



UNIVERSITÀ DI NAPOLI L'ORIENTALE
DIPARTIMENTO ASIA, AFRICA E MEDITERRANEO

Creative Fidelity, Faithful Creativity
The Reception of Jewish Scripture
in Early Judaism and Christianity

Edited by Michael A. Daise and Dorota Hartman



UnioPress
Naples 2022

*Creative Fidelity, Faithful Creativity: The Reception
of Jewish Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity,*
Edited by Michael A. Daise and Dorota Hartman
UniorPress, Naples 2022. ISBN 978-88-6719-258-8



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0
International License

UniorPress - Via Nuova Marina 59 - 80133 Naples, Italy
www.uniorpress.unior.it

‘As It Is Written in the Law of the Lord’ (Luke 2:23): Quotations from the Pentateuch in the Gospel of Luke

DOROTA HARTMAN

It is well known that scripture plays a very important role for the author of the Third Gospel. In the Gospel of Luke, the first public appearance of Jesus shows him discussing the Law with the διδάσκαλοι at the temple,¹ and ends with the risen Jesus explaining the scripture.² From this narrative device alone, it is obvious that Luke makes reference to scripture on various levels. The use of scripture in the Third Gospel and Acts is in fact rather multifaceted, as evident from quotations, allusions and the conscious imitation of OT stories.³ However, despite his interest

¹ Luke 2:41–50.

² Luke 24:44–47. The importance of presenting Jesus as an interpreter of scripture in these verses was underlined by Bart J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, SNTA 14 (Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1989), 149; see also Emerson B. Powery, *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus’ Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*, BibInt 63 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 242.

³ Due to limits of space, this article will mainly discuss OT quotations in the Gospel of Luke, not in Acts. There are countless books and articles on use of the OT in Luke-Acts; as it is impossible to provide a full list here, we will mention only a few, such as Richard N. Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999), 123–24; and, for a general overview of the use of the OT in Luke, David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel, ‘Luke’, in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic/Nottingham: Apollos, 2007), 251–414. Among other studies, there are Charles Kingsley Barrett, ‘Luke/Acts’, in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*, ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 231–44; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, ‘The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts’, in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr., SBLSP 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 524–38; Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually*, JSNTSup 282 (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005); Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus’ Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke’s Gospel*, JSNTSup 94 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994); Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, SNT 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969); Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*, JSNTSup 12 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); Dietrich Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, BZNW 112 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003); and François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)*, 2nd rev. ed. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 87–121. Regarding Acts in particular, Martin Rese, ‘Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte’, in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, ed. Jacob Kremer, BETL 48 (Gembloux: J. Ducolot/Leuven: Leuven University, 1979), 61–79; John T. Carroll, ‘The Uses of Scripture in Acts’, in *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers*, ed. David J. Lull, SBLSP 29 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990),

in the OT and in creating intertextual relations with it, Luke does not quote extensively from the OT, more frequently making use of allusions than explicit quotations.⁴ Most of these quotations are to be found in the speeches in the first fifteen chapters of the Acts; in his Gospel, the biblical quotations are concentrated in the final part of the work. Moreover, while the infancy narrative is full of OT echoes, in the central part of the Gospel the quotations are less frequent.

The independent quotations in Luke's Gospel are mainly from Isaiah, the Psalms and the Minor Prophets.⁵ In the Passion narrative, as in other Synoptics, there is a significant number of quotations from the Psalms, but Luke adds another important quotation from Isaiah that is quoted only by him.⁶ As has already been noted, in Lucan writings there are no direct quotations from the historical books, yet this certainly does not mean that Luke did not know them.⁷ Luke certainly knew the tripartite division of the Hebrew scripture, which he introduces as the 'Law of Moses, Prophets and Psalms'⁸ or more simply as 'Moses and the Prophets'.⁹ Except in Acts 2:17–21, he never uses long quotations, and those he does are usually embedded in direct speech: in fact, all but three quotations in his Gospel occur in direct speech.¹⁰ In eighteen instances of explicit quotation, Luke uses introductory formulas.¹¹ Such introductory formulas

512–28; Gert J. Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum*, CBET 12 (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995), 8–14, 32–35; and Carl R. Holladay, 'Luke's Use of the LXX in Acts: A Review of the Debate and a Look at Acts 1:15–26', in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum – The Septuagint and Christian Origins*, ed. Thomas Scott Cauley and Hermann Lichtenberger, WUNT 277 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 233–300.

⁴ A fundamental problem in the study of these quotations is indeed that of distinguishing between a quotation and an allusion, which is not always possible; in fact, the distinction between them is often quite arbitrary, see Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. We will assume as quotations those texts that agree substantially with the OT text in wording, and that are often identified as a reference to scripture by the author, frequently by the use of an introductory formula.

⁵ Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 114.

⁶ Luke 22:37 (Isa 53); see Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 92.

⁷ Pao & Schnabel, 'Luke', 251.

⁸ Luke 24:44.

⁹ Luke 24: 27.

¹⁰ Luke 2:23, 24; 3:4–6.

¹¹ On introductory formulas in scriptural quotations in the NT, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–305, where it is shown that the NT introductory formulas are similar to those found in the Qumran texts. See also Bruce M. Metzger, 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah', *JBL* 70 (1951): 297–307.

show that Luke was very careful to indicate that he was drawing from scripture, and precisely from where: for example, in Luke 3:4 and 20:42.

Finally, the quotations in the Third Gospel and Acts must be elaborated separately, because of the different natures of the two parts of the Lucan corpus. One main difference is that, in Luke's Gospel, the quotations are often drawn from the same tradition known to other Synoptics. Therefore, some Lucan quotations are adaptations from Mark or Q, and do not stem directly from the underlying OT text: thirteen quotations appear in the Triple tradition,¹² five in the Double tradition,¹³ while in the material peculiar to Luke, we find only six.¹⁴ It is meaningful that, even when Luke draws his quotations from Mark or Q, he is careful about the original context in which the quotation appears.

1. Research on the Use of the OT in Luke

The most important aspect of the use of scripture in Luke is certainly the theological perspective it entails, and much attention has been paid to interpretive frameworks that might account for Luke's use of the OT. Amid this line of enquiry, one prominent theory is that it is meant to reflect the theology of promise and fulfillment, or 'proof from prophecy' pattern: as this is not a concern of the present article, it will be mentioned here only briefly. The assertion that Luke uses the OT in an apologetic manner to demonstrate the fulfillment of God's plan in the ministry of Jesus originates in Henry J. Cadbury's *The Making of Luke-Acts*.¹⁵ This claim was further investigated by Paul Schubert, and subsequently by others. Schubert has argued that 'proof from prophecy' is a core tenet of Lucan theology in both the Gospel and Acts. Luke uses this pattern as the basis of his chapter 24, which is crucial to the theological unity of the Gospel.¹⁶ Hans Conzelmann has described Luke's intent in using the OT as illustrating promise and fulfillment, on the one hand, and apologetics on the other.¹⁷ The introductory formulas show that the scripture is understood as prophecy in Luke. Conzelmann also stresses the priority of chapter 24 of the Third Gospel, while Martin Rese and Darrell Bock focus on the Christolog-

¹² Luke 3:4-6; 7:27; 8:10; 10:27; 18:20; 19:38, 46; 20:17, 28, 37, 42-43; 21:27; 22:69.

¹³ Luke 4:4, 8, 10-11, 12; 13:35.

¹⁴ Luke 2:23, 24; 4:18-19; 22:37; 23:30, 46. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 48.

¹⁵ Rev. ed. (London: SPCK, 1958), 303-06.

¹⁶ 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 24', in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*, ed. Walther Eltester, ZNW 21 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954), 165-86.

¹⁷ *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York: Harper, 1961); trans. of *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, BHT 17 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954).

ical use of the OT. After first examining the quotations in Acts and then those in the Third Gospel, Rese contests the validity of assuming a ‘proof from prophecy’ theme since, in his opinion, Luke’s intent in quoting scripture was mainly hermeneutical. Bock aimed to challenge Rese’s study, re-examining all the Christological quotations, allusions and OT themes in the Gospel of Luke and Acts, particularly with an eye to ‘proof from prophecy’.¹⁸ His conclusion is that Luke’s use of the OT represents neither ‘proof from prophecy’ nor its rejection; he describes Luke’s hermeneutical method in his use of the OT as ‘proclamation from prophecy and pattern’.¹⁹ Bock – who asserts that Luke’s conceptual form of argumentation is not solely dependent on the Septuagint (LXX) – makes the important point that Luke could just as well have used the Hebrew text. Moving beyond direct quotations and indirect allusions, Kenneth Litwak extends the research to Luke-Acts’ intertextuality with the OT, arguing that the promise-fulfillment pattern is not sufficient to explain Luke’s purpose in using such OT references: Luke rather uses the references to scripture hermeneutically, namely, to frame the discourse, and his main aim is ecclesiology.²⁰ A main goal of Litwak’s book is to demonstrate that Luke saturated his writings with echoes of scripture in order to demonstrate the continuity between the events of the OT and the life and ministry of Jesus.

