Testament quotations and the textual origin of each.

Two other recent studies agree with Ellis' belief in Paul's Old Testament texts as essential in evaluating his writings and hermeneutic. In his Ph.D. dissertation, Robert Martin limited himself to the book of Romans, which contains more than half of Paul's Old Testament quotations. In general, Martin asserts, "Determining the sources of Paul's Old Testament quotations is difficult. Ancient mechanics of quotation, the writer's circumstances and the state of the texts all complicate research into this area." This dissertation emphasizes the traditions of quotation and exegesis for Paul's day, and also evaluates each Old Testament reference in Romans.

Richard Longenecker pursues a similar comprehensive route to explain the complicated nature of the Pauline quotations. While he also provides textual evidence and conclusions for each Old Testament reference, the emphasis of his work is in outlining the many avenues of understanding involved in the Old Testament influence on the New Testament. Concerning textual study, he warns, "The present state of Old Testament textual criticism is in such a flux . . . that it is perilous to posit any final solution for this variety of textual readings in the Pauline

---

9 Ibid., 10.

writings. "11

All of the above works will be used to analyze each Old Testament quotation in Paul. These writers' evaluations will be compared and critiqued to discern the most viable solution in light of the complexity of the study. The nature of the hypothesis of the thesis requires an empirical study be made of the Old Testament citations, according to the textual information available at present. Thus, Swete, Johnson, Ellis and the others previously mentioned will supply evidence to judge each quotation. Also utilized are the findings of Barnabas Lindars12 and Mitchell J. Dahood13 for critique of specific passages. Finally, several books from various time periods and backgrounds will lend necessary insight into what the list of Pauline quotations contains. These authors include Ferdinand Prat, Joseph Bonsirven, Westcott and Hort, and Robert Bratcher (with the United Bible Societies).14


Again, purely textual discussions of the Old Testament in the New Testament are rare. The majority of writing pertaining at least in part to this thesis involves a wide spectrum of emphases and approaches. Of these works which at least consider the textual origins of the citations, two give an extensive treatment of the subject. Richard Oudersluys wrote an article which considers all of the subproblems of the hypothesis of this thesis, without, however, the evaluation of the references themselves. "Old Testament Quotation in the New Testament" provides useful introduction to the issues pursued by those who take a broad look at the apostles and their methods. Mary Lily Boney uncovers the influence of rabbinical exegesis upon Paul, along with Paul’s own quotation style and idiosyncracies. One of these unique traits is his use of many Old Testament texts and sources, including the LXX. "A study of his quotations indicates that in the main they are quite close to Septuagint wording, but the apostle deviates from the known recensions of this version enough to make one hesitate to say that he was using it." Boney and Oudersluys both lack the textual criticism data, yet still support the belief that Paul made extensive use of many texts and traditions.

Other works which involve the hypothesis at hand, while emphasizing separate issues in Paul and the New Testament, show great differences toward the LXX question. A. T. Hanson evaluated the Pauline corpus according to a literary

---


16Mary Lily Boney, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1956).

17Ibid., abstract, 1.
perspective and concludes, "without going to the extremes of Septuagint worship . . . he [Paul] had apparently no doubts about the adequacy of his version." Arthur Nock agrees, from a more dogmatic approach, that the LXX was used with confidence as a text, but concedes the LXX only as being an instrument of expression: "The expression is externally Hellenic, but inwardly Jewish." Yet two more theologically minded Pauline scholars view the textual issue differently. F. W. Farrar studied Paul's life and writings, and, concerning his Old Testament references, "though he can refer to the original when the occasion requires the LXX was to him as much 'the Bible' as our English version is to us." Adolf Deissmann went even further to claim Paul as "a pious Bible Jew, a Septuagint Jew." Even with the discrepancies and vast differences of opinion, the material on Paul's Old Testament background and life is essential in evaluating the present hypothesis.

Similarly, the issues discussed by researchers in the fields of the LXX and the Old Testament in the New offer critical insight for the textual question. For instance, D. Moody Smith, Jr., while noting the common belief that 80 percent of Old Testament quotes are drawn from the LXX, warns that, "In many or even most of these instances there is little or no disagreement between the Septuagint and the Masoretic text. This does not, of course, mean that the

---


quotation could have just as well been made from the Hebrew, for no two translators are likely to render the same sentence in exactly the same way."  Septuagint scholar Floyd Filson agrees that exempting the influence of the MT, even in the LXX-worded quotes, is ungrounded and erroneous. However, other source theories exist, such as those given by Dodd or Kahle. An example may be offered by Alexander Sperber. While maintaining the primacy of the LXX, Sperber accounts for the LXX variations by advocating a "Bible of the Apostles," which acts as a "common denominator for the deviations from the LXX text." Finally, besides these scholars, others in the field offer insight into the source critique of Paul's Old testament references.

Practical Aspects of Quotation

Works that examine translation technique, literary tradition and very practical aspects of writing epistles and quoting from texts give essential perspectives on the hypothesis. Authors such as B. F. C. Atkinson, Max

---


25See the notes in chapter 3 for these writers and works.

Wilcox\(^2^7\), F. F. Bruce\(^2^8\), and C. C. McCown\(^2^9\) have written concerning very practical aspects of the texts: how they are read, how an NT writer would quote from a manuscript, to what extent these texts were available, etc. In a similar practical sense, two renowned authors, C. H. Dodd\(^3^0\) and Abraham Kuenen\(^3^1\) speak about the nature of translation itself. These two agree that simply crossing from one language to another obscures not only the meaning by also the ability to effectively postulate on the issue of originality. Yet another issue brought forward is that of the authority within translation and quotation. This characteristic of both the New testament and LXX is discussed in works by T. W. Manson\(^3^2\) and Roger Nicole.\(^3^3\)

Though these authors make little mention of specific citations, the Old Testament textual background and how the text is handled may be clarified in order that the origins may be discerned with intelligence.

Evaluating the many subproblems associated with the


\(^{3^1}\)Abraham Kuenen, The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel (Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969).


hypothesis requires the input of a great breadth of research. Two of the more peripheral but essential resources concerning the LXX influence of Paul and the New Testament are by Stendahl and Kennedy. Stendahl does not limit himself to the gospels in evaluating the question of the use of the Old Testament. Being a modern work, and due to its broad-based and thorough character, The School of St. Matthew stands as a very responsible authority for evaluating the hypothesis of this thesis. Concerning the LXX, Stendahl claims that the New Testament writers showed conscious desire to faithfully reproduce the text of the LXX in their quotations. H. A. A. Kennedy expands on this view; "Still, the early Christian writers, being almost all Jews, retained a Hebrew colouring throughout their thought." Kennedy rejects the hastily-made assumption of LXX influence on the New Testament. Avoiding the questions of Jewish exegesis, the number of Old Testament citations, and the like, Kennedy spends seven of his thirteen chapters in Sources of New Testament Greek discussing the LXX and its "influence". The scientific approach taken by Kennedy along with the logical and complete modern study of Stendahl give weighty evidence toward the understanding of the NT/LXX relationship.

Texts

Finally, it is absolutely necessary to involve writings


36 Stendahl, 158.

37 Kennedy, 94.
which concern the nature and background of the textual traditions involved, namely the LXX, NT, MT and Targums. The following works give the authority behind the statements made by scholars about the ancient texts and what really can be known about them. For instance, this statement by R. C. Nevius, whose focus was on New Testament textual criticism, provides an essential insight for the hypothesis at hand: "It is probable although clearly not provable, that Paul, in fact, used an Old Testament text which differed in varying ways from the text which we now call the Septuagint."^38 Douglas Jones^39 also gives an evaluation of Paul’s source texts, showing the true probability of LXX influence on the Old Testament citations. Further, Sherman Johnson emphasizes the nature of the texts, specifically that the Greek of the LXX is very wooden and Semitized in contrast to the natural speech and idiom of the New Testament.^40 Other resources include Roberts^41 and Gerhardsson^42 on the Hebrew and Aramaic Old Testament texts; and Tov^43, Olofsson^44, and

---


^42Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1961).


Jellicoe on the LXX.

Summary

Although each of these areas is necessary in understanding the scope of evaluating the hypothesis, the facts concerning what the Greek actually says is of primary importance. Each division in this review lends to a checks and balances approach to the question. That is, one ought not postulate concerning memory quotation without understanding the popular exegetical practices of the day. Further, one must not argue about the proof which a certain passage provides without knowing the authority of the texts involved. Still, the nature of the hypothesis requires focus upon the quotations, as well as the writers and research which evaluate the Greek and Hebrew words themselves. The primary version behind Paul's quotes may be discerned only according to the reliability of the assumptions made in the research and the facts found in the texts.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Definition of terms

Derive from. Without doubt, clarity in defining and understanding this word determines the effectiveness of this thesis. The word "derive" is used here to explain the tracing of a source or origin. Thus, from the statement of the problem, "the primary version from which Paul derived his Old Testament quotations" means the source of his

quotes.

Yet, a great distinction is intended to be made between the deriving of words and the deriving of a quotation and its meaning. One must distinguish understanding the source of the words of a quotation from the way in which a quotation is used and what it means as quoted. The influence of a text upon the quotes is a separate issue. This thesis will attempt to discern the source text of the words/language of the quotations. However, the implications of this study are bound up in the understanding of how the meaning of the Old Testament references was derived. Jumping to conclusions in this respect is an all too common exercise. Therefore, since the hypothesis is a textual matter, this thesis will primarily explore the texts from which Paul derived his words in order to postulate clearly about the influence of these texts on Paul and his quotations.

Quotations. No consensus exists concerning what constitutes a quotation of the Old Testament in the New Testament. Defining the term is left to the criteria and opinion of the scholar. One might think that the apostle Paul himself would have had great difficulty determining what of his writings constituted Old Testament quotation, reference and allusion. The modern literary canons of citation were not valued or even existent in his day.

For the purpose of this thesis, E. E. Ellis' criteria for determining a quotation will be used. Ellis lists the three factors involved in a Pauline Old Testament quotation: "The presence of an introductory formula or conjunction, the degree of verbal affinity with the OT text, and the intention of the apostle as judged from the context."46

46Ellis, 11.
Introductory formulas (IF)\(^{47}\) are the most commonly accepted criterion; IF indicate the apostle's intentional design to mark the Old Testament as his source.

The presence or absence of the formulas, however, cannot be considered a completely adequate datum for determining the number of explicit quotations because some obvious citations are without the formula, and some with the formula reproduce only the general tenor of an Old Testament passage.\(^{48,49}\)

Nonetheless, the criteria offered by Ellis are acceptable and his definition, as well as his list of quotations, will be here employed.

**Scope and Limitations**

As previously mentioned, this thesis will focus almost exclusively upon the Old Testament quotations found in the Pauline writings. Richard Longenecker explains, "while a precise determination of the Pauline corpus is of great significance for many historical and theological issues related to the apostle Paul, it is of lesser significance for a study of the apostle's use of the Old Testament."\(^{50}\) Concerning the extent of the Pauline corpus, Ephesians will be studied while the Pastorals are excluded.

While issues and topics such as rabbinic exegesis, the Pauline hermeneutic, textual criticism and reconstruction, and the theological implications of the Old Testament quotations will be germane to this study, the nature of the hypothesis requires that these topics not be extensively

---

\(^{47}\)e.g. *kathos egraptai; . . . legei*; etc.

\(^{48}\)Oudersluys, 3.

\(^{49}\)I Cor. 15:32 has no IF; Eph. 5:14 has IF, but no clear Old Testament reference.

\(^{50}\)Longenecker, 107.
pursued.

