

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. *De Septuaginta Investigationes* 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Katja Kujanpää

katja.kujanpaa@helsinki.fi

Adjusted to the Argument:

Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations

1. Introduction

With his numerous direct quotations,¹ Paul is an early witness to the text of the Septuagint. His testimony, however, always needs to be carefully scrutinized before it can be of any text-critical use, for he frequently alters the wording of his scriptural quotations.² That the majority of Paul’s quotations derive from the Septuagint, not from a Hebrew or an Aramaic text, for example, is a matter of scholarly consensus.³ However, the textual plurality of the first century is reflected in some quotations, and it appears that in certain cases Paul reproduced a Greek text that had already

¹ This article concentrates on “direct” or “explicit” quotations. A scriptural reference is defined as a quotation if it has 1) an introduction formula, or 2) an established formula used for textual interpretation (cf. Rom 10:6: “that is”), or 3) a clear syntactical or stylistic tension with the surrounding text (such as an abrupt change of personal pronouns), or 4) significant verbal correspondence with a certain scriptural passage. The last criterion is disputed among scholars and open to various interpretations. More important than having a certain amount of words quoted in a row is the frequency of words and forms. However, all of the examples used in this article fulfil the first criterion.

² Estimations of the frequency of the alterations depend on the definition of a quotation and on the criteria that scholars use to establish the wording that served as the basis for the changes. For well-informed calculations, see D.-A. Koch, *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1986), 186; C.D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture. Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 348–9.

³ A seminal study for establishing this was A.F. Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti Locis a Paulo Apostolo Allegatis* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2010 [reprint, original 1869]). For more recent investigations, see Koch, *Schrift*, 48–88; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 37–51.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. *De Septuaginta Investigationes* 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

been revised in order to bring it closer to a Hebrew text.⁴ Therefore, studying Paul’s quotation practice not only results in a deeper understanding of his argumentation, but it can also shed light on the transmission of the Septuagint in the first century CE. The significance of his quotations is found not so much in tracing the *Urtext* of the Septuagint, but in reconstructing secondary readings that were circulating in Paul’s time.

Contrary to scribes, translators, and editors, Paul does not transmit complete literary works. Instead, he is an author who uses short extracts of sacred writings in new compositions, interweaving direct quotations with his own discourse. Consequently, Paul’s reasons for modifying the wording of scriptural texts tend to be somewhat different from those of scribes, for in Paul’s letters the context of the scriptural passage has radically changed. Since this change of context creates tensions, in numerous instances Paul modifies the wording of the quotation to make it accord better with the surrounding argumentation. However, if it were possible to “peel off” all Pauline alterations and reconstruct the reading that served as the basis for these alterations, one would gain access to Greek readings that were circulating in the middle of the first century CE. While such an endeavour may at first sound like a wild goose chase because of the textual plurality at that time, the situation is perhaps not that hopeless.

Yet in this article, I will not undertake the task of reconstructing the *Vorlage* of Paul’s quotations, but concentrate instead on a step that should precede all such reconstructions. The aim of distinguishing Paul’s alterations from pre-Pauline variant readings requires an analysis of Paul’s authorial intention when he quotes scriptures.⁵ I will demonstrate how it is often possible to connect deviations from the wording of the Septuagint with certain authorial concerns. It is crucial to examine both Paul’s techniques of altering the wording of quotations and the motives behind the alterations, for this enables one to sketch a profile of Paul as an author quoting scriptures. Familiarity with his quotation practice may then help to also trace the origin of his readings in cases that have major textual problems. For example, when the manuscripts of the Septuagint are divided and the minority reading agrees with Paul, the question arises whether the reading is a pre-Pauline

⁴ See below n. 52.