2. *Luke’s Dependence on the Septuagint and the Form of the Quotations*

Another well-known fact is that, particularly in the first two chapters of his Gospel, Luke seems to depend heavily on the LXX. Apart from the Gospel’s intertextuality with the OT, as seen in the rewriting of some biblical motifs or in OT typology,²¹ Luke also imitates the style and language of the LXX, and can easily switch between language registers.²² The good classical Greek style of the preface is only a literary device: as soon as the core story begins, Luke switches to another kind of language, one well-rooted in Jewish literary tradition. The conscious imitation of

¹⁸ Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*.

¹⁹ Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 278–79.

²⁰ Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*.

²¹ See, for example, Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 101–08. On the OT figures in Luke, or on the imitation of Deuteronomy in Luke’s narratives, see, for example, David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989); Craig A. Evans, ‘Luke 16:1–18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis’, in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*, ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993); and John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden, eds., *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke*, LNTS 493 (London/New York: Bloomsbury, 2014).

²² Luke 1:4–5.

the LXX's language and style can, according to many scholars, explain the Semitic elements recognizable in the Third Gospel. Fitzmyer says that 'the Semitisms of Lucan Greek which are found in the LXX should be frankly labelled as "Septuagintisms"'.²³ However, the question of these Semitisms is more complex, and the dependence on the LXX cannot explain all the Semitic elements in Luke's work. Some instances seem to indicate that Luke might also have consulted the Hebrew text, or even have been bilingual;²⁴ still other explanations of Lucan Semitisms are possible, such as the use of different sources or the influence of the Jewish Greek milieu. The question of Luke's Semitisms was particularly pursued by Charles Torrey, who concentrated his research on the first fifteen chapters of Acts: a section known for its strong 'biblical' flavor which, according to Torrey, reveals an Aramaic source. Research into the Semitic background of Acts was later continued by Matthew Black and Max Wilcox, yet without reaching any satisfactory conclusion.²⁵ Nonetheless, even if a Semitic influence on Luke cannot be excluded, it seems that – especially in the narrative sections – Luke simply used the LXX also as a literary and linguistic model.²⁶ In this regard, it seems clear enough that the main source of his scriptural quotations was usually the LXX,²⁷ not the Hebrew text.²⁸ To make the question even more arduous, there are also instances of quotations that do not conform to the text of the LXX, but may derive from a different Greek textual tradition or from Testimonia.

²³ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 114

²⁴ See, for example, the quotation from Isa 53:12, peculiar to Luke (22:37), which is closer to the MT than to the LXX. A very extensive discussion of the various theories on the presence of Semitisms in Luke's work can be found in Albert Hogeterp and Adelbert Denaux, *Semitisms in Luke's Greek: A Descriptive Analysis of Lexical and Syntactical Domains of Semitic Language Influence in Luke's Gospel*, WUNT 401 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018). The authors discuss some of the most important phenomena, such as the use of sources, imitation of Old Testament language, influence of the so-called 'Greek of the ancient synagogue', code-switching and bilingualism.

²⁵ Charles C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts*, HTS 1 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916); Max E. Wilcox, 'The Old Testament in Acts 1-15', *ABR* 5 (1956): 1-42; and idem, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965); Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts with an Appendix on the Son of Man by Geza Vermes*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967).

²⁶ Adelbert Denaux and Rita Corstjens, *The Vocabulary of Luke: An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel*, BTS 10 (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 508.

²⁷ It was already argued that the LXX was the main source of Luke's style and quotations: H.F.D. Sparks, 'The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1943): 129-38.

²⁸ The use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18.

Therefore, while Luke did draw from the LXX, it remains to determine both the extent of his knowledge of the text, and what stage of text he had access to. As stated above, studies on the textual form of Lucan quotations have mainly focused on Acts because of the high concentration of scriptural citations in its first fifteen chapters. After having analysed these quotations in Acts, Lucien Cerfaux deemed those quotations inconsistent with the LXX to be from the collections of Testimonia.²⁹ In his above-mentioned work on Semitisms in Acts, Wilcox analyzes some of the quotations in Acts and concludes that, since many diverge from the LXX, they must preserve the Targumic textual tradition; in other instances, where the text seems to be closer to the Hebrew (Masoretic) text, he considers the possibility that Luke used a Hebraicizing version of the LXX.³⁰

An enduring study on this topic is Traugott Holtz's *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*.³¹ Holtz's conclusions are quite interesting, as he argues that Luke knew the LXX of Isaiah, the Psalms and the Minor Prophets, but not that of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets; thus, when quoting or alluding to them, he must have relied on other sources. When Luke fails to reproduce the LXX version of a quotation, it is because he did not have access to the text.³² His quotations from the Minor Prophets seem to be consistent with the LXX Alexandrian manuscript group. Holtz continues to conclude that, since the Lucan quotations from the Pentateuch usually differ from the LXX text, Luke not only lacked access to this text, but he also had no particular interest in the ancient laws as expressed in the OT. His quotations from the Pentateuch are thus traditional: Luke derived them from collections of liturgical texts like the Testimonia.³³ The problem of Luke's use of Testimonia has also been explored by other scholars. On the Christian Testimonia – a collection of messianic texts similar to 4Q175 *Testimonia* – from which NT writers drew, J. Rendel Harris has completed an early

²⁹ 'Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre of Acts', in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*, ed. Philippe H. Menoud and Oscar Cullmann (Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950), 43–53. Among other studies on the quotations in Acts, see W. K. Lowther Clarke, 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts', in *The Beginning of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, 5 vols. (1920–1933; repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1965–1966), 2:66–105; Ernst Haenchen, 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte', *ZTK* 51 (1954): 153–67.

³⁰ Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, 20–55.

³¹ TUGAL 5, Reihe 49–51 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968).

³² As in, for example, Stephen's speech in Acts.

³³ Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 81–82.

study, followed by C.H. Dodd and others.³⁴ The discovery of such collections of proof texts in Qumran would later lend more support to their hypotheses. Martin Albl has compiled a review of Testimonia research and, regarding Luke, examined various quotations from the speeches in Acts.³⁵ Kenneth Thomas likewise demonstrates that the quotations in Synoptics were liturgical quotations preserved in Septuagintal form.³⁶ Various other scholars working on Acts have assumed Luke's use of Testimonia.³⁷ Rese has criticized Holtz's conclusions, maintaining that where Luke's quotations depart from the LXX text, it is due to his redactional activity and theological exigences.³⁸

Among other treatments, we may recall the short study of Helmer Ringgren, who examined the textual form of the quotations in Luke, dealing first with the quotations shared by the other Synoptics, then with the quotations peculiar to Luke, the allusions in the hymns of the infancy narrative and finally the quotations in Acts.³⁹ He reaches the conclusion that the differences between the LXX and Luke are due to Luke's quoting the text by heart. In another essay, C.K. Barrett narrows the focus to quotations with an introductory formula, comparing the Lucan quotations to those in Mark and Matthew.⁴⁰ He also concludes that Luke had no particular interest in the interpretation of the OT. In his doctoral thesis, Wayne Litke discusses the thesis that Holtz elaborated, arguing that Luke used the LXX as the source of his quotations

³⁴ J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920); C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952). Harris's hypothesis was that a single Testimonia book was circulating in the first century, but later scholars have rather supposed many smaller collections. A modified version of the Testimonia hypothesis has survived in other works. Pierre Prigent demonstrated how the writer of Pseudo-Barnabas used many collections of Testimonia, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses sources*, EBib (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961); see also Oskar Skarsaune, 'From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church', in *The New Testament and Christian-Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser*, ed. Malcolm Lowe (Jerusalem: Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, 1992), 207–19.

³⁵ *'And Scripture Cannot be Broken': The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovT-Sup 96 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 190–201.

³⁶ 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics', *NTS* 22 (1976): 205–14 (207–09).

³⁷ George D. Kilpatrick, 'Some Quotations in Acts', in *Les Actes des Apôtres*, 81–97. This study focuses on quotations from Acts.

³⁸ *Alttestamentliche motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, 208–09; 217–23. See also Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 98–101.

³⁹ 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament', *HTR* 79 (1986): 227–35.

⁴⁰ Barrett, 'Luke/Acts', 231–44.

from all the OT books.⁴¹ Some scholars, most notably John Drury and Michael Goulder, building on the thesis of Christopher Evans – who claimed that Luke composed his central section as a parallel to LXX Deuteronomy 1–26 – use the expression ‘literary midrash’ to describe the technique Luke adopts in his Gospel: they claim that the author of the Third Gospel would have used the LXX to create his narratives.⁴² Drury, in particular, maintains that Luke used the LXX, Mark and Matthew as his sources, while the parts that are peculiar to his Gospel are merely rewritings of the stories he found in the LXX.⁴³ Goulder extends this thesis, developing a ‘lectionary cycle’ theory. The Gospel of Luke would thus have been a liturgical gospel read in worship, and Luke’s quotations would reflect the Jewish ‘lectionary cycle’ of Torah and Prophets.⁴⁴

3. *The Problem with the Pentateuch*

It is indeed difficult to establish the accuracy of Luke’s biblical quotations, especially as we are nowadays aware of the fluidity of the LXX text in its first centuries of life. Quotations not conforming to the LXX’s later, fixed text might have originated from another version (or versions) of the Greek scripture in circulation at that time. On the other hand, these quotations can reveal the form of the LXX text in the first century; the same materials can inform us of the existence of such secondary LXX textual forms. It is known that there was a movement that promoted the revision of the Greek Bible in line with the Hebrew text, as the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever has clearly shown. It seems probable that Luke also used a Greek text of the Minor Prophets that was revised in line with the Hebrew text.⁴⁵ When the quotation diverges from the LXX, however, we cannot always be sure

⁴¹ ‘Luke’s Knowledge of the Septuagint: A Study of Citations in Luke-Acts’ (Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 1993).