METHODOLOGY

The research for this Master's thesis has required extensive study on the part of the writer. While my interest in the subject has been continually high, never having studied the LXX, my knowledge was quite lacking at first. Preliminary research mandated my study initially of the LXX and MT concerning textual tradition and transmission. Deciphering the code of manuscript classification (the "alphabet soup" of page 1) became essential for understanding the implications for this thesis. Not ever having taken a course on the LXX or on the Old Testament as viewed by the apostolic church, broad study and reading of introductory material were employed. The order of the Review of Related Literature reflects the opposite course of my research for this thesis. Comprehending the texts first, then understanding translation technique, citation method, and Paul as a writer leads one to gain the necessary foundation for viewing Paul's Old Testament quotes.

This thesis will attempt to build that foundation. Without having analyzed many components of the study of Paul, the LXX, and the Old Testament, one easily may make erroneous assumptions about textual use and influence. Chapter three of this thesis will consist of evaluation of each of Paul's citations of the Old Testament texts. However, to understand the factors involved, a discussion of the relevant components will comprise chapter two. These factors include practical matters of Paul's quotations and

51 The Review of Related Literature and the Bibliography reflect many general works used in this manner.
personal background, as well as a discussion of what may be said concerning the Old Testament versions and texts at that time. Finally, a summary chapter will evaluate the hypothesis according to these findings.

THESIS ORGANIZATION

Chapter One Introduction

Chapter Two Paul's Use of the Old Testament
   LXX as Primary Influence
   Critique of LXX as Source
   Knowledge of the Texts
   New Source Perspective
      a. practical matters
      b. freedom and respect for OT

Chapter Three Analysis of Quotations

Chapter Four Summary of Findings
   Evaluation of Hypothesis
   Implications of the Study
In one observable respect, St. Paul the apostle was not unique among his counterpart New Testament writers; he made great use of the Old Testament in his epistles. The Old and New Testaments may be today's Bible, but the Torah, Prophets and Writings were the Bible of the apostles. The New Testament is replete with references to each part of the Old Testament. Richard Oudersluys cites H. B. Swete estimating 160 direct quotations of the Old Testament in the New, Roger Nicole with a total of 295 and Louis M. Sweet counting approximately 300. ¹ "When scholars include allusions, and probable reminiscences the totals tend to run much higher, even into the thousands."² B. F. C. Atkinson notes 1020³, while Oudersluys cites Nestle's Greek New Testament showing 950, Toy with 613, A. J. B. Higgins with 1368, W. Dittmar with 1640, and E. Huhn with 4150.⁴ "In the absence of generally accepted criteria for establishing what


²Ibid., 2.


⁴Oudersluys, 2.
constitutes a quotation, we must expect these calculations of the scholars to be diverse and somewhat arbitrary. ⁵ Nonetheless, the point is well taken that the Bible of the apostles, the Old Testament, is an absolutely integral part of the New Testament writings.

The Pauline epistles contain a great variety of Old Testament citations. According to the criteria of what constitutes an Old Testament quotation, Paul quotes the Old Testament 93 times, which comprises about one-third of all New Testament quotations. ⁶ Koine Greek was the lingua franca of the New Testament world and the language of the New Testament writings. Paul certainly knew his Greek. This is evidenced in his writings and proved by his background as a Roman citizen, born and raised in a Greek speaking city and having spent at least six years in Greek speaking communities between his conversion and the call to the Gentiles at Antioch. ⁷ Paul was well versed in Greek, but what role does his knowledge of the language play in his 92 Old Testament citations?

It has long been understood that "the Bible used by these earliest Christians was mainly the Old Testament as it had been translated into the Greek language, called the Septuagint." ⁸ The original languages of the Old Testament,

⁵Ibid.

⁶E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1981), 11. Please see note #45 in Chapter one for Ellis' quotation criteria. In the remainder of this thesis, the total number of Pauline quotations will be 92. To account for 93 quotes Ellis includes two Timothean quotes and excludes Ephesians 5.14, which lacks a specific Old Testament reference.


Hebrew and Aramaic, were not popularly used, as was Greek, and do not show up in the New Testament. Old Testament quotations appear in Greek in the New Testament. Simply put, if the New Testament is Greek and the Old Testament quotes in the original texts are not, Paul and the New Testament writers had to either translate or transliterate the Old Testament. While there exists a handful of transliterations, translation was the norm. Logically, with the Old Testament in Greek existent, the three alternatives for translation are: coinciding with the Greek Old Testament version; modeling upon the Greek Old Testament version; or creating an independent version according to the writer’s source or intention. With this in mind, it is obvious to see how, concerning the 92 Pauline Old Testament references, the LXX becomes an unavoidable focus point.

Acceptance of the LXX as the primary text from which Paul derived his Old Testament quotations has been the consensus for well over a century. In 1869, Kautzsch considered eighty-four specific citations in Paul, declaring that seventy are either "verbatim from the Septuagint or are very close to it." Shortly after Kautzsch, H. B. Swete noted seventy-eight of the Pauline quotes from the LXX. The Septuagint scholar B. F. C. Atkinson agrees as well: "In the Pauline Epistles, excluding the Pastorals, at least nine-tenths comes from the LXX." Finally, from the most

---


10Mary Lily Boney, "Paul’s Use of the Old Testament" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1956), 4.


12Atkinson, 39.
comprehensive view of all modern scholarship, Ellis concludes the LXX affirmation noting "fifty-one of Paul's citations are in absolute or virtual agreement with the LXX."\(^{13}\)

Along with the overwhelming support of the LXX as the primary source of Pauline quotes, much has been consequently written of the influence of the LXX on the Pauline corpus and the New Testament. The fact of the LXX being used in the quotations is beyond argument. What may one conclude then about related issues? Ellis shows G. Roepe to be of the opinion that Paul quotes nearly without exception from the LXX, and that the exceptions imply the use of another Greek version.\(^{14}\) Beyond the question of which Old Testament texts were Paul's source texts is the matter of LXX influence. Adolf Deissmann believes, "The historical presupposition of Paul's religious life is not the Hebrew Old Testament, and not necessarily what we should call 'Old Testament Theology', but the faith contained in the Greek Old Testament."\(^{15}\) Another popular understanding of LXX influence is expressed in this statement: "The careful student of the Gospels and of St. Paul is met at every turn by words and phrases which cannot be fully understood without reference to their earlier use in the Greek Old Testament."\(^{16}\) Further consequences of LXX primacy are seen in that "the apostle's writing is flavored with the expressions of the Septuagint even when he is not directly

\(^{13}\)Ellis, 12.

\(^{14}\)Ibid., 4.


\(^{16}\)Swete, 404.
These opinions are common assumptions made with the support of the LXX text as being both a source of Paul's Old Testament quotations and an apparent influencing factor on the New Testament.

However, one must consider much more than the popular assumptions to evaluate the hypothesis at hand. In critique of the above statements, too few dissenting voices have been heard. Concerning the textual issue, R. C. Nevius clarifies, "It is altogether too simple a solution to say either 'Paul differs from the Septuagint' or 'Paul agrees with the Septuagint.'" The factors which complicate such decisions will be later discussed. Textually, many questions are unclear or have been left unanswered. Nevius also suggests, "There would be a strong tendency, I should think, for scribes to make the Old Testament quotations found in the New conform to the standard text of the Septuagint." Corruptions and emendations must certainly be considered. A final warning about LXX textual use and influence is given by Franklin Johnson as he quotes August Tholuck:

It is a remarkable fact that, although the authors of the New Testament seem to have used the Septuagint translation, yet where that translation--at least as it lies before us--wholly wanders away from the sense of the original, or becomes entirely destitute of meaning, they either resort to another translation, or themselves translate the text independently. We do not recall a single place, either in the gospels or in the epistles of Paul, where a text of the Old Testament, as to its essential contents, has been disguised by the use of the Septuagint version.

---

17Boney, 6. (e.g. Philippians 4.3, 2.16; Ephesians 6.14,17).


19Ibid., 205.

20Johnson, 28.
As previously stated, LXX use in the New Testament leads one to consider how this text may have had a general influence on the New Testament as a whole. Many place great emphasis on it as containing a wealth of information toward understanding New Testament word usage and theology. The validity such a statement about the LXX’s value in this respect must be proven. Richard Longenecker is skeptical: "But that the LXX should be looked upon as a theological commentary, as has sometimes been suggested, and thereby employed as a primary source for a knowledge of the hermeneutical procedures of the day, is an overstatement of the facts." In his study of one particular Pauline passage, Douglas Jones proved that LXX use of the term anamnesis provides no authority for interpretation in I Corinthians 11.25. The LXX is ambiguous, and no evidence exists that Paul used the term as the LXX translators did. In this way, Jones and Longenecker warn that seeking LXX in order to interpret the New Testament may be at times entirely inappropriate.

In Sources of New Testament Greek, H. A. A. Kennedy contends adamantly against the unfounded assumptions concerning LXX influence on the New Testament. Kennedy asks, "If these writers were so thoroughly versed in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, as is certainly the fact, is it not likely that when they came to write books in Greek themselves, their language would be moulded and shaped by the language of the LXX?" Popular opinion has


answered affirmatively. Having fully researched the question, Kennedy answers, "The influence of the Septuagint on the New Testament vocabulary has often been, and is still, absurdly exaggerated." There are many who suggest using the LXX as the principle interpretive tool in understanding the New Testament "religious" vocabulary. Kennedy does not deny the words of the LXX being represented in some of the Old Testament quotes. But, such information does not support LXX influence upon the meaning of the references. "The special theological terms of the New Testament are at most connected with, not derived from, the usage of the LXX." The need to distinguish the terms 'derive' and 'influence' is essential at this point. Few would argue that a good number of New Testament words and phrases are derived from--having as their source--the LXX. Whether or not the LXX influences these terms is not immediately seen or assumed. "We should expect to find the vocabulary of the LXX exercising a direct influence on that of the New Testament in regard to religious and theological terms. Strangely enough, we discover that this particular class of terms does not include as a main element words either formed or brought into literature for the first time by the LXX." In researching the pertinent terms, Kennedy found little to support the propositions made by many others concerning the LXX influence. The third chapter of Sources of New Testament Greek closes with this important statement: Several of the 'Biblical' meanings, though apparently moulded by the Greek of the Old Testament, may have been common enough in the spoken languages found in Egypt, Asia Minor, and Syria. . . . At any rate, it

---

24 Ibid., 136.
25 Ibid., 109.
26 Ibid., 95.
shows us that we are not at liberty to make dogmatic assertions even in that sphere of the New Testament vocabulary where the influence of the LXX appears most powerful, the sphere of religious and theological terms.27

In closing the critique of the assumptions made concerning the LXX and its influence upon the New Testament, several authors have advocated an opposing scenario. While it does stand to reason that scribes would likely tend to alter the New Testament to match the LXX more closely, if they were desiring to make corrections, it would be logical to attempt also to discern whether the LXX was emended to defend the New Testament readings. Floyd Filson considers an important chain of Pauline quotations, Romans 3.13-18, to have influenced the LXX of Psalm 14.1-3.28 Similarly, Longenecker points out several "additions" to the LXX.29 Although none of these examples will be further pursued in this thesis, alterations of the LXX for the sake of agreement with the New Testament is quite a viable possibility. "Most N.T. scholars . . . consider agreements between the N.T. and LXXa(etc.) as an influence of the N.T. upon the LXX."30 While Krister Stendahl is taking a reactionary stance here, his point is well taken.

What may be known of the LXX as a text in Paul's day? "In the first place, the discoveries show that no fixed

27Ibid., 109.