⁵ Cf. Wilk’s emphasis on authorial intention: F. Wilk, “Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text,” in W. Kraus/R.G. Wooden (ed.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SCS 53; Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 253–271, on pp. 259, 261.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

variant or whether the manuscripts of the Septuagint have been harmonized with Paul’s quotation, the wording of which Paul himself has altered. To decide between these alternatives, one should analyze what Paul’s motives for both quoting and modifying the wording could have been and whether there are parallel cases of similar motives elsewhere in his letters. In other words, it is helpful to know Paul’s “style”.

Tracing Paul’s authorial intentions when he quotes scriptures does not mean that one should attempt to get inside his head. I do not propose a psychological approach, but an argumentative and rhetorical one: it is necessary to examine what functions the quotations perform in the discourse and how they are related to their immediate new context on one hand and the argumentation as a whole on the other.⁶ When Paul’s reading deviates from the reading of the Septuagint (as reconstructed in critical editions), one should approach these deviations with the following questions: Do they make sense in the new context of quotation? Does Paul’s version of the quotation create thematic or verbal links with its surroundings? Does it solve grammatical, lexical or theological problems that may have arisen with the reading of the Septuagint? Does it increase the coherence or the rhetorical effectiveness of the argumentation? In the following, I examine three quotations from Rom 9–11 and demonstrate how deviations from the wording of the Septuagint are related to the new context of the quotations in Romans. The quotations to be analysed exemplify the different techniques that Paul employs to modify the wording of the quotations and how the modifications render the quotations more compatible with the surrounding argumentation. Instead of producing a comprehensive list of all techniques and motives that occur in Paul’s letters, the case studies only function as examples.

Studying Paul’s alterations to the wording of quotations necessitates careful text-critical analysis that encompasses the textual variance in both the Septuagint and the New Testament.⁷ In most

⁶ In my opinion, tracing Paul’s authorial intentions is less problematic than tracing the intentions of an anonymous author of a writing representing a different genre. This is because of the nature of Paul’s writings: the letters are argumentative and intended to persuade the audience, not multi-layered narratives to be interpreted. Moreover, they are letters by a historical author to a certain audience and can be dated with reasonable accuracy. This makes the situation substantially different from trying to reconstruct the intentions of, for example, the author of Esther or its Greek translator.

⁷ It is not possible to offer an extensive discussion of methodology here. For that, see Koch, *Die Schrift*, 11–24; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 31–61; Wilk, “Letters of Paul,” 253–263; R.J. Wagner, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul “In Concert” in the Letter to the Romans* (NTS 101; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 5–8, 16–28; J.D.H. Norton, *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus and the Yahad* (LNTS 430; New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 1–56.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

cases, the textual tradition of New Testament does not pose major problems (either because of the lack of significant variants or because there are convincing arguments for their secondary origin), but there are a handful of quotations on which the witnesses are strongly divided and deciding between the alternatives becomes more difficult.⁸ As for the source text of the quotation, while the critically reconstructed text of the Septuagint and the preserved textual variants of its manuscript tradition offer a good starting point for comparison, the other Greek textual traditions (e.g. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, patristic quotations), the Hebrew variants of Qumran, the Masoretic text, and early translations (before all Old Latin, the Targums, and the Peshitta) should also be included. The possibility that the textual tradition that Paul used suffered extinction, leaving no other witnesses, also has to be considered. When all of the preserved text-critical material on one hand and the function and the context of the quotation on the other are taken into account, it is possible to attribute with reasonable probability certain deviations from the Septuagint to Paul’s own editorial activity.⁹ This is certainly the case with the textual examples in this article; in order to avoid circular reasoning, I have deliberately chosen cases in which already the textual evidence strongly suggests Pauline origin. Analysing Paul’s authorial intention in cases like these is of considerable importance, for the observations may then be extended to quotations the textual profile of which is more obscure. My treatment of the examples is selective in this article, for one quotation may contain several text-critical problems on different levels: although the Pauline origin of certain alterations may be almost beyond doubt, the same quotation may also contain a pre-Pauline variant reading (an approximation towards the Hebrew, for example). In the following, I