⁴² Christopher F. Evans, ‘The Central Section of St Luke’s Gospel’, in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. Dennis E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), 37–54. It is important to note that Evans did not use the term ‘midrash’ when describing the use of LXX Deuteronomy in the central section of Luke.

⁴³ *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976).

⁴⁴ He draws attention to P⁷⁵, whose system of divisions reflects the lectionary cycle, see *The Evangelists’ Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1978); idem, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 2 vols., JSNTSup 20 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1989). An overview of Goulder’s theory is in Mark Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, JSNTSup 133 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996). See the critique of Goulder’s theory in Christopher Francis Evans, ‘Goulder and the Gospels’, *Theology* 82 (1979): 425–32.

⁴⁵ Litke, ‘Luke’s Knowledge of the Septuagint’, 100.

whether the difference is due to the fact that the quotation is traditional or originates from Testimonia or a different LXX text, or if it is due purely to the author's redactional activity. This process becomes even more complicated when attempting to trace the origins of the indirect allusions.

Luke shows a preference for quotations from the Prophets and Psalms, while he seems less interested in the Pentateuch. Perhaps because of their many textual problems, quotations from the Pentateuch in Luke's Gospel have been less studied. This corpus consists mainly of composite quotations⁴⁶ that are usually short and, compared to quotations from Psalms and Prophets, more frequently depart from the LXX. In his Gospel, Luke quotes from the Pentateuch ten times, the Book of Numbers excluded.⁴⁷ In the whole two-volume Lucan corpus, there are thirty-five references to the Pentateuch altogether, not counting mere allusions. In the Third Gospel, all but three Pentateuchal quotations are found in direct speech, usually in the conversations of Jesus. While the quotations from other books are often Christological, and are used to explain the necessity of the Messiah's suffering, the quotations from the Pentateuch aim to underline adherence to the Law. Luke repeatedly emphasizes the importance of the 'law of the fathers'.⁴⁸

4. Textual Problems: Luke 18:20 (Exod 20:12-16; Deut 5:16-20)

As mentioned above, the Third Gospel features many citations that Luke found in his sources Mark or Q.⁴⁹ Here, accepting the two-source hypothesis, we will present just one example of a quotation from the material that Luke draws from Mark.

For some reason, Luke was not satisfied with the Marcan form of the quotation, and thus revised it. The quotation, which contains the commandments from the second table of the decalogue,⁵⁰ appears in all three Synoptics, in the episode

⁴⁶ On composite quotations in Luke-Acts, see Stanley Porter, 'Composite Citations in Luke-Acts', in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Volume 2, New Testament Uses*, ed. Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn, LNTS 593 (London: T&T Clark, 2018), 62-94.

⁴⁷ Luke 2:23/Exod 13:2, 12; Luke 2:24/Lev 12:8; Luke 4:4/Deut 8:3; Luke 4:8/Deut 6:13; Luke 4:12/Deut 6:16; Luke 10:27/Deut 6:5; Lev 19:18; Luke 12:35/Exod 12:11; Luke 18:20/Exod 20:12-16; Deut 5:16-20; Luke 20:28/Deut 25:5; Gen 38:8; Luke 20:37/Exod 3:6. Kimball adds a quotation in Luke 1:15 from Lev 10:9 (Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 204).

⁴⁸ Luke 2:23, 24, 39; Acts 22:3.

⁴⁹ In the Third Gospel, five quotations appear in the Double Tradition (4:4, 8, 10-11, 12; 13:35), and thirteen in the Triple Tradition (3:4-6; 7:27; 8:10; 10:27; 18:20; 19:38, 46; 20:17, 28, 37, 42-43; 21:27; 22:69).

⁵⁰ Exod 20:12-16 = Deut 5:16-20. Jews considered Exod 20:2 (and Deut 5:6) the first commandment, and Exod 20:3-6 the second. The first five commandments, regarding God, were inscribed on the first tablet, and the other five, regarding humans, on the second.

of the rich man asking Jesus about eternal life.⁵¹ Regarding the order of the sixth, seventh and eighth commandments in the Qumran fragments, Josephus and the Samaritan Pentateuch, the order is the same as that transmitted by the Masoretic Text. Nonetheless, in the Alexandrian Jewish milieu another order was known, as we see from both the LXX and Philo. Both in Exodus and Deuteronomy the MT presents the thematic order of these commandments as murder, adultery, theft, whereas in the LXX, the prohibition on adultery appears first.⁵² Whether the change in order was motivated by some particular emphasis on the crime of adultery is a matter of discussion; while some scholars believe this, the order may simply derive from a different *Vorlage*.⁵³

Exodus 20:12–16

¹² τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι

¹³ οὐ μοιχεύσεις

¹⁴ οὐ κλέψεις

¹⁵ οὐ φονεύσεις

¹⁶ οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ

Deuteronomy 5:16–20

¹⁶ τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα σου ὃν τρόπον ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι

¹⁷ οὐ μοιχεύσεις

¹⁸ οὐ φονεύσεις

⁵¹ Mark 10:19; Matt 19:18–19; Luke 18:20. Thomas, ‘Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics’, 207–09; Kimball, *Jesus’ Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke’s Gospel*, 138–39; Porter, ‘Composite Citations in Luke-Acts’, 74–77; Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, 118–19.

⁵² The order of the MT, in both Exodus and Deuteronomy, is murder, adultery, theft. The same order appears in 4QDeut^a, the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Peshitta. The order of the prohibitions in LXX Exodus is adultery, theft, murder; in Deuteronomy, adultery, murder, theft. See John W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SCS 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 314.

⁵³ In the MT Exodus, adultery is low on the list of prohibitions, and the wife is treated as part of the husband’s possessions; in Deuteronomy, wives are separate from possessions; and in the LXX’s Exodus and Deuteronomy, adultery is a more serious offence. This could indicate a change of approach, possibly due to the emphasis on fornication in Hellenistic Judaism – cf. Liliana Rosso Ubigli, ‘Alcuni aspetti della concezione della “porneia” nel tardo giudaismo’, *Hen* 1 (1979): 201–45 – but might also indicate the availability of a different text to the translators. See Leonard J. Greenspoon, ‘Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Exodus’, in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans and Joel N. Lohr, VTSup 164, FIOTL 7 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 341–42.

¹⁹ οὐ κλέψεις

²⁰ οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ

In fact, the text of the quotation in Mark already differs from that in the LXX, where we find:

τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης, μὴ ἀποστερήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.⁵⁴

Mark substitutes μή with the subjunctive for οὐ with the future indicative found in the LXX. He changes the order of the commandments to murder, adultery, theft, bearing false witness, honoring one's parents. Thus, Mark puts τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα after the first four prohibitions. He also adds another prohibition, μὴ ἀποστερήσης, 'do not defraud', which is neither in the LXX nor in the MT, and probably derives from the catechetical tradition.⁵⁵

The version in Matthew, on the other hand, reads:

¹⁸ λέγει αὐτῷ· ποίας; ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· τὸ οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, ¹⁹ τίμα τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.⁵⁶

Matthew follows the LXX, omitting the Marcan addition of μὴ ἀποστερήσης; he retains the LXX οὐ with the future indicative for the prohibitions.⁵⁷ He adds, 'you shall love your neighbour as yourself'.

Luke further modifies the quotation found in Mark:

τὰς ἐντολάς οἶδας μὴ μοιχεύσης, μὴ φονεύσης, μὴ κλέψης, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσης, τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα.⁵⁸

Like Mark, Luke maintains the commandment form of μή with the aorist subjunctive. as opposed to the LXX, where the negated future indicative is found (as in

⁵⁴ Mark 10:19.

⁵⁵ Thomas, 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics', 207. The NT authors were not interested in the first commandments, regarding images and idolatry. Moreover, later on, two commandments from Exod 20:2–6 were merged into one. On the commandments in the NT, see David Flusser, 'The Ten Commandments and the New Testament', in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*, ed. Ben-Zion Segal and Gershon Levi, Sidrat sefarim le-ḥeker ha-Mikra mi-yisudo shel S. Sh. Peri (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990), 219–26.

⁵⁶ Matt 19:18–19.

⁵⁷ Matthew's quotation reflects the A text of Deut 5:16–20. The differences between the Lukan and Matthean versions of the quotation – despite their agreement on the common omission of the Marcan addition μὴ ἀποστερήσης – makes Luke's dependence on Matthew improbable.

⁵⁸ Luke 18:20.