29Longenecker, 20. For example, certain instances of resurrection words and angelic references in the Old Testament are speculated to have been generated by Christian redactors based on New Testament usages. (e.g. Job 42.17, Isaiah 26.19, Daniel 12.2, Deuteronomy 32.8, 33.2, Psalm 8.6).

standard text had been effectively spread over the whole of
Israel at that time [the 'dawn of the Christian era']."\textsuperscript{31}
This was true of all the Old Testament texts, even with the
'masoretic' tradition in existence,\textsuperscript{32} and especially so of
the LXX. Of the LXX recensions known today, the New
Testament writers made greatest use of LXX-A, -B, and -F.
Although Ellis shows the scholars Kautzsch, Monet, and
Vollmer agreeing that Paul uses the Alexandrian version in
all but two references,\textsuperscript{33} he himself notes no consistency
with the use of LXX text forms. However, Ellis does claim A
and F to be most common.\textsuperscript{34} H. B. Swete certainly provided
the most complete study of this matter, and he "was able to
show that the Septuagint recension used in the Gospels and
Epistles agreed more nearly with Alexandrinus than
Vaticanus."\textsuperscript{35} Half a century later, Krister Stendahl
remarked, "Thus Swete's statement about the relation between
the N.T. and the LXX holds good to-day; indeed, it has
become apparent that it has more solid foundations that
Swete himself could have known."\textsuperscript{36} It may be decided then
that Paul had the most familiarity with LXX-A.

Yet none agrees that all of Paul's quotes reflect LXX-
A, or any single LXX version. Though the number of
instances may differ from scholar to scholar, Paul uses some
sources against the LXX. Searching for the true sources,
considering the limited knowledge of the texts available

\textsuperscript{31}Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript (Uppsala:
Almqvist and Wiksells, 1961), 38.

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{33}Ellis, 4.

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid., 13.

\textsuperscript{35}as quoted in Oudersluys, 3.

\textsuperscript{36}Stendahl, 171.
today, requires much speculation. Robert Martin asserts that Paul's "variations" from Old Testament texts may simply reflect the different textual traditions back then, and may also be muddled by the textual transmission. "There is no reason to demand that Paul's quotations agree with the texts now available."\textsuperscript{37} The variety of sources is caused by "inferior" copies of the Old Testament available to the New Testament writers, according to Lieberman.\textsuperscript{38} As previously mentioned, Alexander Sperber is an advocate of "The Bible of the Apostles" as an adequate explanation of LXX quotation variations.\textsuperscript{39} Crawford Toy offers the opinion that where Paul differs from any LXX version, all quotations are then derived from Aramaic Targums, since they stood as the second most popular version of the day.\textsuperscript{40}

However, without solid textual evidence, these postulations prove fruitless. Certainly a Bible of the Apostles is a possibility, but little is available to prove or disprove such a text. Placing the Aramaic version in such high regard is also unsubstantiated. Further, speculating on the transmission of the Old Testament texts, and what one ought to regard as "inferior," is hindered by the lack of much research and critical study done on the LXX. Much more is known about the transmission and textual tradition of the MT. And while most scholars have been searching for texts which answer the question of these textual variations, Sidney Jellicoe writes, "Some hitherto

\textsuperscript{37}Robert Paul Martin, "Paul's Use of Old Testament Quotations in Romans" (Ph.d. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1983), 11.

\textsuperscript{38}Boney, 10.


\textsuperscript{40}Crawford Howell Toy, \textit{Quotations in the New Testament} (New York: Scribner's, 1884), ix.
supposed 'corruptions' can now be demonstrated not so to be, and over and over again supposed deviations from MT, or the use by a translator of a text differing from it, have been shown to be without foundation."41 One must continue to consider the MT, along with LXX issues, as an answer to textual problems.

Certainly, keeping the Hebrew in this pursuit is essential also because the LXX versions were likely all based on Hebrew Old Testament texts. This fact is a central concern of the whole hypothesis. Regardless of whether Paul quoted from LXX-A or LXX-B or whether true textual origins and quotation sources can be traced, was Paul influenced by a non-Hebrew text? Since the LXX is a translation, any LXX recension is ultimately based on a Hebrew text. Yet, "Translation is an impossible art, for the words of one language seldom or never convey precisely the same ideas as the corresponding words of another language."42 This too is a foundational fact. A Greek Old Testament is not the equivalent of a Hebrew Old Testament in spite of the consensus that "the Greek words used in translation may have acquired something of the value of the Hebrew words they represent."43

Although evaluating this thesis' hypothesis will not involve defining what differences of meaning exist between the Greek and Hebrew Old Testaments, the knowledge that the LXX stands as a unique Old Testament text is essential. If the LXX and MT were in very close agreement throughout the entire Old Testament, it would matter little what texts Paul employed. However, "The translation of the Hebrew


43Ibid.
Scriptures into Greek (The Septuagint, LXX) during the two centuries or so before Christ was an enterprise in interpretation, for every translation inevitably involves interpretation and reflects the translator's understanding of the text."^4 This explains the value of the studies of textual sources for Pauline quotations. The texts used provide foundations for determining Old Testament interpretation and meaning in the LXX and New Testament periods.

Popular opinion holds that Paul primarily derived the Old Testament quotations he used from the LXX. All agree that the LXX is a translation of the Hebrew, and therefore the potential for differences of meaning and interpretation is implied. Yet, an assumption that the apostle's quotations and writings in general were influenced by the LXX is an invalid and illogical step. Many make such an assumption. An alternative perspective will here be offered. Deriving one's words from a certain text does not automatically imply the influence of the text on the writer or his meanings. Practically speaking, where the apostle is unquestionably employing LXX wording in his quotes, this shows only a verbal affinity between the LXX and New Testament. Similar wording is not ample proof of influence.

This alternative perspective may be summarized by Nock's statement from chapter one above, "The expression is externally Hellenic, but inwardly Jewish."^45 Certainly the Greek of Paul's quotes may be Septuagintal, but there is much evidence to lead one to understand Paul's quotes as

---

44Longenecker, 20.

"inwardly" Hebraic. Kennedy reminds us "that the [New Testament] writers are almost all Jews, and that the Jewish reverence for the actual letters of the Hebrew original of the Old Testament is unparalleled." This would be particularly true of Paul from his background: a Jewish youth who studied and learned the respect and value of the Hebrew, a student of Gamaliel, and a Pharisee. Nock believes that "Paul had some acquaintance with the Old Testament in Hebrew also and seems to see some of the original connotations which underlie the Greek as he quotes it." But Paul's respect for the Hebrew canon and language ought not be underemphasized. For instance, "Another noteworthy fact about the New Testament quotations from the Old Testament is that although the Greek version known as the LXX contained more books than the Hebrew canon, there is in the New Testament no explicit quotation from any of the added books." Thus, in contrast to more popular assumptions, it will be profitable to see where the apostle offers LXX wording yet maintains influence or meaning from the Hebrew text in his Old Testament references.

---

46 External as deriving the words of a quotation; inwardly/internal as the influence of a text on its meaning.

47 Kennedy, 85.

48 Nock, 183.

49 Filson, 40.

50 The MT will be the Hebrew text considered in this thesis. Krister Stendahl covers this issue with the following question and answer: "To what extent are we justified in making use of the M.T. as the Hebrew text with which the quotations in the N.T. should be compared?" (Stendahl, 166). "On the whole the M.T. offers good material for comparison with the N.T.'s quotations to the extent to which they show acquaintance with or dependence upon the Hebrew text of the O.T." (Stendahl, 167).
This being the case, what would then motivate Paul to "clothe" his Hebrew thoughts in LXX wording? Practical explanations are available. "This Septuagint version, being the sole version which he possessed in writing, was a work of the very first importance. It was necessary for the apostles to appeal to it, since it contained the only documentary evidence to which the great mass of their readers could turn to verify the Christian argument from history and type and prophecy."\(^5\) Familiarity for the readers was most certainly an important emphasis for the apostle. This was also likely true when, as mentioned above, Paul knew of the Hebrew connotations in the LXX.

Thus, To quote from a version unknown to his readers and not trusted by them, or to overload his pages with perpetual teasing emendations of the version which he employs, would be foolish. . . . So the writers of the New Testament, in citing from the Greek, seldom corrected the version to which they appealed, unless to do so was necessary to their course of thought.\(^5\)

It is true however that the LXX is not consistently used in its most familiar form. It may not be said of Paul, or any other New Testament writer, that verbatim quotes were imperative. But Toy explains that "citations were made in good faith, and with general accuracy, from the versions which were familiar to the writers; and the changes made were such as were believed to bring out the meaning into stronger relief."\(^5\) Paul did not intend to needlessly compromise familiarity. In fact, most agree upon a few instances of Paul using the LXX when it clearly differs from the MT. "When Paul follows his Greek version against our Hebrew version, he is not necessarily slavishly preferring

\(^{51}\)Johnson, 18.
\(^{52}\)Ibid., 20.
\(^{53}\)Toy, xxi.
the Greek to the original, nor is he necessarily preferring
the Greek because it suits better his ideas of
prediction."54 Other practical explanations exist for such
a circumstance. But one may generally notice, within the
sphere of valid reasoning, that when Paul does make use of
the LXX wording, he does not automatically adopt LXX
influence.

Still, Paul does not always use LXX language.
Familiarity for his readers was of import to the apostle.
Ellis offers four reasons why the apostle at times varies
from the LXX: the use of Hebrew to correct the LXX; the
citation of an Aramaic translation; the use of another Greek
Old Testament; or the making a free quotation from
memory.55 There were more factors that motivated the
apostle to quote certain Old Testament texts than just
familiarity and proper meaning. "It is probable that the
combination of (1) Paul's Gentile interest, (2) his rabbinic
training, (3) his wider knowledge of variant readings, and
(4) his incorporation of early Christian pesher text forms,
accounts most adequately for this rather peculiar mixture of
textual readings in the apostle's citations."56

Stylistically, Paul was a very free writer. He was
certainly not an exception to this statement: "The New
Testament writers allow themselves certain freedoms with the
Old Testament text in the way of abridgement, condensation,
expansion, and combination of different passages into
one."57 Also, "The wide variety of IF [introductory

54Anthony Tyrell Hanson, Studies in Paul’s Technique and

55Ellis, 14.

56Longenecker, 113.

57Toy, xx.
formulas] only illustrates the apostle's stylistic freedom." 58 Although he was very free in his writing 59, he was consistent of style and especially conscientious in his Old Testament quotations. The fact of so many reasons for the quotation variations tends to blur the picture of what the Old Testament texts meant to Paul. The following chapter, in considering each reference, will help to clarify the issue.

There are other very practical issues to look at in order to evaluate the use of the LXX wording by Paul. Although Paul was certainly a capable Biblical scholar, he likely did not have either the Greek or Hebrew Old Testaments memorized. Thus in his writings, reference to an actual text would be at times necessary for him to ensure a valid quotation. But, "The comparing of the original to the translation, which we make without the least trouble, was certainly for the most of them exceedingly difficult, if not impracticable." 60 It was very unlikely that Paul carried with himself bulky rolls of the Hebrew Old Testament, and he was rarely welcome in the Hellenic synagogues to use their scrolls. C. C. McCown advocates that the LXX was in codex form in Paul’s day. This being the case, "One has but to imagine the repeated unw windings and rew windings of a roll of the prophets or the Pentateuch by a Christian in search of a

58Ellis, 22.

59With such breadth of style, some have argued that Paul did not write all of the Pauline corpus himself. Others speculate that there being different writers of the epistles is the reason for the textual variation in the Pauline Old Testament quotes. Franklin Johnson disagrees. The Greek of Paul’s writings must be his own. He certainly had several amanuenses, but it is obvious that his style is consistent, and his amanuenses could not have been his translators (Johnson, xiii-xiv).

text"⁶¹ to understand the impracticality of constant reference for quotes in a Hebrew volume, as compared to an LXX codex. The codex would have been more convenient, and, of greatest significance, much more available to the apostle. Among the Greek believers, the LXX certainly was the practical choice of Old Testament texts. Stendahl notes that the letters written from different cities show no difference in type of Old Testament text.⁶² Thus, either Paul was able to carry an LXX codex with himself or he most often employed the LXX texts available to him in those Greek communities.

Another issue that tends to obscure the textual source of the Old Testament citations is related to these practical issues. Several of Paul’s quotes match no known recension. As stated above, the apostle did not have the texts continually at hand. However, "Paul’s knowledge of Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek would have made it possible to make ad hoc renderings as the need arose."⁶³ Although those may have been accomplished purely by memory, even the quotes with distinct sources show stylistic freedom. "On the whole, however, the Pauline material gives the impression of an author quoting from memory, yet a memory which was the storehouse of more that one language, and one trained in Jewish methods of bringing together passages from different books of the O.T."⁶⁴ It must be stated, though, that Paul would not quote Scripture in a nonchalant manner. "'Memory quotation' should be understood, however, as a free rendering in accordance with literary custom or for and

⁶²Stendahl, 159.
⁶³Martin, 209.
⁶⁴Stendahl, 159.
exegetical purpose rather than as a result of 'memory lapse'."\(^{65}\)

In Paul's day, free rendering was truly the norm, even though the source text becomes uncertain. "It is obvious that our New Testament writers frequently employed free or loose quotation and even paraphrase in preference to verbatim quotations. This was a common ancient practice irrespective of the text form being used, whether Aramaic, Targum, Hebrew or Greek."\(^{66}\) Martin agrees, "Such deliberate alterations of the Old Testament text, comparable to the Jewish Targums, were a generally accepted manner of citation."\(^{67}\) However, some of the alterations made by the apostle involve few words and are relatively insignificant. Naturally, Paul needed to alter tenses from the original or to change the audience of a passage or its names and pronouns in order to maintain person and case within his epistles. But these instances are not as serious or radical as the cases where the New Testament writers take great freedom in quoting the Scriptures.

T. W. Manson makes an excellent point concerning a final practical issue: "Odd as it may seem to us, the freedom with which they handled the Biblical text is a direct result of the supreme importance which they attached

\(^{65}\)Ellis, 14-15. That is not to say that all memory quotation was entirely intentional. "It is entirely possible that the transpositions and other textual variants in the apostle's Scripture citations are due to a memory which though excellent was not infallible" (Boney, 19). One must not "blame" Paul--differences between his texts and today's account for much disagreement--nor can Paul be considered superhuman; nor ought he be judged by modern literary standards.

\(^{66}\)Oudersluys, 6.

\(^{67}\)Martin, 209.
Paul in particular made prolific use of the Old Testament, at times making of it what today is considered questionable use. Manson replies, "For them [early Jewish and Christian translators] the meaning of the text was of primary importance; and they seem to have had greater confidence than we moderns in their ability to find it." Further, non-verbatim quotes and free renderings do not testify to an attitude of indifference toward the text. "It is certainly not warranted to conclude, since many of Paul's Old Testament quotations in Romans cannot be traced to an extant textual source, that the text of Scripture was not sacrosanct for the Apostle." In proof of this, Paul made consistent use of introductory formulas, even in the less exact quotations. "The presence of these formulas reflects a conscious, intentional quotation-practice and the basic conviction that there is an inseparable connection between the two testaments. They also reflect unquestionably the conviction that authoritative Scripture is being cited."

Also involved is the authority of the Scriptures used. By using the LXX, at times in contrast to the MT, Paul makes an inherent but important statement concerning the evaluation of texts. "Our New Testament writers evidence no embarrassment whatever in their employment of the Septuagint. Evidently the latter [New Testament writers] believed that the inspired word of God was reaching them through the Septuagint despite its defects." "Their willingness to make use of the LXX, in spite of its

---
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71 Oudersluys, 2.
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occasional defects, teaches the important lesson that the basic message which God purposed to deliver can be conveyed even through a translation."  Though there may be some who contest the authority of a translated text, Paul's use of the LXX and Targums lends support to the use of faithful translations and would lead to silence a few of his critics who question the use of texts besides the MT. Having been canonized themselves, the Pauline epistles, many of which are replete with Old Testament references, become a useful standard for evaluating translations and their vested authority.

---


74 F. F. Bruce quotes the Westminster Confession of Faith: "The Old Testament in Hebrew (which was the native language of the people of God of old), and the New Testament in Greek (which at the time of the writing of it was most generally known to the nations), being immediately inspired by God, and by His singular care and providence kept pure in all ages, are therefore authentical; so as in all controversies of religion, the church is finally to appeal unto them" (F. F. Bruce, *The Books and the Parchments* [London: Pickering & Inglis, 1950], 120). The use by Paul and the New Testament writers of several translations seems to contradict the Reformation/Post-Reformation tenet of the unique authority of the most original texts.
CHAPTER THREE
ANALYSIS OF QUOTATIONS

Having established a foundation of how to view the Old Testament quotations of the Pauline corpus, this chapter will include an evaluation of each of the 92 Old Testament quotes. A chart at the end of the chapter will summarize the findings as to the question of textual source. Several authoritative works will be employed to analyze each citation. These include the studies done by Ellis, Turpie, Martin, Prat, Bratcher, Lindars, Shires, and Toy\(^1\). The English translations used come from Bratcher's book by the United Bible Societies.

Each quotation will be classified according to the one of the five divisions given here below:

I ----- Paul, the LXX, the Hebrew all in agreement.
II ----- derived from the LXX against the Hebrew.
III ----- derived from the Hebrew against the LXX.
IV ----- Paul varies from LXX and Hebrew in agreement.
V ----- Paul varies from LXX and Hebrew in disagreement.

**ROMANS 1.17**

Habakkuk 2.4

But the righteous shall live by faith.

The only point of contention about this passage's origin lies in the pronomial use of the LXX and MT. Literally, the LXX has "my faith", while the MT contains "his faith". Turpie and Ellis both feel that Paul thus deviates from both texts by having no pronoun. Prat and Lindars both believe that the LXX is still the text that Paul used here, while Martin and Toy show the LXX to have mistakenly translated the Hebrew. There is no significant reason to claim that Paul differs greatly from either the LXX or MT here.

CLASSIFICATION: I

**ROMANS 2.24**

Isaiah 52.5

For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles because of you.

This passage finds a few words added and a few words taken out. Toy and Martin both agree that the LXX is interpretive of the Hebrew in this Isaiah verse. However, Shires believes Paul does differ significantly from the Hebrew. Yet, the LXX is still a substantially faithful reproduction of the Hebrew. Turpie and Ellis state that
Paul's words differ from both the LXX and MT. The inclusion of "among the Gentiles" shows Paul's familiarity with the LXX in this instance. Though Paul could just as easily have made the changes to the Isaiah verse found in the LXX verse on his own, he follows the LXX more closely.

CLASSIFICATION: II

ROMANS 3.4
Psalm 51.6
That thou mightest be justified in thy words,
And mightest prevail when thou comest into judgment.

Turpie, Martin, Ellis, and Toy believe that the LXX does faithfully reproduce the Hebrew in a general sense. Few disagree that Paul follows the LXX here. Martin points out that Romans 3.4 follows LXX-B exactly, but this could be due to the New Testament's influence on LXX-B. One problem is the passive voice for the Hebrew's "when you judge". A. T. Hanson points out that the LXX is in error in this case, yet Paul follows the LXX exactly. Paul could have taken this quote from either the LXX or MT, and since they do not disagree, both are equally possible.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 3.10-12
Psalm 14.1-3
There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth,
There is none that seeketh after God; they have all turned aside,
They are together become unprofitable;
There is none that doeth good, no, not so much as one.

Verse 10 seems also to include Ecclesiastes 7.20 as

well, with the word "righteous" inserted into the Psalm verse. Certainly the apostle based 10-12 on Psalm 14, but he did not closely quote any known version. Possibly this catena of passages may have been a common formula in Paul's day, but this too is not proved by any known text or Targum. The LXX does not differ significantly from the Hebrew. Thus Paul quotes here against any known version.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

ROMANS 3.13a
Psalm 5.10
Their throat is an open sepulchre:
With their tongues they have used deceit.

13a is a very faithful reproduction of the LXX. The change from Psalm 14 to Psalm 5 interrupts Paul's loose quotations in 10-12. Here, the LXX agrees also with the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 3.13b
Psalm 140.4
The poison of asps is under their lips.

Same as 13a. Paul matches the LXX which matches the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 3.14
Psalm 10.7
Whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness.

Few authors make any comment on this verse. The distinguishing factors which Ellis marks between Paul and both the LXX and MT are nearly insignificant. Paul may have derived this quote from either the LXX or the Hebrew. Speculation alone determines which text, if either, Paul preferred here.
ROMANS 3.15-17
Isaiah 59.7-8
Their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known:

Toy is the only one to comment extensively here. He claims Paul quotes the Septuagint "with slight verbal changes. . . . The first clause is condensed by Paul; 'misery' is a loose and incorrect translation. The Alexandrian Septuagint has 'have they not known,' as Romans."³ This is a case of Paul abridging material according to his own style and intention. Paul shows some knowledge of the LXX here, though the abridgement may have come solely from the Hebrew. In any case, the variations are great enough that determining an actual source is untenable.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 3.18
Psalm 36.2
There is no fear of God before their eyes.

There exists variation in Paul's wording. Yet, the largest difference is simply changing the pronoun reference to plural in keeping with the rest of the quotations. All agree that the LXX matches the Hebrew here. This change is minuscule, and Paul could have derived this quote from Greek or Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 4.3
Genesis 15.6
And Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for

³Toy, 131.
righteousness.

This stands as an excellent example of how involved and controversial discerning a text of origin can be. It is quite likely that the apostle knew this verse in Hebrew since the days of his youth. This is a critical passage in the life of any Jew or Christian. Paul also appealed to this in verse 9 and 22 of this chapter. He even asks the question, as an introductory formula, "For what does the Scripture say?" Paul may have preferred to quote such a familiar passage in the original Hebrew. Since he does not have such a luxury, and since he has already appealed to the Scriptures (which the Romans audience would equate with the LXX), Paul has little choice but the quote the LXX verbatim. The Hebrew can be translated in various senses, but Paul must limit to building his argument in Romans 4 on the LXX interpretation. One cannot truly say that the LXX is a correct translation of the Hebrew here. But Paul does follow the LXX, and this is against the Hebrew. Does this have significance regarding the LXX influence on the passage? Is Paul therefore a "Septuagint Jew," as Deissmann claims him to be, because he adopts the LXX interpretation? Considering all the circumstances, a proof of LXX influence, in spite of employment of LXX wording, is not very strong in this case.

CLASSIFICATION: 2

ROMANS 4.7-8  
Psalm 32.1-2

Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin.

Paul quotes the LXX verbatim. In this verse, it would be unlikely that Paul would start with the Hebrew and translate, winding up with word for word correspondence with the LXX. Do the LXX and the Hebrew differ? Hebrew has a
parallelism of third person singular, which the LXX fails to follow. Certainly the two versions differ, but in mostly insubstantial ways.

CLASSIFICATION: II

ROMANS 4.17

Genesis 17.5

A father of many nations have I made thee.

Again, the LXX is reproduced verbatim. All of the writers used to critique these references agree that the LXX matches the MT, even with a slight but inconsequential variation concerning the description of "nations."

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 4.18

Genesis 15.5

So shall thy seed be.

Though this is among the shortest of the Romans quotes, it is recognized as a quotation, instead of as an allusion, due to the introductory formula Paul supplies to mark the use of Scripture. Both the LXX and MT are represented well here.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 7.7

Exodus 20.17 (Deuteronomy 5.21)

Thou shalt not covet.

Again, this short quotation is preceded by a definite formula. Toy does not include this reference as a quotation, and Turpie is of the opinion that the LXX and MT are at variance. However, Paul could have certainly used either the LXX or Hebrew here, having to translate only two words.

CLASSIFICATION: I
Romans 8.36 Psalm 44.23
For thy sake we are killed all the day long
We were accounted as sheep for the slaughter.

Here is a clear example of variance without disagreement. The LXX is quoted here by Paul. But there is variation between the LXX and the Hebrew texts known today. However, Ellis and Turpie think that the LXX is in fact in agreement with the Hebrew.