Matthew).⁵⁹ The aorist subjunctive is typical of Luke, who uses it consistently in prohibitions,⁶⁰ so he may have found this more apt. He omits the Marcan addition of μη ἀποστερήσης, which is lacking in the LXX, and, surprisingly, reverses the order of the commandments to μη μοιχεύσης, μη φονεύσης, μη κλέψης. Since it does not seem that Luke wanted to place particular emphasis on the prohibition of adultery here, as it is not relevant to the episode of the rich man, the change is not redactional, but probably simply due to the text he was following. It also seems that Luke here is referring not to the LXX of Exodus, but to Deuteronomy 5:16–20, and the order of the prohibitions is the same as that attested in the B text of LXX Deuteronomy. The same order is found in other early Christian authors, such as Paul in Romans:

τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυήσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἑτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται [ἐν τῷ] ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.⁶¹

or in James:

ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν· μὴ μοιχεύσης, εἶπεν καὶ· μὴ φονεύσης· εἰ δὲ οὐ μοιχεύεις φονεύεις δέ, γέγονας παραβάτης νόμου.⁶²

According to Holtz, Luke used a quotation drawn not from the LXX, but from the liturgical tradition. This is probable, and must have been a tradition already circulating in Jewish circles, as noted above, since the same order is visible in Philo, for whom the prohibition on adultery is particularly relevant.⁶³ Indeed, in Philo we find: ἡ δ' ἑτέρα πεντὰς τὰς πάσας ἀπαγορεύσεις περιέχει· μοιχείας, φόνου, κλοπῆς, ψευδομαρτυριῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν.⁶⁴ The same order of the sixth to eighth commandments appears in the Nash Papyrus, which attests to the use of the ten commandments in liturgy.⁶⁵ The text of the Nash Papyrus is conflated, but it reflects a different textual tradition than the MT and the LXX. Even if the order of the commandments is similar to that in LXX

⁵⁹ Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, 138–39.

⁶⁰ Luke 6:29; 8:28; 10:4; 12:22; Acts 7:60; 18:9.

⁶¹ Rom 13:9; cf. also 1 Cor 6:9.

⁶² Jas 2:11.

⁶³ *Decal.* 168–71; *Spec.* 3.7–4.40. See Ulrich Kellerman, 'Der Dekalog in den Schriften des Frühjudentums: Ein Überblick' in *Weisheit, Ethos und Gebot: Weisheits- und Dekalogtraditionen in der Bibel und im frühen Judentum*, ed. Henning Graf Reventlow, *Biblich-theologische Studien* 43 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001), 161–70; Innocent Himbaza, 'Le Décalogue de Papyrus Nash, Philon, 4QPhyl G; 8QPhyl 3, et 4Qmez A', *RevQ* 20 (2002): 411–28, esp. pp. 421–24.

⁶⁴ *Decal.* 1:51.

⁶⁵ The Nash Papyrus contains the Decalogue in the mixed version of Deuteronomy and Exodus (Deut 5:6–21, Exod 20:2–17), Deut 4:45 and the Shema': see the classic exposition of William F. Albright, 'A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus', *JBL* 56 (1937): 145–76.

Deuteronomy in Vaticanus B, the text of Nash Papyrus differs from the LXX in other respects.⁶⁶ The Nash Papyrus was found in Egypt, but its actual provenance is unknown, and it should be recalled that – as demonstrated by Emmanuel Tov – there are strong affinities between this text and the Palestinian liturgical traditions, not with the LXX.⁶⁷ This fact attests that the alternative order of the commandments that we also find in Luke was circulating in Jewish milieus.

This example makes it less probable that Luke corrected the Marcan quotation to the text of the LXX similar to the text preserved in Codex Vaticanus. More probable is that he corrected it according to the tradition he was familiar with. Since there are other instances where it seems that Luke knew the Jewish exegesis of scripture, it is probable that he revised the quotation under its influence. The example also shows that, in the material drawn from Mark, Luke deliberately changed the OT quotations and modified them. These changes were not due to particular theological reasons, but simply because he followed the tradition he preferred or knew better.

5. Luke 2:22–24

Our second example is a cluster of quotations in the infancy narrative, which has no parallel in other Synoptics.⁶⁸ These quotations are particularly interesting because, being peculiar to Luke, they show his knowledge of the biblical texts and the Jewish background of these texts.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ See Emmanuel Tov, 'The Papyrus Nash and the Septuagint', in *A Necessary Task: Essays on Textual Criticism of the Old Testament in Memory of Stephen Pisano*, ed. Dionisio Candido and Leonardo Pessoa da Silva Pinto, AnBib 14 (Rome: G&B Press, 2020), 38.

⁶⁷ The Decalogue section of the Nash Papyrus is often described as similar to the LXX, but Tov demonstrates that the papyrus is close neither to the textual tradition of LXX Deuteronomy nor to LXX Exodus. Tov draws attention to the fact that the text of the Decalogue and the Shema transmitted in the Nash Papyrus is parallel to certain *tefillin* found in the Judaeen Desert, and therefore more probably reflects Palestinian tradition; see Tov, 'The Papyrus Nash and the Septuagint'.

⁶⁸ Being impossible here to quote all the extensive literature on the infancy narrative, see just Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1977), who rejects the historicity of most of the material in the Lucan infancy narrative. For a different opinion, see Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 55–90; Stephen Farris, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance*, JSNTSup 9 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). On the problem of the original language, see Chang-Wook Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, JSNTSup 267 (London: T&T Clark, 2004). We assume here that Luke composed his infancy narrative himself, in Greek.

⁶⁹ See Gert J. Steyn, 'Intertextual Similarities between Septuagint Pretexts and Luke's Gospel', *Neot* 24 (1990): 229–46. Steyn notes also that the same can be observed for Acts, where the explicit quotations are found in speeches which are Luke's own creation: see *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum*, 23.

The study of quotations from the Pentateuch in Luke is also connected with some broader questions: the possible source of the infancy narratives, and the extent of Lucan redactional activity, or his authorship of the first two chapters of the Third Gospel. The quotations in Luke 2:23–24 are also among the very few Pentateuch quotations in the Gospels that are not attributed to Jesus.⁷⁰ Section 2:21–40 of the Third Gospel is concerned with matters of purification after birth and with the presentation of Jesus by his parents at the temple on the eighth day after his birth. Apart from the Pentateuchal references, these verses echo the presentation of Samuel to the ‘House of the Lord’ at Shiloh in 1 Sam 1:22–24.⁷¹

Luke 2:22–24 is carefully structured around two references to OT law: the law concerning the firstborn (2:23) and that concerning purification of the mother (2:24):

²² Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστήσαι τῷ κυρίῳ,
²³ καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοίγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται, ²⁴ καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου, ζευγὸς τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νοσοῦς περιστερῶν.⁷²

These presentation ceremonies are delineated as part of the Law of Moses or of the Lord, and three times Luke underlines obedience to the Law: κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως (v. 22); καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου (v. 23); κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου (v. 24).⁷³ The quotation in verse 23 pertains to the dedication of the firstborn, but it is preceded by a mention of another rite, that of purification after birth, in the phrase ‘when the time came for their purification’ in Luke 2:22, though the actual description of this rite is found only later on, in verse 24. According to some authors, Luke confounded the two rites – the purification of the mother after birth, in Leviticus 12, and the dedication of the firstborn, in Exodus 13:2 – putting them together.⁷⁴ In any case, Luke focuses here on Jesus’ parents fulfilling the requirements of the Law. The author of the Third Gospel, in fact, frequently emphasizes that the ministry of Jesus is to be seen as a fulfillment of the Law of the Lord,

⁷⁰ There are only five quotations from the Pentateuch in the Gospels that were not pronounced by Jesus himself (and seventeen pronounced by him); cf. Kenneth J. Thomas, ‘Torah Citations in the Synoptics’, *NTS* 24 (1977): 85–96.

⁷¹ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 450–51; Pao-Schnabel, ‘Luke’, 268–71; Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*, 49.

⁷² Luke 2:22–24.

⁷³ The structure could be derived from a source according to Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 306n114.

⁷⁴ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 447.

the νόμος κυρίου.⁷⁵ Further, as the narrative of the Gospel continues, adherence to the Law is mentioned again, 'and when the parents brought in the child Jesus, to do for him what was customary under the law',⁷⁶ and 'When they had finished everything required by the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own town of Nazareth'.⁷⁷

The term 'Law', νόμος, appears nine times in the Third Gospel, five of which are in the infancy narrative.⁷⁸ First, in chapter 2:22, Luke uses the expression 'law of Moses', which appears five times in the Lucan corpus⁷⁹ as well as in the LXX.⁸⁰ Moses is clearly connected with the Law:

Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως,
ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ.⁸¹

Luke 2:22 begins with the mention of the purification rite: καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν; the use of the third-person plural pronoun in τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν is interesting, because it does not follow the text of LXX Leviticus, which instead contains the regulation ἕως ἂν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρσεως αὐτῆς.⁸² In the LXX, as also in the MT, the singular feminine pronoun referring to the mother appears, while Luke uses the third-person plural pronoun in τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν, 'their purification'. Since all the available manuscripts of LXX Leviticus contain the feminine αὐτῆς, the change in pronoun must derive from something other than the different text of the LXX followed by Luke.⁸³ The pronoun αὐτῶν could indicate that both Joseph and Mary have to be purified; otherwise, it could refer to Mary and Jesus. The regulations in Leviticus mention only

⁷⁵ Luke 2:24; 4:8, 10, 12; 19:46.