Classification: I

Romans 9.7 Genesis 21.12
In Issac shall thy seed be called.

No debate is raised in this reference. The Hebrew and Greek match without question.

Classification: I

Romans 9.9 Genesis 18.10,14
According to this season will I come, and Sarah shall have a son.

Paul uses his Greek in the simplest way possible. However, neither the MT nor the LXX give Genesis 18 such a short treatment. The LXX and the MT do not match, particularly in the first clause. Toy suggests that the LXX was translated from a Hebrew text which differs from the MT. Paul abridges all of the material here to make a concise statement in the Greek. If Paul follows the LXX, he does so by a recension which is not extant today.

Classification: V
The elder shall serve the younger.
   As in 9.7, there is nothing to question. Paul could have employed any text he pleased.

CLASSIFICATION: I

Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.
   Although Paul is certainly not to be held accountable to twentieth century readers, his word order in 9.13 is questionable. The LXX matches even the Hebrew word order of Malachi 1.2-3. Septuagint scholars believe the Twelve were the last books to be translated into Greek, and that the later translations lacked the style and expertise of the earlier LXX books. Although the LXX and MT are in perfect agreement, Paul deviates from the word order in the first clause. Perhaps the apostle disapproved of the wooden character of the LXX translation. In any case, the difference of order, in contrast to Ellis' opinion, is entirely insignificant in evaluating the source text. Paul again proves himself to be very free with the texts.

CLASSIFICATION: I

I will have mercy on whom I have mercy,
and I will have compassion on whom I have compassion.
   This may be considered an example of the translators of the Pentateuch exhibiting natural language and style, in contrast to the later portions of the LXX. In Hebrew, the verbs are repeated, with the forms changing, but the future tense is maintained. The same structure in Greek would not have a difference in the form of the verb. The translators were likely desiring to write a better sounding sentence,
and chose to sacrifice the repetition of verb tense. The variation of a word in a sentence is a common stylistic practice. Thus, the LXX translators reproduced the significance of the Hebrew verse while not creating a wooden, literal translation. Paul follows the LXX here.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 9.17
Exodus 9.16
For this very purpose did I raise thee up, that I might shew in thee my power, and that my name might be published abroad in all the earth.

Paul varies significantly from the LXX in this case. There is variance in the choice for the word "power" between Paul and the LXX. But of more significance is the voice of the verb in the first clause. The LXX has a passive verb, while the MT shows Yahweh acting in the first person. Franklin Johnson claims the apostle chose to follow the Hebrew to maintain the more direct personal meaning.  

Paul's intention is to clarify the divine agency which is only implied in the LXX. Also, the LXX differs from the Hebrew in the indirect object of "to show." The dative of the LXX and Paul, en soi, may not be as certain in its meaning (means; indirect object) as is the Hebrew. Yet, "in you" is not a substantial difference. In general, the apostle prefers the Hebrew and follows it more closely.  

Even the pro-LXX scholar Fernand Prat agrees with this assessment.

CLASSIFICATION: III

__________________________________________________________


5Toy advocates that Paul translated this passage from the Aramaic. However, evidence fully supporting such a claim is not available.
ROMANS 9.25
Hosea 2.25

I will call that my people, which was not my people,
And her beloved, which was not beloved.

The inversion of clauses and the variation of words and forms marks this quotation as a unique Pauline creation. Lindars is convinced that 9.25 exhibits an independent translation from the Hebrew. Toy states that Paul certainly varies from both the LXX and MT, and that an Aramaic source is also unlikely. In this case, the LXX reproduces the Hebrew quite well. Paul's independence here is inexplicable, particularly in light of Romans 9.26.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

ROMANS 9.26
Hosea 1.10, 2.1

And it shall be, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called sons of the living God.

As Martin points out, Paul nearly exactly follows LXX-A. It cannot be said that the LXX agrees closely with the MT. However, the significant difference lies in the use of direct address in the second clause of the Hebrew, which use is missing in the Greek. This is merely a style change and such alterations rarely effect the meaning of the quotation. The quote is still a certain LXX derivation.

CLASSIFICATION: II

ROMANS 9.27-28
Isaiah 10.22-23

If the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the sea, it is the remnant that shall be saved: for the Lord will execute his word upon the earth, finishing it and cutting it short.

Paul's free rendering accounts for the major variations
found here. Lindars and Toy agree that Paul assimilates the LXX, with abridgement being the substantial change. However, too many words are altered to claim that there is evidence of the LXX as a true source. No Aramaic explanation may be offered, and the Hebrew is certainly not reflected here. The LXX and MT do not match, and Paul has taken the liberty to translate according to his own design.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 9.29 Isaiah 1.9
Except that the Lord of the Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had become as Sodom, and had been made like unto Gomorrah.

"Seed" is the key to the source of this passage. The word in the Hebrew is "remnant," which is not present in any Greek version. "Seed" is an interpretation of the Hebrew, and it is significant that Paul repeats it. Turpie, Prat, and Ellis all agree upon the LXX use her against the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: II

ROMANS 9.33 Isaiah 8.14, 28.16
Behold, I lay in Zion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence:

And he that believeth on him shall not be put to shame.

Prat considers this a composite quotation. Bratcher simply calls it a paraphrase and chooses not to include it in the listing of quotations. Lindars labels it a conflation, and notes that Paul probably felt this to be a valid exact quotation, one with which his readers would be familiar. All writers point out that Paul's jumble of Isaiah here is exactly reproduced in I Peter. Most believe this conflation is of Targumic origin. Johnson notes that the controversial "in him" phrase is in the Targums, and
that it is truly an original concept from Isaiah. However, Abraham Kuenen, cited by Martin, believes that "in him" was not in any Old Testament text, and where it does show up it may be explained by New Testament influence.

It is obvious that this reference was an appropriate paraphrase, and that for Peter and Paul, readers would recognize it and accept its authority. Shires notes that the LXX and Hebrew do vary significantly. Thus, this citation is most likely of Targumic origin.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 10.5 Leviticus 18.5
... the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby.

As Bratcher points out, this too may be best considered a paraphrase. Paul begins it with more of a reference to the words of Moses than a true introductory formula. Lindars contends that this was probably a common rabbinic phrase, and may have been documented in a Targum. In any case, Paul certainly employs interpretation upon the Old Testament reference, which is the same in either the LXX or MT. The interpretation does point to a text besides the LXX or the MT as the apostle's source.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

ROMANS 10.6-8 Deuteronomy 30.12-14
... Say not in thy heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? ... or
Who shall descend into the abyss? ... The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart ...

---

*Johnson, 45-47.
The LXX disagrees with the Hebrew, and Paul differs from both. Prat describes this quotation best with the words "very free." None offer any suggestions as to the origin of this paraphrase/quotation. Simply put, 6-8 stand as a unique literary creation of Paul.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 10.11 Isaiah 28.16
Whosoever believeth on him shall not be put to shame.

10.11 exhibits the same problems as 9.33. Martin and Boney both point out that the LXX translators may have misread the second consonant of "make haste," which would account for the disagreement between the LXX and MT here. Still, Paul's inclusion of "in him" demonstrates a primary source besides the LXX.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 10.13 Joel 2.32
Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.

Only Turpie, Martin and Ellis consider this a quotation. Only the conjunction gar stands as an introductory formula. However, it is apparent that the apostle intends to make his statement authoritatively with the use of Scripture. Besides this, his words agree exactly with LXX-AB, according to Martin. Also, there are no deviations between the LXX and Hebrew. Paul's words agree exactly with Old Testament sources, but a specific source cannot be verified.

CLASSIFICATION: I

Mary Lily Boney, "Paul's Use of the Old Testament" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1956), 7-8.
ROMANS 10.15

How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things!

Paul employs a very free rendering at 10.15. Toy supports either a synagogue Aramaic translation as source, or an unknown LXX recension. Paul's loose reference here is not for the sake of interpretation. One may think that, with the use of the "as it is written" introductory formula, the apostle did derive this citation from an actual written source. However, such a source is entirely unknown today. Although Martin believes Paul to follow the Hebrew more than the LXX here in their disagreement, what text Paul derived this quote from is unclear.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 10.16

Lord, who hath believed our report?

As a quotation, 10.16 matches the LXX perfectly. The inclusion of the vocative "Lord" is found in Paul and the LXX alone. Most writers simply consider this an instance of Paul following the LXX against the Hebrew. But did Paul adopt the LXX language? It may have been natural for Paul to clarify who is being addressed by the quotation, whether the Old Testament texts state so or not. Also, Isaiah 53, on the suffering servant, would be an expected place for "Lord" to be inserted later. Christians wishing to associate the suffering servant with the Messiah and with Jesus would certainly approve. Thus, it is uncertain from this information whether Paul simply copied the LXX or the LXX was altered by the New Testament. This is all speculation. The final analysis here, though, must state that the LXX and MT differ, and that 10.16 mirrors the LXX.

CLASSIFICATION: II
I will provoke you to jealousy with that which is no nation,
With a nation void of understanding will I anger you.

Paul gives slight variation from the LXX with a change from third to second person. The LXX and MT fully agree, and the simple alteration of pronouns does not cause conflict between New Testament and Old Testament.

CLASSIFICATION: I

I was found of them that sought me not;
I became manifest unto them that asked not of me.

Paul speaks here and in verse 21 as a Christian apologist. These Isaiah verse likely constituted part of his message to any Jewish crowd he addressed. He most certainly had memorized such verses, and had no need to look them up in any Old Testament to quote them. This may explain the inversion of clauses in 20. The words are verbatim from the LXX, yet the order of statements is reversed. The source of this quote was almost certainly the apostle's memory. However, the LXX is faithfully reproduced, and is at variance with the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: II

All the day long did I spread out my hands
unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.

"Disobedient and gainsaying" replaces the Hebrew text's "rebellious" in both the LXX and Paul. In this way alone do the MT and LXX differ. Shires considers this doublet to be a significant difference. The situation is the equivalent of 10.20 with a few phrases with different placements. Paul
did not likely check these references, but they do match the LXX rather closely.

CLASSIFICATION: II

ROMANS 11.3
I Kings 19.14
Lord, they have killed the prophets, they have digged down thine altars:
and I am left alone, and they seek my life.

Toy shows that the LXX and MT are identical and that the quotation, though free, is based on the LXX text. The rest of the scholars agree that there is but slight variation between Paul and the Old Testament texts. This is just an abridgement based on known texts.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 11.4
I Kings 19.18
I have left for myself seven thousand men,
who have not bowed the knee to Baal.

Paul does not agree with the LXX, and the LXX and Hebrew differ greatly. All agree that Paul's source is unclear, with the exception of Fernand Prat, who advocates that Paul does follow the Hebrew. This assessment is possible, but difficult to verify.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 11.8
Isaiah 29.10; Deuteronomy 29.3
God gave them a spirit of stupor, Eyes that they should not see,
and ears that they should not hear, unto this very day.

The LXX is very similar to the Hebrew in both instances. The Greek of the Isaiah reference is somewhat of a clarification of the meaning in Hebrew. However, as
Lindars proposes, Paul makes a very intentional composite quotation based on no one specific text. The apostle’s freedom in general is evidenced in this original conflation.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

ROMANS 11.9-10

Psalm 69.23-24

Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, And a stumblingblock, and a recompense to them: Let their eyes be darkened, that they may not see, and bow thou down their back alway.

Although much of the LXX is evidenced in Paul’s reference, a number of variations makes one hesitate to say he was using it. Neither are the LXX and Hebrew terribly close. The apostle likely began with the LXX text and proceeded to edit and revise as he deemed helpful. Thus, the passage is in agreement with no known text.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 11.26-27

Isaiah 59.20-21, 27.9

There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer; He shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: And this is my covenant unto them, When I shall take away their sins.