⁷⁶ Luke 2:27.

⁷⁷ Luke 2:39.

⁷⁸ Luke 2:22, 23, 24, 27, 39, also 10:26; 16:16, 17; 24:44, and another fifteen occurrences in Acts. See Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, SNTSMS 50 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1.

⁷⁹ Luke 2:24; Acts 13:38; 15:5; 28:23. Meanwhile, it appears only three times in other NT writings (John 7:23; 1 Cor 9:9; Heb 10:28). Moses is clearly connected with the Law and his association with it is more frequent in Luke than in other NT writers.

⁸⁰ 1 Kgdms 2:3; 1 Esd 9:39; Tob 7:13; Dan 9:11.

⁸¹ Luke 2:22.

⁸² Lev 12:4.

⁸³ All the available manuscripts of LXX Leviticus contain the feminine αὐτῆς; see John W. Wevers, ed., *Leviticus*, vol. 2.2 of *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 38.

the purification of the mother after birth.⁸⁴ In the LXX, there is clearly a feminine pronoun, αὐτῆς:

λάλησον τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐρεῖς πρὸς αὐτούς γυνή, ἣτις ἐὰν σπερματισθῆ καὶ τέκη ἄρσεν καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἐπτά ἡμέρας κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ χωρισμοῦ τῆς ἀφέδρου αὐτῆς ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται

Speak to the people of Israel, saying: 'If a woman conceives and bears a male child, she shall be ceremonially unclean for seven days; as at the time of her menstruation, she shall be unclean'.⁸⁵

καὶ τριάκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς καθήσεται ἐν αἵματι ἀκαθάρτῳ αὐτῆς παντὸς ἁγίου οὐχ ἄψεται καὶ εἰς τὸ ἁγιαστήριον οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται ἕως ἂν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρσεως αὐτῆς

Her time of blood purification shall be thirty-three days; she shall not touch any holy thing, or come into the sanctuary, until the days of her purification are completed.⁸⁶

The reading αὐτῶν is found in the best witnesses of the Gospel of Luke: Sinaiticus, A, B and L. Textual variants, however, attest that the scribes were puzzled by αὐτοῦ, as it did not correspond to the prescription in Leviticus. Thus, Codex D has αὐτοῦ (also in Sahidic and in Syriac), a singular pronoun that could refer either to Jesus or to Joseph. Some Vetus Latina manuscripts and the Vulgata have *eius* – equivalent to αὐτῆς, in αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρσεως αὐτῆς⁸⁷ – to indicate that only the purification of Mary was intended: however, this could derive from scribal harmonization with the LXX of Leviticus 12:4. Other witnesses omit the pronoun entirely: 435, bo^{pt}; Ir^{lat}. Since αὐτῶν seems to be the better *lectio*, most commentators think that the pronoun refers to Joseph and Mary.⁸⁸ This does not agree with the prescription found in Leviticus, but Luke – who is usually thought to have been of Gentile origin – could simply have been ignorant of Jewish regulations regarding purification after childbirth. Clearly, this would strengthen the argument of Luke's ignorance of the Pentateuch;⁸⁹

⁸⁴ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 424.

⁸⁵ Lev 12:2.

⁸⁶ Lev 12:4.

⁸⁷ Lev 12:4.

⁸⁸ Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 424; Raymond Brown, 'The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22-40)', *Worship* 51 (1977): 2-11.

⁸⁹ It is not possible to mention all the commentators that share this view. See Brown, 'The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22-40)', 3; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 424; François Bovon, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, vol. 1 of *Luke*, ed. Helmut Koester, 3 vols., Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 99; trans. of *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, 4 vols., EKKNT 3 (Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen, 1989-2009); and I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 116.

others, however, assume that Luke was not precise because his main focus here was the visit to the temple and presentation of the child, not matters of purification.⁹⁰ Therefore, Luke does not aim to give technical details here. Origen, however, in his *Homilies on Luke*, thinks that the plural refers not to Mary and Joseph, but to Mary and Jesus.⁹¹ If the pronoun refers to Mary and Jesus, it would mean that the child also needed purification.

Why would Luke change the text of LXX Leviticus 12:4? This question has been pursued by Matthew Thiessen.⁹² Leviticus 11–16 is concerned with matters of impurity, and chapter 12 concentrates on impurity after childbirth.⁹³ As a consequence of bearing a child, a woman is impure, and cannot touch holy things or enter the sanctuary. After the birth of a male, she is impure like a menstruant (כִּימֵי טַמְאָה דוֹתָהּ/κατὰ τὰς ἡμέρας τοῦ χωρισμοῦ τῆς ἀφέδρου αὐτῆς).⁹⁴ After seven days, the male child is circumcised, but the mother is still in a state of downgraded impurity for thirty-three days. After the birth of a female, the period of uncleanness lasts for fourteen days, after which her downgraded impurity doubles to sixty-six days. On completion of this period, the mother has to present a lamb for the burnt offering (עֹלָה), and a pigeon or turtledove for the purification offering (חַטָּאת).⁹⁵ In Leviticus, only the mother is described as impure, but there is no mention of the child. Thiessen argues that the legislation in Leviticus is only a very concise description of the impurity rules, and possibly not exhaustive: other Jewish traditions probably also described the newborn child as ritually impure.⁹⁶ This seems to be confirmed in *Jubilees* 3:8–14, which contains evidence that the child also undergoes a period of impurity.⁹⁷ This text reflects on longer periods of impurity after giving birth to daughters: the Garden of Eden is described as an archetypal temple, and Adam and Eve become impure after birth, even if they have no

⁹⁰ Wilson, *Luke and the Law*, 21.

⁹¹ *Hom. Luc.* 14:3–6.

⁹² 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', *NovT* 54 (2012): 16–29.

⁹³ See Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1–16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 3 (New York: Doubleday, 1991); Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 19–20.

⁹⁴ Lev 12:2.

⁹⁵ Lev 12:6–8.

⁹⁶ Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 18.

⁹⁷ Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 24. For the Book of *Jubilees*, see James C. VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*, 2 vols., CSCO 510–511, *Scriptores Aethiopicici* 87–88 (Louvain: Peeters, 1989); Linda S. Schearing, 'Double Time ... Double Trouble? Gender, Sin, and Leviticus 12', in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*, ed. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler, VTSup 93, FIOTL 3 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 431–32.

mother. Since Eve was created after Adam, her entrance to the Garden of Eden was subsequent to that of the man, so bearing a daughter entails a longer period of impurity. The text also implies that all those associated with childbirth are unclean. The impurity pertains not only to the husband of a woman who has given birth, but also to the newborn itself.⁹⁸

Another text connecting entrance into the Garden of Eden with the legislation in Leviticus 12 is 4Q265.⁹⁹ This text also implies the impurity of the child itself.¹⁰⁰ But why would the question of the child's impurity bother Luke? Differently than in the text of Leviticus 12, Luke explicitly describes the newborn Jesus' entrance into the sacred space when his parents present him to the Lord at the temple. Since, as mentioned above, Luke was very careful to demonstrate Jesus' family's complete adherence to the Law, he was concerned that the child's entrance might bring impurity to the sanctuary. If Thiessen's proposal is correct, Luke displays a deep knowledge of the impurity rules, as well as knowledge of other Jewish texts dealing with impurity, apart from the instructions given in Leviticus 12. It is hard to imagine that Luke would have ignored the legislation of Leviticus, or that he had no access to the text of LXX Leviticus. He must have wanted to underline that the child was purified before his parents presented him to the Lord, so he slightly modified the text of the LXX according to other Jewish prescriptions he knew.

Thiessen, however, does not mention the problem found in the following section:

καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ.¹⁰¹

The verb ἀνήγαγον,¹⁰² which is connected with αὐτῶν, seems to refer to Joseph and Mary, not to Mary and the child. This could just be bad syntax, but it could also mean that the pronoun αὐτῶν refers to Joseph and Mary, or to the entire family. If

⁹⁸ Joseph M. Baumgarten, 'Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and *Jubilees*', in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies*, Paris, 1992, ed. George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez, STDJ 15 (Leiden: Brill 1994), 3–10. Such is the interpretation given to this passage of *Jubilees* by Syncellus, who declares that, after birth, newborns were impure like their mothers, and could not be introduced into the temple before a period of purification (Syncellus, *Chronography* 5, quoted by Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 26).

⁹⁹ This text was reconstructed by Baumgarten, 'Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and *Jubilees*', esp. p. 5.

¹⁰⁰ Thiessen, 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity', 25.

¹⁰¹ Luke 2:22.

¹⁰² The verb is an allusion to 1 Kgdms 1:22: καὶ Ἀννα οὐκ ἀνέβη μετ' αὐτοῦ ὅτι εἶπεν τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς ἕως τοῦ ἀναβῆναι τὸ παιδάριον ἐκ ἀπογαλακτίσω αὐτό καὶ ὀφθήσεται τῷ προσώπῳ κυρίου καὶ καθήσεται ἐκεῖ ἕως αἰῶνος.

this is the case (however, see below), the impurity after birth is, for Luke, extended to all those associated with childbirth, again in accordance with other Jewish texts, such as *Jubilees* and 4Q265.