While the variations are not as pronounced as in 11.9-10, the situation is the same as above.

CLASSIFICATION: V

ROMANS 11.34

Isaiah 40.13

For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor?

Again, only gar stands as an introduction to this quote. However, Paul’s close association with the LXX--only an omission of the last three words separates the two--shows
his intention to make an authoritative quotation. The Hebrew varies from the Greek in that \textit{nous} is used for "spirit" where \textit{pneuma} would be more appropriate.\footnote{Boney, 9.} With only slight variation from the LXX, Paul seems to use the Greek against the Hebrew.

\textbf{CLASSIFICATION: II}

\textbf{ROMANS 11.35} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Job 41.3}

Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again?

\hspace{1cm} As stated earlier, it is likely that only Hebrew and Aramaic texts were available to Paul for the book of Job. Ellis indicates that Paul used the Hebrew against a poor LXX translation. Lindars and especially Toy suggest an Aramaic source to account for the slight variation between Paul and the MT. However, Martin asserts that Paul definitely uses the Hebrew.

\hspace{1cm} \textbf{CLASSIFICATION: III}

\textbf{ROMANS 12.19} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{Deuteronomy 32.35}

Vengeance belongeth unto me: I will recompense . . .

\hspace{1cm} Hebrews 10.30 also quotes this reference. Lindars notes that both agree against the LXX. But Lindars suggests another Greek version as the source. Thackeray specifically suggests Theodotion as the LXX alternative.\footnote{Henry St. John Thackeray, \textit{The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought} (London: Macmillan and Co., 1900): 181.} Toy claims that Paul uses the synagogal Aramaic version. While these may be possible, without evidence they remain untenable. Martin and Prat agree on the use of Hebrew here as the text
from which Paul derived this quote.

CLASSIFICATION: III

ROMANS 12.20

Proverbs 25.21-22

But if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink:

for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head.

Though many writers note that this text agrees exactly with LXX-B\(^{10}\), it should be noted that there is significant agreement between the LXX and the Hebrew. Toy regards this as a nearly literal rendition of the Greek translation. Thus, the Pauline quote clearly follows the LXX, but without variation between the LXX and MT.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 13.9

Deuteronomy 5.17-21; Leviticus 19.18

Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not covet. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

Both 9a and 9b would be well known to Paul's readers, and Jews could know them in three languages. It is not surprising that Paul, the LXX and the MT are all in agreement.

CLASSIFICATION: I

ROMANS 14.11

Isaiah 48.18, 45.23

As I live, saith the Lord, to me every knee shall bow,

And every tongue shall confess to God.

Martin points out that Paul agrees most nearly with the Alexandrian version. However, Toy properly warns that this version may have been influenced by Paul. The Hebrew is followed here with the exception of the phrase in question, "swear to God." Crawford Toy advocates Paul's addition of "swear to God" as a common rabbinic expression. Ellis and Turpie reject any one source as the origin. With so much speculation, memory quotation may be the most probable. In any case, nothing may be effectively verified.

**CLASSIFICATION: V**

**ROMANS 15.3**

Psalm 69.10

The reproaches of them that reproached thee fell upon me.

Paul, the LXX, and the Hebrew are all in agreement. A rare consensus.

**CLASSIFICATION: I**

**ROMANS 15.9**

Psalm 18.50

Therefore will I give praise unto thee among the Gentiles,
And sing unto thy name.

Only slight variation separates the standard sources and Paul. Verse 9 omits the vocative; this is the opposite circumstance of 10.16. However, Paul's omission of an Old Testament term is less significant than the inclusion of a word which the Scriptures lack. With this slight variation, Paul likely still followed his Old Testament texts.

**CLASSIFICATION: I**

**ROMANS 15.10**

Deuteronomy 32.43

Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.

The translation of the Hebrew is unclear in this reference. But Paul adheres faithfully to the LXX version,
which is at variance with the MT. All of the scholars agree with this assessment.

CLASSIFICATION: II

ROMANS 15.11
Psalm 117.1
Praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; And let all the peoples praise him.

Paul's word order is somewhat inverted, and with a change of person. These variations are only slight, but suggest that a text beside the LXX or MT could have been the source. The Hebrew is translated well by the LXX, so neither text may be deemed more likely to be the origin of this quote.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

ROMANS 15.12
Isaiah 11.10
There shall be the root of Jesse, And he that ariseth to rule over the Gentiles; And let all the peoples praise him.

Verse 12 lacks the LXX phrase "in that day." Paul's reference is quite distinct from the Hebrew. The absence of the temporal phrase is acceptable, particularly as this quote completes a catena of Old Testament citations. A time phrase late in the quotations is unnecessary. There are few indications that the LXX was not the source of this quote.

CLASSIFICATION: II

ROMANS 15.21
Isaiah 52.15
They shall see, to whom no tidings of him came,
And they who have not heart [sic, heard] shall understand.

Here is a situation which the LXX is a poor translation of the Hebrew, yet the apostle is faithful to the Greek. The difference is found in the object of the Hebrew verb,
the relative pronoun, being taken as the subject in the Greek. The meaning is not substantially altered, but Paul follows the LXX meaning as well as using its words.

CLASSIFICATION: II

I CORINTHIANS 1.19
Isaiah 29.14
I will destroy the wisdom of the wise,
And the prudence of the prudent will I reject.

Shires gives the first and most certain aspect of note in this reference in that Paul does not follow the Hebrew. The LXX differs significantly from the MT here. Paul supplies "reject" for the LXX and MT word "hide." Although Lindars believes this to be a deliberate replacement by the apostle from and LXX foundation, the origin of this usage is uncertain. Following Ellis and Turpie, which text Paul derived this quote from cannot be discerned.

CLASSIFICATION: V

I CORINTHIANS 1.31
Jeremiah 9.23
He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

Although Paul prefaced this citation with a common introductory formula, that which he marked as having its source in the sacred writings bears little resemblance to the actual Scripture. 1.31 is an extreme abridgement of Jeremiah's words. The LXX matches the Hebrew in this case, and what Paul includes in his epistle is congruent with the Old Testament texts. But, this adaptation may have been taken from another source, thus explaining its brevity.

CLASSIFICATION: IV
I CORINTHIANS 2.9
Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, And which entered not into the heart of man, Whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him.

Simply put, as Prat again describes, this is a very free quotation. The LXX makes a very free translation; perhaps the LXX is derived from another Hebrew version. Paul does the LXX one better with a broad adaptation of the Old Testament text. Memory quotation, with a poor recall on the apostle's part, is a poor explanation in such cases. Paul most likely took satisfactory liberties with his translation to produce the quote most appropriate for his writing.

CLASSIFICATION: V

I CORINTHIANS 2.16
For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he should instruct him?

See Romans 11.34 above. Paul makes another adaptation to both the order and wording. His free style obscures the evaluation of the text of origin.

CLASSIFICATION: V

I CORINTHIANS 3.19
He that taketh the wise in their craftiness.

This rendering follows the Hebrew quite faithfully, while being entirely dissimilar to an errant LXX. As with Romans, 11.35 above, either the LXX of Job was unavailable to Paul or its translation was unsatisfactory for the apostle's quotations.

CLASSIFICATION: III
I CORINTHIANS 3.20  Psalm 94.11
The Lord knoweth the reasonings of the wise, that they are vain.

Paul's substitution of "the wise" for "man," found in both the LXX and MT, constitutes the only deviation from known Old Testament texts. The Greek and Hebrew Old Testament texts are in agreement. Again, Paul simply has adapted the text, by intention or by another textual source or misquotation.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

I CORINTHIANS 6.16  Genesis 2.24
The twain . . . shall become one flesh.

Only Ellis, Prat, and Turpie choose to comment on this reference, most likely because it is not prefaced with a common introductory formula. In all Greek references, the word "the two" is inserted. The Hebrew lacks the numeric reference, and thus the three authors note Paul's agreement with the LXX in this instance. If one were to say that Paul based this quote on the Hebrew, it is only necessary to claim that he also made an acceptable clarification concerning the subject of the verse. But, technically, it is most reasonable to claim Paul here prefers the LXX against the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: II

I CORINTHIANS 9.9  Deuteronomy 25.4
Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn.

There exists much textual confusion over this citation. Different manuscripts have differing words for "muzzle." R. C. Nevius shows that Paul matches the "muzzle" of LXX-B, -D, -G, and -F. Apparently the rest of the manuscripts have the
word *phimoseis*.\textsuperscript{11} There is no consensus as to which "muzzle" was Paul's true original word, and whether certain manuscripts affected the New Testament or vice versa. Bratcher and Toy both claim that Paul matches the Hebrew quite well, and concede the discussion of "muzzle" to futility.

CLASSIFICATION: I

**I CORINTHIANS 10.7**  
Exodus 32.6

The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.

I Corinthians, the LXX, and the MT all render this verse exactly the same.

CLASSIFICATION: I

**I CORINTHIANS 10.26**  
Psalm 24.1

For the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof.

Again, no discrepancies exist in any of the texts and versions involved.

CLASSIFICATION: I

**I CORINTHIANS 14.21**  
Isaiah 28.11-12

By men of strange tongues and by the lips of strangers will I speak unto this people; and not even thus will they hear me . . .

Paul simply disagrees with the LXX in this citation. Lindars suggests another Greek Old Testament was employed. However, Paul comes closest to the Hebrew, with a few inversions and adaptations. None of the Aramaic versions march 14.21 any better than does the MT, according to Toy.

Obviously, if there were a source text to be chosen, the Hebrew would be selected. Yet the apostle writes so freely as to cause one to be doubtful that any text was employed at all.

CLASSIFICATION: V

I CORINTHIANS 15.27 Psalm 8.7
He put all things in subjection under his feet.

This short quotation, marked only be a conjunction, shows little variation from the Greek or the Hebrew Old Testaments. Paul changes the verse from second to third person and uses a slightly different preposition than the LXX. However, it seems that Paul employed an Old Testament text here and could have used either Greek or Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: I

I CORINTHIANS 15.32 Isaiah 22.13
... let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.

The extremely close association between Paul and the LXX here shuts out any possibility of another text to have been used. The Greek matches verbatim, proving Paul employed the LXX against the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: II

I CORINTHIANS 15.45 Genesis 2.7
The first man Adam became a living soul.

This verse certainly does not vary significantly with the meaning of either the LXX or the MT. Both Old Testament texts are in agreement. However, Paul wishes to establish literary parallelism within the verse. Thus he employs a free translation of the Genesis reference, which shows the
I CORINTHIANS 15.54 Isaiah 25.8
Death is swallowed up in victory.
Eis nikos is just one of the puzzles to solve in this short citation. "In victory" is distinctly absent in the MT and LXX. From what source did Paul derive this reference? Toy explains that, in contrast to the active verb in Hebrew, the Aramaic version took the verb as passive and "death" as the subject. Bratcher and Thackeray\textsuperscript{12} maintain that Paul follows Theodotion. However, the reference is too loose to make any speculation beyond the criteria involved.

I CORINTHIANS 15.55 Hosea 13.14
O death, where is thy victory? O death, where is thy sting?
Author Pieter Verhoef claims this as a "conspicuous quotation taken from the deviating text of the Septuagint."\textsuperscript{13} The term "deviating" is in reference to several manuscripts which replace the LXX "Hades" with "death," in agreement with Paul's citation. However, the source of these words is unclear, and it is likely that Paul's mind and freedom are most responsible for what is found here.

\textsuperscript{12}Thackeray, 181.
II CORINTHIANS 4.13 Psalm 116.10
I believed, and therefore did I speak.

The LXX provides an adequate translation of the Hebrew, and the apostle matches the LXX letter for letter. Therefore do Turpie and Ellis agree that all versions are in agreement here.

CLASSIFICATION: I

II CORINTHIANS 6.2 Isaiah 49.8
At an acceptable time I hearkened unto thee,
And in a day of salvation did I succour thee.