6. Luke 2:23

In the next verse, Luke describes the reasons for the dedication of the firstborn. The focus on the firstborn's total dedication to the Lord in Luke 2:23 is again a sign of Luke interpreting scripture according to Jewish exegetical tradition. The firstborn's presentation to the Lord is strictly connected with the purification rite described in the previous verse, and here it is clear that, differently than in the text of Leviticus, Luke is describing the child entering the temple's sacred space; thus, the focus on matters of impurity is not connected only with the mother. Here we find one of the three quotations in Luke that do not appear in direct speech.¹⁰³ The quotation is announced with an introductory formula, καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου,¹⁰⁴ thus specifying the source of the quotation as the 'Law of the Lord':¹⁰⁵

καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοίγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται

As it is written in the law of the Lord, 'Every firstborn male shall be designated as holy to the Lord.'¹⁰⁶

Luke clearly states that he is referring to scripture here. The ὅτι clause is introduced by καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου. Elsewhere in his Gospel, Luke does not use καθὼς γέγραπται, but it appears two times in Acts.¹⁰⁷ This is the only instance in Luke's work where a quotation from the Pentateuch is announced as being from 'the Law of the Lord'. This formula, however, frequently introduces quotations in the LXX.¹⁰⁸ The lack of an article in ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου has occasionally been attributed to its translation from Hebrew, but this argument is not strong, as the same

¹⁰³ On this quotation, see Thomas, 'Torah Citations in the Synoptics', 91; Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*, 140-42.

¹⁰⁴ Luke 2:23.

¹⁰⁵ This is the only place where such an expression occurs. In Luke 10:26, we find 'in the law', ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τὶ γέγραπται, without κυρίου; cf. Matt 22:36.

¹⁰⁶ Luke 2:23.

¹⁰⁷ Acts 7:42; 15:15. Denaux and Corstjens, *The Vocabulary of Luke*, 131; Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 69.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. 2 Kgdms 14:6; 2 Chr 23:18; 25:4; Dan 9:13.

expression appears with an article in v. 24.¹⁰⁹ Further, the expression appears both with and (more frequently) without an article in the LXX;¹¹⁰ thus, it is more probable that the expression is a Septuagintism. The quotation refers to the regulations in Exodus 13 pertaining to firstborn sons, who have to be consecrated to the Lord in honor of the firstborns' lives being spared during the Passover in Egypt. Luke's quotation seems to be a conflation of Exodus 13:2, 13:12 and 13:15. Because the wording of the quotation does not correspond exactly to either of the LXX verses, Holtz classifies the quotation as originating in the tradition, and argues that it does not indicate the Third Gospel author's knowledge of the LXX text.¹¹¹ Of the same opinion is Bock, who treats this quotation as a conflated one, originating in the early tradition.¹¹² However, since the quotation is preceded by the introductory formula, it is clear that Luke was intending to quote explicitly from scripture.¹¹³ The quotation specifically speaks of a firstborn that is holy to the Lord; we can thus assume that the reference is to Exodus 13:2:

קִדְּשִׁי לִי כָּל־בְּכוֹר פֶּטֶר כָּל־רֶחֶם בְּבִנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאָדָם וּבַבְּהֵמָה לִי הוּא
(MT)

ἀγίασόν μοι πᾶν πρωτότοκον πρωτογενές διανοῖγον πᾶσαν μήτραν ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους ἐμοί ἐστιν

Consecrate to me every firstborn, firstproduced, opening every womb among the sons of Israel, from human being to animal. It's mine!¹¹⁴

Or:

καὶ ἀφελεῖς πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν τὰ ἀρσενικά τῷ κυρίῳ πᾶν διανοῖγον μήτραν ἐκ τῶν βουκολίων ἢ ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσίν σου ὅσα ἐὰν γένηταί σοι τὰ ἀρσενικά ἀγιάσεις τῷ κυρίῳ

You shall also set apart everything opening the womb, the males, for the Lord. Everything opening the womb from the herds or among your animals, whatever belongs to you, you shall consecrate the males to the Lord.¹¹⁵

¹⁰⁹ See Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 437; Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 74.

¹¹⁰ So, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου 2 Chr 31:3; 1 Esd 1:31; Ps 1:2; ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου 4 Kgdms 10:31; 1 Chr 16:40; 2 Chr 35:26; Sir 46:14; Ps 118:1.

¹¹¹ Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 82–83.

¹¹² Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 83.

¹¹³ David New, who has a very strict definition of quotations, believes that, despite the introductory formula, this is not a quotation, as it does not correspond exactly to any OT text: *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Two-Document Hypothesis*, SCS 37 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993), 90.

¹¹⁴ Exod 13:2 (NETS).

¹¹⁵ Exod 13:12 (NETS).

In Luke’s quotation, the main difference is that πᾶν is connected with ἄρσεν, instead of the διανοῖγον of Exodus 13:12 or πρωτότοκον of Exodus 13:2. Even though the quotation is not exact, there are some arguments that it is based on the LXX of Exodus 13:2. First, the expression πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοῖγον μήτραν is rather peculiar, and should be considered a Septuagintism. Both LXX Exodus 13:2 and 13:12 have διανοῖγον μήτραν. רִצְפָּה,¹¹⁶ ‘anything coming first’, is translated in the LXX with neuter διανοῖγον. Even if Luke favors the verb διανοίγω (which he uses seven times elsewhere, three times with the meaning ‘to open’), διανοίγω in connection with μήτρα ‘womb’ is typical of the LXX,¹¹⁷ so it is an obvious argument for his dependence on the LXX.¹¹⁸ Moreover, the word μήτρα for ‘womb’ appears only here in Luke, who elsewhere consistently chooses κοιλία (also in the infancy narrative), so this use must be Septuagintal.¹¹⁹ Exodus 13:2 refers to the firstborn being holy to the Lord. In the MT, b^ekôr is used with reference to the eldest son;¹²⁰ Luke knew this, as he added the specification that the child is a male ἄρσεν, a neuter singular, as opposed to the neuter plural ἄρσενικά in the LXX of Exodus 13:2. The extra specification reflects Luke’s profound knowledge of scripture, and the Pentateuch in particular. The main argument against the quotation originating from the LXX of Exodus 13:2 could be that the Lucan quotation lacks πρωτότοκος; this could indicate that the quotation is traditional.¹²¹ However, Luke does use the term πρωτότοκος, albeit only once, in chapter 2:7.¹²² Thus, the omission could be intentional; perhaps because Luke was focusing on the child’s dedication to the Lord, the fact that the child was a firstborn was less relevant. Further, in Exodus 13:12, there is no reference to the firstborn, so if Luke was quoting this verse, he had no reason to use πρωτότοκος.

The other element present in Luke’s quotation, but found neither in the LXX nor in Exodus 13:2 or 13:12, is the verb κληθήσεται in ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται,¹²³ which is redactional. In Exodus 13:12, there is ἀγιάσεις τῷ κυρίῳ, which is probably the origin of the Lucan ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ. Luke frequently uses καλέω, particularly

¹¹⁶ Exod 13:2, 12.

¹¹⁷ Except in Exod 13:2, 12, 15; and Gen 29:31; 30:22; Exod 34:19.

¹¹⁸ Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 81–82. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 83, considers the expression ‘a technical idiom’; however, it does not appear outside the LXX.

¹¹⁹ Luke 1:15; 1:41–42, 44; 2:21.

¹²⁰ Gen 10:15; Exod 6:14.

¹²¹ Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 307n117.

¹²² As in Heb 1:6 and Col 1:15; Litke, ‘Luke’s Knowledge of the Septuagint’, 227.

¹²³ Luke 2:23.

in prophecies about Jesus and John.¹²⁴ The use of καλέω in connection with ἅγιος echoes the messenger angel's words to Mary:

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ· πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ
καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς
θεοῦ.¹²⁵

The child is twice called ἅγιος, and is dedicated to God. The use of Exodus 13 in underlining the importance of Jesus being wholly dedicated to the Lord is again an echo of Jewish tradition: such an exegesis of Exodus 13 in connection with total dedication to God can be found, for example, in Philo.¹²⁶ Therefore, the choice of καλέω is intentional, and indicates the amount of Lucan redactional activity.

Summing it up, it seems that Luke abridged the quotation of Exodus 13:12, probably also making a mental connection with Exodus 13:2.

7. Luke 2:24

In v. 24, Luke completes the description of the rite of purification he began in v. 22. This quotation also has a problematic origin, but is frequently believed to be drawn from Leviticus 12:8.¹²⁷ Verse 24 explains the complete dedication of Jesus and his activity to God, as further developed in the *Nunc Dimittis*, Luke 2:29–32:

καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου, ζευγὸς τρυγόνων
ἢ δύο νοσοῦς περιστερῶν.¹²⁸

Here, Luke is returning to the laws of purification drawn from Leviticus, as mentioned above. Following the period of blood purification after birth, the mother has to offer a lamb for the burnt offering, and a pigeon or turtledove for the sin offering.¹²⁹ If she cannot afford a lamb, she shall use two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for the burnt offering and the other for the sin offering. The fact that Mary offers only the pigeons in this verse is probably mentioned because Luke is always concerned with poverty and, in general, with socio-economic matters.

The quotation is again prefaced by an introductory formula, with a slight variation compared to the previous verse: instead of καθὼς γέγραπται (v. 23), we find

¹²⁴ Luke 1:13, 31, 32, 35, 60, 76.

¹²⁵ Luke 1:35.

¹²⁶ *Sacr.* 97; *Spec.* 1.248.

¹²⁷ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 437. See also Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, 426; Litke, 'Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint', 229.

¹²⁸ Luke 2:24.

¹²⁹ Lev 12:6.

‘according to what is stated in the Law of the Lord’, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου. The expression τὸ εἰρημένον, which introduces a quotation, also appears in Acts 2:16 and 13:40; thus, the author’s intention of quoting from the OT is evident. The quotation, as it seems from the context of the purification after birth depicted in the Gospel, should be from Leviticus 12:8:

δύο τρυγόνας ἢ δύο νεοσσούς περιστερῶν μίαν εἰς ὄλοκαύτωμα καὶ μίαν περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὐτῆς ὁ ἱερεὺς, καὶ καθαρισθήσεται.

The only difference, apart from the slight variation of νεοσσούς as νοσσούς,¹³⁰ is the Lucan use of ζευγος, ‘a pair’, instead of δύο with the genitive τρυγόνων (the LXX of Leviticus has δύο τρυγόνας). MT Leviticus 12:8 clearly states וְשֵׁנִי אִוּ תְּרִים אִוּ בְּנֵי יוֹנָה – in both cases, ‘two’ – and there are no known variants that could justify the use of ζευγος in the LXX of Leviticus 12:8. This leads Holtz to conclude that Luke did consult the LXX directly, but drew the quotation from another source.¹³¹

The word ζευγος is rather rare; it specifically means a yoked pair of oxen or donkeys – ζευγος ὄνων,¹³² ζεύγη βοῶν¹³³ – and usually translates מְזֻג (‘yoke, pair’). Its use as a translation of שְׁנַיִם, ‘two’, appears exclusively in LXX Leviticus 5:11:

ἐὰν δὲ μὴ εὐρίσκη αὐτοῦ ἡ χεὶρ ζευγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νεοσσούς περιστερῶν καὶ οἴσει τὸ δῶρον αὐτοῦ περὶ οὗ ἥμαρτεν τὸ δέκατον τοῦ οἴφι σεμίδαλιν περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἐπιχεῖ ἐπ’ αὐτὸ ἔλαιον οὐδὲ ἐπιθήσει ἐπ’ αὐτὸ λίβανον ὅτι περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἐστίν

וְאִם-לֹא תִשֶׂי יָדוֹ לְשֵׁנִי תְּרִים אִוּ לְשֵׁנִי בְּנֵי-יוֹנָה וְהִבִּיא אֶת-קֶרְבָּנוֹ שָׂרָר אֶת-עֲשִׂירֹת הָאֶפֶס סֶלַת לְחֻטָּאת לֹא-יִשִׂים עָלֶיהָ שֶׁמֶן וְלֹא-יִתֵּן עָלֶיהָ לְבָנָה כִּי חֻטָּאת הִיא

Since the Hebrew expression ‘two turtle doves or two young pigeons’ in Leviticus 5:11 is identical to that in Leviticus 12:8 (וְשֵׁנִי בְּנֵי-יוֹנָה אִוּ לְשֵׁנִי תְּרִים אִוּ), and the translation of ‘two’ in ζευγος τρυγόνων ἢ δύο νεοσσούς περιστερῶν is not common – it appears only in the LXX of Leviticus 5:11 – Luke must have drawn it from the LXX. There is indeed the possibility that Luke, when quoting Leviticus 12:8, made a connection with the passage on the sin offering in Leviticus 5:11, where the word ζευγος appears. Otherwise, he may have intended to quote Leviticus 5:11, not 12:8, even if the context of Leviticus 5:11 seems less apt: the passage in Leviticus 5:11 is concerned with the sin offering in general, while Leviticus 12:8 specifically concerns the purification of the woman after giving birth. However, if Luke intended to explain that the purification from sin applied to both Mary and to Joseph, as the

¹³⁰ In the LXX νεοσσός is used for a young dove (Lev 5:7, 11; 12:6, 8; 14:22); see *LEH*, 415. Meanwhile, Luke uses the syncopated form, more widespread in Hellenistic Greek.

¹³¹ Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*, 83.

¹³² 2 Sam 16:1.

¹³³ As in Luke 14:19.

pronoun in αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν in Luke 2:22 might suggest, he could have been referring to Leviticus 5:11. Perhaps Luke wanted to emphasize Joseph's participation in the purification.¹³⁴

The best explanation of all, in this case, may be that Luke was quoting the passage from memory, thus conflating two different quotations. This would confirm that the quotation is not traditional, revealing his real knowledge of the LXX Pentateuch. It is possible that Luke quoted the Pentateuch by heart, as he knew the text well and felt little urge to check the quotation (especially as his quotations from the Pentateuch are always short). As François Bovon states about not checking the texts one knows well, 'the verbatim quotations often come from books that the author knew less, and to which he must refer to the text in order to verify it'.¹³⁵ Luke must have been less inclined to check the Pentateuch quotations, but he also knew other traditions diverging from the LXX text.

8. Conclusions

Unlike the quotations from Isaiah and the Psalms, which are better suited for theological purposes, the quotations from the Pentateuch in the Third Gospel are found in contexts where they serve to underline the importance and continuity of OT law in the life and ministry of Jesus and his family; so they appear especially in the infancy narrative. Frequently highlighting the fulfilment of the νόμος κυρίου was very important to Luke.

Luke assumes that his readers are competent in scripture, which accounts for the frequency of his allusions, loose quotations and scriptural echoes. The most important aspect of the Lucan use of the Pentateuch is that, as in Jewish exegetical tradition, Luke's use of the text of scripture is rather free: he sometimes conflates different quotations, and sometimes doesn't hesitate to modify the text to conform to his exigencies, or to reflect the actual conditions in which scripture was being used in his day and in the context he knew.¹³⁶ Luke also seems conscious of the original context of each quotation, and even when using Mark or Q as a source, he is often not satisfied with the form of the text he has found in his sources, modifying them according to the other texts and traditions he knew or that were available to him. He appears by no means passive in his reception of scripture, but becomes an interpreter of it. The Lucan use of the Pentateuch can be described as a 'creative reception', such as can be seen in other contemporary Jewish texts.

¹³⁴ Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern*, 83; Jung, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*, 91.

¹³⁵ Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 115.

¹³⁶ On the use of scripture in Qumran, see Corrado Martone's article, this volume.

The quotations from the Pentateuch in Luke are short and loose but, because of some specific Septuagintal expressions, it is possible to trace their origin back to the LXX. Contrary to Holtz's opinion, we think that Luke not only knew the LXX of the Pentateuch, but also demonstrates a rather profound knowledge of this material. So why does he not strictly follow the LXX text? Textual deviations from the LXX are due both to Luke's adjusting the text based on the traditions he preferred, and to his tendency to quote from memory. Luke probably knew the Pentateuch better than other books, and did not feel compelled to check the text. Did he use other traditions, such as Testimonia? Though the question is too broad to be pursued here,¹³⁷ it is certain that some quotations display knowledge of traditions that go beyond the biblical text. Luke certainly does not limit himself to quoting from the OT, but he draws from traditions known to other Jewish authors too: he was clearly aware of the Jewish methods of interpretation.

As Bart Koet says of Luke: 'By the manner in which he deals with interpretation of Scripture he reveals not only something about Jesus, the disciples, and the community for which he wrote, but also something about himself'.¹³⁸ His profound knowledge of scripture and of Hellenistic Jewish exegetical methods leads us to the suspicion that the author of the Third Gospel actually hailed from a Jewish milieu.¹³⁹ Luke not only reveals his own scriptural competence here and there, but also takes his audience's deep knowledge of scripture for granted. As Robert Maddox has noted, if Luke's audience was not competent in scripture, many of his scriptural allusions would have been missed.¹⁴⁰ This also leads us to infer that his audience was hardly Gentile, but Jewish or at least a mixed audience, formed of God-fearers and Jews.¹⁴¹

¹³⁷ It is noteworthy that one of the criteria that may indicate the use of a collection of testimonies is, for example, a lack of awareness of the original context of the quotation; however, Luke is usually aware of this. The use of composite quotations may also be due to the use of testimonies, but, as mentioned above, it may also derive from quoting the text by heart.

¹³⁸ *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, 159–60.

¹³⁹ Luke certainly knew the Jewish exegetical *middah Gezerah Shawah*, as can be seen, e.g., in Luke 4:18–19 or Acts 13:22: see Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*, 98; Jan W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954), 172; Bovon, *Luke the Theologian*, 115, 117, 120. It is not possible to elaborate on the topic here, but Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*, demonstrates that, in Luke's Gospel, various first-century Jewish exegetical techniques are used in the discourses of Jesus, including formulas, patterns and terminology.