Again the LXX is followed verbatim. The only question is whether the quotation varies from the Hebrew. Ellis, Toy and Turpie are confident that the LXX and MT match adequately here.

CLASSIFICATION: I

II CORINTHIANS 6.16 Leviticus 26.11-12; Ezekiel 37.27
I will dwell in them, and walk in them;
And I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

The Hebrew and LXX match well, but Paul's citation is too loose to know which version was employed, or even if a version was used. Again, the New Testament does not disagree with the Old Testament texts, but the free translation has altered the text beyond evaluation.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

II CORINTHIANS 6.17 Isaiah 52.11-12
Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, And touch no unclean thing; And I will receive you.

Verse 17 follows verse 16 in its free character.
Again, how Paul derived this quotation is ambiguous.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

II CORINTHIANS 6.18 II Samuel 7.14
And I will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.

This quote ends the series of free paraphrase by the apostle. Possibly this chain of quotes was known before Paul's writing of it, but this too is speculation. It is most reasonable to consider 16-18 as Paul's original creation based on no particular text, but rather a compilation of references from memory.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

II CORINTHIANS 8.15 Exodus 16.18
He that gathered much had nothing over; and he that gathered little had no lack.

Paul makes an excellent translation here of what is found in the Hebrew text. Paul and the LXX differ in word order--an inversion in the first clause--and the word used for "gather." These differences are quite unimportant; Toy and Prat therefore see no reason to rule out LXX use here. However, along with Bratcher, Ellis, and Turpie, it must be seen that Paul's choice of a different word for "gather" has no significance behind it. Which word is used has little impact on the verse. If Paul did derive this quotation from the LXX, the alteration is both unnecessary and inexplicable. Paul almost certainly derived this quotation from the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: III
II CORINTHIANS 9.9 Psalm 112.9
He hath scattered abroad, he hath given to the poor;
His righteousness abideth for ever.

Paul follows the LXX verbatim, and both of these Greek verses match the Hebrew with the simple alteration of the verb tenses. This is an acceptable difference, and cannot disprove the fact that Paul may have derived 9.9 from either the Greek or the Hebrew.

CLASSIFICATION: I

II CORINTHIANS 10.17 Jeremiah 9.24
But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.

This reference lacks an introductory formula, being marked only by the conjunction de. Otherwise 10.17 is a duplicate of I Corinthians 1.31 (see above). Paul did not need to reintroduce this quote which the readers at Corinth had previously encountered.

CLASSIFICATION: IV

II CORINTHIANS 13.1 Deuteronomy 19.15
At the mouth of two witnesses or three shall every word be established.

The New Testament lacks only a repetition of "at the mouth" of the LXX. Omitting a portion of a parallel phrase is certainly not a major modification, especially when every word found in 13.1 is found in the LXX. Although Turpie and Ellis object, there is also no significant difference between Paul and the Hebrew. Paul certainly does not disagree with the MT, and shows no sign of preferring the one text over the other in this instance.

CLASSIFICATION: I
GALATIANS 3.6

Genesis 15.6

... Abraham believed God,
and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness.
The introductory formula in this case is simply kathos.
Otherwise, 3.6 is a duplicate of Romans 4.3 (see above).

CLASSIFICATION: II

GALATIANS 3.8

Genesis 12.3

In thee shall all the nations be blessed.
Paul may have also been quoting Genesis 18.18. 3.8 shows a slight abridgement of the Old Testament here, and Paul's choice of the word for "nations" follows the LXX of Genesis 18.18 in contrast to phulai of 12.3. Although some believe that Paul simply quoted this verse without referring to a text--Genesis 12.3 would be one of the most recognized verses in Scripture to Paul's readers, especially to Jews--he did not stray from either the Greek or Hebrew text.\(^{14}\)
The lack of significant variation shows no distinct text from which Paul derived this reference.

CLASSIFICATION: I

GALATIANS 3.10

Deuteronomy 27.26
Cursed is every one which continueth not in all the things that are written in the book of the law, to do them.

Simply stated, the LXX, the MT, and the New Testament all differ significantly. Paul would certainly be familiar with this verse in Hebrew. The LXX varies from the MT in several respects. The LXX translators seem to have changed the Hebrew to a more emphatic expression. In this respect, Paul shows familiarity with the LXX. Missing in the MT, but crucial in both 3.10 and the LXX is the word "all." Paul

\(^{14}\)Johnson, 17.
shows dependence on the LXX in building part of his argument upon "all." However, the apostle also deviates from the rest of the LXX in his expression. This is a clear case of unclear textual origin of a quotation.

CLASSIFICATION: V

GALATIANS 3.11       Habakkuk 2.4
The righteous shall live by faith.

Again, Paul repeats himself having employed the same quotation at Romans 1.17 (see above).

CLASSIFICATION: I

GALATIANS 3.12       Leviticus 18.5
He that doeth them shall live in them.

Paul at Romans 10.5 quotes the first half of the Leviticus verse and employs interpretive freedom. 3.12 shows a greater affinity between Paul and the Old Testament texts. Paul merely excludes the LXX anthropos and condenses the Hebrew. Ellis notes these as slight variations. Paul thus may have derived this from either Old Testament text.

CLASSIFICATION: I

GALATIANS 3.13       Deuteronomy 21.23
Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.

Many debates have historically arisen over the use of Deuteronomy 21.23 in reference to Jesus' crucifixion. "On a tree" is only implied in the Hebrew. The reference "of God" is missing in Paul though it stands in both the MT and LXX. Paul alters the LXX "cursed" slightly, but shows that he was familiar with this verse in the LXX from the duplication of

---

\[^{15}\text{Boney, 7.}\]
words and order. However, there is not a clear consensus concerning whether any of the texts are original and escaped emendation or corruption. Paul varies enough with the Old Testament to cause a question of his true source.

CLASSIFICATION: V

**GALATIANS 3.16**

And to thy seed.

This quotation is introduced with the unusual formula, "He (it) does not say," marking this short reference distinctly as a quotation. The Old Testament reference is found in several verses in Genesis. As short as it is, no speculation can be made as to the priority of sources since all texts show no variation in the treatment of the three or four words involved.

CLASSIFICATION: I

**GALATIANS 4.27**

Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; Break forth and cry thou that travailest not; For more are the children of the desolate, Than of her which hath the husband.

All scholars are in agreement that Paul follows the LXX verbatim from this Isaiah text, which is at slight but definite variance with the Hebrew. However, when "agreement with the LXX against the Hebrew" is selected, one must not infer that the apostle was influenced in the passage's meaning and interpretation by the Greek version alone. The LXX faithfully translates the passage quite adequately in terms of meaning. Paul simply follows the wording of the LXX in this instance.

CLASSIFICATION: II
GALATIANS 4.10  
Genesis 21.10
Cast out the handmaid and her son: for the son of the handmaid shall not inherit with the son of the freewoman.

The LXX and MT are in agreement in this reference. Paul does make definite variations. However, altering "this handmaid" to "the handmaid" and making "my son Issac" to "son of the freewoman" are both obviously intentional as Paul desires to use specific terms for general application. Toy shows that Paul does not alter the meaning of the reference, though he does employ these variations. Generalizing Old Testament citations is a common literary device; the variations are not significant. His wording otherwise follows the LXX.

CLASSIFICATION: I

GALATIANS 5.14  
Leviticus 19.18
Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.

For the sake of familiarity, Paul would likely not even consider altering the wording of a commandment that nearly all Galatians readers would know by heart. Similarly, the LXX translators chose not to alter the words or meaning of Siniatic law. No variations exist here.

CLASSIFICATION: I

EPHESIANS 4.8  
Psalm 68.19
When he ascended on high, he led captivity captive,  
And gave gifts unto men.

No controversy exists between the LXX and MT here. However, the Pauline citation exhibits a significant variation in the reference to Christ giving gifts. Tasker points out that Paul probably altered this form according to his own design of Christ being a giver a gifts which are
given back to him.\textsuperscript{16} This is such a radical change, unlike any other alteration Paul has made of an Old Testament quotation. Paul's reverence for the Old Testament texts proves it unlikely that the apostle would alter the entire meaning of a quote without textual support to prove his point. Toy showed that a Targumic translation offered support for "gave," explaining that "if God received gifts from men, it was in order that he might dispense them to men (the Targum says, through Moses).\textsuperscript{17} Targumic influence is a possibility, though hardly final and authoritative, explanation for the origin of the variation. Paul follows LXX language closely with the exception of this interpretive variant. But even pro-LXX scholar Atkinson agrees that the apostle makes a rare deviation from the LXX here.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{CLASSIFICATION: IV}

\textbf{EPHESIANS 5.14}

?  
Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead.  
And Christ shall shine upon thee.  

\textit{Dio legei} is a certain introductory formula. Though Paul certainly uses it to intentionally distinguish this phrase as Scriptural, none can discern a corresponding Old Testament passage. Several authors, including Bratcher, suggest the quotation of a Christian apocryphal work. The possibility of Paul quoting noncanonical material is rather doubtful. Toy and Ellis postulate the apostle making an exceptionally free paraphrase of Isaiah passages,


\textsuperscript{17}Toy, 198.

particularly from Isaiah 60. Although the alterations are so great as to make the source unknowable, free quoting of Isaiah is the most reasonable explanation considering the presence of the introductory formula.

**CLASSIFICATION:** N/A

**EPHESIANS 5.31**

*Genesis 2.24*

For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh.

Paul differs from the LXX in the case of the word "wife" and the exclusion of the redundant "his" before "mother." Besides these alterations, the same circumstances surround 5.31 as are seen in I Corinthians 6.16 (see above). No distinct text is comprehensible, in agreement with Turpie and Ellis.

**CLASSIFICATION:** V

**EPHESIANS 6.2-3**

*Deuteronomy 5.16 (Exodus 20.12)*

Honour thy father and mother . . . that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth.

The final quotation in the Pauline corpus is a paraphrase and abridgement which exhibits no introductory formula. Paul himself may have disagreed with these verses as being considered quotation. Ellis' criteria for quotation include obvious references to Scripture and its authority. Paul's words show affinity with both the Greek and the Hebrew, yet the abridgement makes it impossible to discern a certain source text.