¹⁴⁰ *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*, ed. John Riches (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 14.

¹⁴¹ See Philip Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivation of Lucan Theology*, SNTSMS 57 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 32. On the opinion that Luke was a Jewish priest, see Rick Strelan, *Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel* (Aldershot, UK/

Bibliography

- Albl, Martin C. *'And Scripture Cannot be Broken': The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*, NovTSup 96. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Albright, William F. 'A Biblical Fragment from the Maccabean Age: The Nash Papyrus'. *JBL* 56 (1937): 145–76.
- Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 'Luke/Acts'. Pages 231–44 in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars, SSF*. Edited by D.A. Carson and H.G.M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Baumgarten, Joseph M. 'Purification after Childbirth and the Sacred Garden in 4Q265 and Jubilees'. Pages 3–10 in *New Qumran Texts and Studies: Proceedings of the First Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Paris, 1992*. Edited by George J. Brooke and Florentino García Martínez. STDJ 15. Leiden: Brill 1994.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts with an Appendix on the Son of Man by Geza Vermes*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. JSNT-Sup 12. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Bovon, François. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*. Vol. 1 of *Luke*. Edited by Helmut Koester. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002. Translation of *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 4 vols. EKKNT 3. Zürich: Benziger/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchen, 1989–2009.
- _____. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)*. 2nd rev. ed. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Brown, Raymond. *The Birth of the Messiah*. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1977.
- _____. 'The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22–40)'. *Worship* 51 (1977): 2–11.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. Rev. ed. London: SPCK, 1958.
- Carroll, John T. 'The Uses of Scripture in Acts'. Pages 512–28 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers*. Edited by David J. Lull. SBLSP 29. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Cerfaux, Lucien. 'Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre of Acts'. Pages 43–53 in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Edited by Philippe H. Menoud and Oscar Cullmann. Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. New York: Harper, 1961. Translation of *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. BHT 17. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954.
- Denaux, Adelbert and Rita Corstjens. *The Vocabulary of Luke: An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke's Gospel*. BTS 10. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.

Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2008); see also Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).

- Dodd, Charles H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet, 1952.
- Doeve, Jan W. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.
- Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976.
- Eslser, Philip F. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivation of Lucan Theology*. SNTSMS 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Evans, Christopher F. 'The Central Section of St Luke's Gospel'. Pages 37–54 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.
- _____. 'Goulder and the Gospels'. *Theology* 82 (1979): 425–32.
- Evans, Craig A. 'Luke 16:1–18 and the Deuteronomy Hypothesis'. Pages 121–39 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Farris, Stephen. *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance*. JSNTSup 9. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Yale Bible Commentaries. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- _____. 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in the Qumran Literature and in the New Testament'. *NTS* 7 (1961): 297–333.
- _____. 'The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts'. Pages 524–38 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1992 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. SBLSP 31. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Flusser, David. 'The Ten Commandments and the New Testament'. Pages 219–26 in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition*. Edited by Ben-Zion Segal and Gershon Levi. Sidrat sefarim le-ḥeḳer ha-Miḳra mi-yisudo shel S. Sh. Peri. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990.
- Goulder, Michael D. *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1978.
- _____. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.
- Greenspoon, Leonard J. 'Textual and Translation Issues in Greek Exodus'. Pages 322–48 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception and Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans and Joel N. Lohr. VTSup 164, FIOTL 7. Leiden: Brill 2014.
- Haenchen, Ernst. 'Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte'. *ZTK* 51 (1954): 153–67.
- Harris, J. Rendel. *Testimonies*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916–1920.
- Himbaza, Innocent. 'Le Décalogue de Papyrus Nash, Philon, 4QPhyl G; 8QPhyl 3, et 4Qmez A'. *RevQ* 20 (2002): 411–28.
- Holladay, Carl R. 'Luke's Use of the LXX in Acts: A Review of the Debate and a Look at Acts 1:15–26'. Pages 233–300 in *Die Septuaginta und das frühe Christentum – The Septuagint and Christian Origins*. Edited by Thomas Scott Caulley and Hermann Lichtenberger. WUNT 277. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

- Holtz, Traugott. *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. TUGAL 5, Reihe 49-51. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis, IN: Augsburg Publishing, 1972.
- Jung, Chang-Wook. *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative*. JTSNTSup 267. London: T&T Clark, 2004.
- Kellerman, Ulrich. 'Der Dekalog in den Schriften des Frühjudentums: Ein Überblick'. Pages 147-226 in *Weisheit, Ethos und Gebot: Weisheits- und Dekalogtraditionen in der Bibel und im frühen Judentum*. Edited by Henning Graf Reventlow. Biblisch-Theologische Studien 43. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2001.
- Kilpatrick, George D. 'Some Quotations in Acts'. Pages 81-97 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by Jacob Kremer. BETL 48. Gembloux: J. Ducolot/Leuven: Leuven University, 1979.
- Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. JSNTSup 94. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Kloppenborg, John S. and Joseph Verheyden, eds. *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke*. LNTS 493. London and New York: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Koet, Bart J. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. SNTA 14. Leuven: Leuven University Press/Uitgeverij Peeters, 1989.
- Litke, Wayne D. 'Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint: A Study of Citations in Luke-Acts'. Ph.D. diss., McMaster University, 1993.
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. JSNTSup 282. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Lowther Clarke, William K. 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts'. Vol. 2 pages 66-105 in *The Beginning of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. 1920-1933. Repr., Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1965-1966.
- Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
- Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Edited by John Riches. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC 3. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Metzger, Bruce M. 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah'. *JBL* 70 (1951): 297-307.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 3. New York: Doubleday, 1991.
- Moessner, David P. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

- New, David D. *Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels and the Two-Document Hypothesis*. SCS 37. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993.
- Pao, David W. and Eckhard J. Schnabel. 'Luke'. Pages 251–414 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by Gregory K. Beale and Donald A. Carson. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic/Nottingham: Apollos, 2007.
- Porter, Stanley. 'Composite Citations in Luke-Acts'. Pages 62–94 in *Composite Citations in Antiquity: Volume 2, New Testament Uses*. Edited by Sean A. Adams and Seth M. Ehorn. LNTS 593. London and New York: T&T Clark, 2018.
- Powery, Emerson B. *Jesus Reads Scripture: The Function of Jesus' Use of Scripture in the Synoptic Gospels*. BibInt 63. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Prigent, Pierre, *Les testimonia dans le christianisme primitif: L'Épître de Barnabé I–XVI et ses sources*. EBib. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1961.
- Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. SNT 1. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1969.
- _____. 'Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte'. Pages 61–79 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by Jacob Kremer. BETL 48. Gembloux: J. Ducolot/Leuven: Leuven University, 1979.
- Ringgren, Helmer. 'Luke's Use of the Old Testament'. *HTR* 79 (1986): 227–35.
- Rusam, Dietrich. *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas*. BZNW 112. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.
- Schearing, Linda S. 'Double Time ... Double Trouble? Gender, Sin, and Leviticus 12'. Pages 429–500 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert A. Kugler. VTSup 93. FIO TL 3. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Schubert, Paul. 'The Structure and Significance of Luke 24'. Pages 165–86 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem 70. Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*. Edited by Walther Eltester. ZNW 21. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1954.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. 'From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church'. Pages 207–19 in *The New Testament and Christian-Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser*. Edited by Malcolm Lowe. Jerusalem: Ecumenical Theological Research Fraternity in Israel, 1992.
- Sparks, H.F.D. 'The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel'. *JTS* 44 (1943): 129–38.
- Steyn, Gert J. 'Intertextual Similarities between Septuagint Pretexts and Luke's Gospel'. *Neot* 24 (1990): 229–46.
- _____. *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum*. CBET 12. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995.
- Strelan, Rick. *Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel*. Aldershot, UK/Burlington, VT: Ashgate: 2008.
- Thiessen, Matthew. 'Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity'. *NovT* 54 (2012): 16–29.
- Thomas, Kenneth J. 'Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics'. *NTS* 22 (1976): 205–14.
- _____. 'Torah Citations in the Synoptics'. *NTS* 24 (1977): 85–96.

- Torrey, Charles C. *The Composition and Date of Acts*. HTS 1. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1916.
- Tov, Emmanuel. 'The Papyrus Nash and the Septuagint'. Pages 33–50 in *A Necessary Task: Essays on Textual Criticism of the Old Testament in Memory of Stephen Pisano*. Edited by Dionisio Candido and Leonardo Pessoa da Silva Pinto. AnBib 14. Rome: G&B Press, 2020.
- Ubigli, Liliana Rosso. 'Alcuni aspetti della concezione della "porneia" nel tardo giudaismo'. *Hen* 1 (1979): 201–45.
- VanderKam, James C. *The Book of Jubilees: A Critical Text*. 2 vols. CSCO 510-511, *Scriptores Aethiopici* 87-88. Louvain: Peeters, 1989.
- Wevers, John W., ed. *Leviticus*. Vol. 2.2 of *Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
- _____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SCS 30. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Wilcox, Max E. 'The Old Testament in Acts 1–15'. *ABR* 5 (1956): 1–42.
- _____. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.
- Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Law*. SNTSMS 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.