**CLASSIFICATION:** V
<p>| ROM 1.17 | HABAKKUK 2.4 | I |
| ROM 2.24 | ISAIAH 52.5 | II |
| ROM 3.4 | PSALM 51.6 | I |
| ROM 3.10-12 | PSALM 14.1-3 | IV |
| ROM 3.13a | PSALM 5.10 | I |
| ROM 3.13b | PSALM 140.4 | I |
| ROM 3.14 | PSALM 10.7 | I |
| ROM 3.15-17 | ISAIAH 59.7-8 | V |
| ROM 3.18 | PSALM 36.2 | I |
| ROM 4.3 | GENESIS 15.6 | II |
| ROM 4.7-8 | PSALM 32.1-2 | II |
| ROM 4.17 | GENESIS 17.5 | I |
| ROM 4.18 | GENESIS 15.5 | I |
| ROM 7.7 | EXODUS 20.17 | I |
| ROM 8.36 | PSALM 44.23 | I |
| ROM 9.7 | GENESIS 21.12 | I |
| ROM 9.9 | GENESIS 18.10,14 | V |
| ROM 9.12 | GENESIS 25.23 | I |
| ROM 9.13 | MALACHI 1.2-3 | I |
| ROM 9.15 | EXODUS 33.19 | I |
| ROM 9.17 | EXODUS 9.16 | III |
| ROM 9.25 | HOSEA 2.25 | IV |
| ROM 9.26 | HOSEA 1.10, 2.1 | II |
| ROM 9.27-28 | ISAIAH 10.22-23 | V |
| ROM 9.29 | ISAIAH 1.9 | II |
| ROM 9.33 | ISAIAH 8.14, 28.16 | V |
| ROM 10.5 | LEVITICUS 18.5 | IV |
| ROM 10.6-8 | DEUTERONOMY 30.12-14 | V |
| ROM 10.11 | ISAIAH 28.16 | V |
| ROM 10.13 | JOEL 2.32 | I |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Scripture Reference</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROM 10.15</td>
<td>ISAIAH 52.7</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 10.16</td>
<td>ISAIAH 53.1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 10.18</td>
<td>PSALM 19.5</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 10.19</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 32.21</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 10.20</td>
<td>ISAIAH 65.1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 10.21</td>
<td>ISAIAH 65.2</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 11.3</td>
<td>I KINGS 19.14</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 11.4</td>
<td>I KINGS 19.18</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 11.8</td>
<td>ISAIAH 29.10; DEUTERONOMY 29.3</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 11.9-10</td>
<td>PSALM 69.23-24</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 11.26-27</td>
<td>ISAIAH 59.20-21, 27.9</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 11.34</td>
<td>ISAIAH 40.13</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 11.35</td>
<td>JOB 41.3</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 12.19</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 32.35</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 12.20</td>
<td>PROVERBS 25.21-22</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 13.9</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 5.17-21; LEVITICUS 19.18</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 14.11</td>
<td>ISAIAH 48.18, 45.23</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 15.3</td>
<td>PSALM 69.10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 15.9</td>
<td>PSALM 18.50</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 15.10</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 32.43</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 15.11</td>
<td>PSALM 117.1</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 15.12</td>
<td>ISAIAH 11.10</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROM 15.21</td>
<td>ISAIAH 52.15</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 1.19</td>
<td>ISAIAH 29.14</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 1.31</td>
<td>JEREMIAH 9.23</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 2.9</td>
<td>ISAIAH 64.4</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 2.16</td>
<td>ISAIAH 40.13</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 3.19</td>
<td>JOB 5.12-13</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 3.20</td>
<td>PSALM 94.4</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 6.16</td>
<td>GENESIS 2.24</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 9.9</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 25.4</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 10.7</td>
<td>EXODUS 32.6</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 10.26</td>
<td>PSALM 24.1</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 14.21</td>
<td>ISAIAH 28.11-12</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 15.27</td>
<td>PSALM 8.7</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 15.32</td>
<td>ISAIAH 22.13</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 15.45</td>
<td>GENESIS 2.7</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 15.54</td>
<td>ISAIAH 25.8</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I COR 15.55</td>
<td>HOSEA 13.14</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 4.13</td>
<td>PSALM 116.10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 6.2</td>
<td>ISAIAH 49.8</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 6.16</td>
<td>LEVITICUS 26.11-12; EZEKIEL 37.27</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 6.17</td>
<td>ISAIAH 52.11-12</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 6.18</td>
<td>II SAMUEL 7.14</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 8.15</td>
<td>EXODUS 16.18</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 9.9</td>
<td>PSALM 112.9</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 10.17</td>
<td>JEREMIAH 9.24</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II COR 13.1</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 19.15</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 3.6</td>
<td>GENESIS 15.6</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 3.8</td>
<td>GENESIS 12.3</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 3.10</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 27.26</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 3.11</td>
<td>HABAKKUK 2.4</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 3.12</td>
<td>LEVITICUS 18.5</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 3.13</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 21.23</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 3.16</td>
<td>GENESIS 22.18</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 4.27</td>
<td>ISAIAH 54.1</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 4.30</td>
<td>GENESIS 21.10</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL 5.14</td>
<td>LEVITICUS 19.18</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPH 4.8</td>
<td>PSALM 68.19</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPH 5.14</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPH 5.31</td>
<td>GENESIS 2.24</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPH 6.2-3</td>
<td>DEUTERONOMY 5.16</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

I  Paul, LXX, Hebrew agree  . . . . . . . . . . . . 36
II  LXX used against Hebrew  . . . . . . . . . . . . 16
III Hebrew used against LXX  . . . . . . . . . . . .  5
IV LXX, Hebrew agree, Paul varies  . . . . 13
V LXX, Hebrew disagree, Paul varies  . . . 21

The chart containing the analysis of Paul's Old Testament quotations, found on pages 69-72, may be analyzed in a variety of ways. Depending upon one's intentions, these findings may be used to support a wide range of assumptions. Categories IV and V combined represent 34 citations which vary from the Old Testament texts. One might therefore state that well over one-third of Paul's citations are at variance with both the Hebrew and Greek Old Testaments. One may further interpret the chart to show that only 21 references may be classified as being derived from any specific known text (Classifications II and III combined). These two statistics together---34 quotes of unknown origin with only 21 quotes having definite sources---might be utilized to argue the futility of attempting to discern Paul's Old Testament source texts.

Similarly, these statistics might be applied to an argument for LXX primacy. Sixteen references of Classification II combined with the potential for 36 of the quotations having also been derived from the LXX, according to category I, gives the LXX advocate over 50 quotations with the LXX as the most probable source. One might
reasonably concede the other classifications and claim the primacy of the LXX for Pauline Old Testament quotations.

With the possibility of such liberties to be taken with the statistics, it is important to clarify the meaning of the classifications. Classification I is obviously the most crucial, seeing that it accounts for a full two-fifths of the references. In this study, Classification I marks those quotations which are fully recognizable according to the Old Testament texts. All 36 agree quite closely with the LXX wording. In all of these cases, the MT and the LXX are in close agreement. Classification I in general represents those quotations which could have been derived from either the Greek or the Hebrew Old Testaments.

However, further explication is necessary. As shown earlier, Paul employed the LXX in his quotation largely for the reasons of familiarity and availability. 36 citations that agree equally well with the LXX and MT in reality represent the probable use of the LXX. The LXX was more available to Paul than Hebrew scrolls, and when a quotation did not require alteration of any sort, the apostle, in good judgment, would most likely choose to follow the LXX wording. Thus, of the 36, the LXX is the plausible source text. Exceptions to this reasoning would include extremely short quotations (e.g. I Cor. 15.27; Rom. 4.18) and well-known references (Rom. 7.7; Gal. 3.8). In the case of short quotes, the source is impossible to discern, and with recognizable, familiar Old Testament references, the apostle may have simply quoted accurately from memory. Most of Classification I may be attributed to the LXX, explained by the apostle's use of a text familiar to him and to his audience. But the fact that many references (Classifications III, IV, V) disagree with the LXX cause one to hesitate to claim LXX use in all cases.

Classifications IV and V together represent quotes which lack a discernible source text. What may be said of
these? In many of the references in Chapter Three which fall into these categories, Paul does not disagree with the Old Testament texts, he merely varies. Paul altered quotes, paraphrased and combined passages, but he almost never betrayed the meaning of the quotes as found in the LXX or MT. Thus it must not be said that IV and V represent 34 instances of the use of other Old Testament texts (Targums or unknown Greek or Hebrew recensions). Nor should one lump these categories together as "memory quotation." While these classifications probably contain the majority of those quotes Paul made from memory, one would have to simply make educated guesses at which quotes are the result of poor memory. It is the opinion of this writer that Classifications IV and V represent Paul's stylistic and interpretive freedom. His variations are most often based on a known source, but lacking the textual affinity to say he used a certain source.

What then is the meaning of the findings? In brief, Classifications II and III do represent references with specific source texts. The first three categories combined give an important total of 57 references with the utilization of a source text, either Greek or Hebrew. The remaining 34 do not however imply that Paul did not employ a known source. Distribution among all five categories proves the apostle's freedom in quotation practice and style. The majority of quotes in Classification I should be attributed to the LXX. Finally, Classifications III and V prove Paul not to be a "Septuagint Jew."

EVALUATION OF THE HYPOTHESIS

The Hypothesis: The LXX was not the primary version from which Paul derived his Old Testament quotations.

Having defined "derive" early on in this study, "primary" remains as the final point of ambiguity in testing
the hypothesis. The thesis statement will be judged according to two definitions of the word "primary."

First, primary describes the version which is first in representation among the texts involved. Included in this study have been Targums, the MT and the LXX. Also included has been Paul himself, in terms of his intellect and memory together as being a source of its own. However, among the versions, the specific word employed in the hypothesis, the LXX is demonstrably primary. From the findings of this thesis, one may estimate Paul's use of the LXX as the primary version of derivation for an estimated 24 quotes of Classification I along with 16 of Classification II, concretely from the LXX. Reasonably, the LXX accounts for at least 40 quotations, whereas the MT may be only considered to be the source of 16 or so quotations. Although estimation and speculation are certainly factors in the numbers, the fact is that the LXX stands far above any other version as the source of Pauline quotations.

The other definition of "primary" utilized here is that which describes importance, significance, essentiality, etc. In other words, Paul quoted the Old Testament 92 times. Was the LXX the primary version of deriving those quotations? Did the LXX hold greatest significance in the deriving of quotations from sources? With Ephesians 5.14 as the lone exception, 91 sources of these citations in Paul show distinct scriptural origins. In Paul's writing, the LXX was not the primary version of derivation of these quotes in terms of importance.

Paul utilized the LXX in only 40 quotations, with reasonable certainty. Thus, only 40 of 92 quotations can be proved to be derived from the LXX. The remaining 52 substantiate the claim that the LXX was not primary to Paul.
Paul varies from the LXX in 40 instances. While it can not be said that the MT is of greater importance than the LXX, the significance of any version cannot be proved since the apostle shows freedom to choose his source in at least 56 quotations (all quotations besides Classification I).

Of primary importance in quoting the Old Testament is Paul's own interpretation, memory and style. If Paul considered the LXX primary, he certainly would have quoted it, with little variance, more than 40, 46 or 50 times. It is obvious that deriving his quotes from the LXX version was not as primary as producing the Old Testament citation which Paul felt to be most appropriate. The apostle's variations from either the MT and LXX assimilate a version of derivation themselves.

In summary, of the versions/texts from which Paul quoted, the LXX was the primary source of his Old Testament quotations. However, it is demonstrated in his method of quotation that the LXX was not the primary source of deriving quotations in terms of importance. His own judgment and style have primary significance over the source of his quotes.

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

Although the hypothesis has been proven to be untenable, much may be gleaned from the study concerning the implications of the LXX as the primary source of Paul's quotes. First, as is noted in the evaluation, according to the second definition of "primary," quoting the LXX closely was not an essential objective of Paul. Only 16 quotations can be proved to exhibit the LXX as the sole authoritative source. In general, exhibiting the sources of Old Testament

----

1The total of Classifications III, IV and V, along with Ephesians 5.14
quotations was demonstrated to be of little import to the apostle. Modern standards of citation and quotation practice are not applicable to the New Testament writers. Generalizing about Paul's quotation method and source preference is shown to be simply inappropriate and unsound.

The findings also imply the importance of the Hebrew foundations of Pauline quotes. Still, each quote must be evaluated individually, for generalization is impossible. But most scholarship has over-emphasized the role of the Greek Old Testament. Paul agrees with the Hebrew in 41 cases. This is substantial information which was not found to be presented as such in any of the literature in the bibliography. Also, the LXX was certainly based on Hebrew texts originally. Considering Paul's background along with the evidence of the origins of the quotations leads one to stress the role of Hebrew in Paul's quotes beyond what has been previously emphasized.

Finally, implied in this study is the necessity to avoid aggrandizing the role and influence of the LXX on the New Testament writers and writings. Both the evidence about the sources of Paul's quotations, as well as the study of the use of the LXX and its meaning to the New Testament writers and Christian communities, have exposed weaknesses in the rationale which advocates LXX influence on the New Testament. The LXX still stands as a valuable tool for New Testament scholarship. However, since Paul could have significantly utilized the LXX in at most 52 of 92 quotations, previous claims and conclusions such as Paul being a "Septuagint Jew" are untenable. Case by case evaluation of LXX influence, with an appropriate awareness of other background and practical matters, must be undertaken.
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