⁸ Rom 9:26 is a good example: the reading of NA28 (א A D K L P Ψ 33. 81. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 1506.) follows the Septuagint by reading οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς, whereas the witnesses P⁴⁶ F G ar b d* sy^p read οὗ ἐὰν κληθήσονται. The testimony of P46 is significant, for according to Günther Zuntz, the papyrus contains less adaptations to the Septuagint than numerous other manuscripts: G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953). The syntax of the minority reading does not follow the grammar of classical Greek, for ἐὰν is followed by the future instead of the subjunctive aorist (see the detailed analysis of Wagner, *Heralds*, 84–5 n. 127). In consequence, the origin of the variant is difficult to explain if assumed to be secondary: it is far more probable that Paul’s wording has later been adapted towards the wording of the Septuagint that represents better Greek than that the change has occurred vice versa. The substitution of ἐρρέθη with κληθήσονται accords well with Paul’s overall argument where the verb καλέω is in a key position, occurring in three other places in verses 24–6 alone. As will be argued below, Paul also replaces the verb λέγω with καλέω at the beginning of verse 25. Therefore, there are good arguments to conclude that the minority reading is probably the original one (Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 174; Wagner, *Heralds*, 84).

⁹ Cf. Wilk, “Letters of Paul,” 263–4. Attention to Paul’s authorial intention is also central for the question of “memory lapses”. Koch’s and Stanley’s comprehensive studies on all quotations in undisputed Pauline letters (see n. 2 above) indicate that deviations from the source text should not primarily be explained by Paul quoting from memory and not getting the wording quite right, for often it is obvious that the deviant wording is connected to the way in which Paul uses the quotation; see Koch, *Schrift*, 186–90; Wagner, *Heralds*, 14.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

discuss only changes that are directly related to the theme of this article. Before turning to the case studies, it is useful to briefly discuss the process of recontextualization in light of modern quotation theory, for it illuminates how modifications can be necessitated by the new context of the quotation.

2. From One “Network of Relations” to Another

When Paul presents a quotation from scriptures, the passage he quotes is detached from its immediate literary context and integrated into a new textual entity. In the field of literary criticism, Meir Sternberg has examined what happens to a quotation when it is taken from its original context and inserted into a new one.¹⁰ Sternberg argues that a shift in the meaning of the quotation is *inevitable* in this recontextualization process, for a quotation always belongs to “a network of relations”: the quoted passage has a frame that encloses and regulates it. When the passage is extracted from the framing elements that influence its interpretation and inserted into a new frame with different regulating elements, there is always a change in the meaning of the quotation.¹¹ Sternberg concludes: “However accurate the wording of the quotation and however pure the quoter’s motives, tearing a piece of discourse from its original habitat and reconstructing it within a new network of relations cannot but interfere with its effect.”¹²

The concepts “frame” and “network of relations” are helpful for describing the differences between the old and new literary contexts of a scriptural passage quoted by Paul. For example, a verse in Isaiah is situated in a network of relations that specifies who is speaking to whom, whom the personal pronouns refer to, what the topic is, and how it is related to the broader narrative. Moreover, verbal links may connect the passage with a certain thematic framework. When Paul inserts the verse into his letter, a different network of relations surrounds the quotation, and what made sense in the original context may appear obscure or irrelevant in the new one. In general, Paul takes great care to frame quotations with elements that tie them to the rest of the argumentation. The most important framing element is the introduction formula. Occasionally Paul uses

¹⁰ M. Sternberg, “Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse”, *Poetics Today* 3 (1982) 107–56.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 108, 131, 152.

¹² *Ibid.*, 145.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

established, formulaic expressions (“as it is written”),¹³ but more often he creates a new introduction according to his argumentative needs. Introduction formulae offer the audience additional information by specifying the content, speaker, addressee, or location of the quotation. Most of them feature conjunctions (γάρ, ὡς, καθὼς, δέ) that indicate how the quotation is related to Paul’s own words or other quotations, offering confirmation or indicating a change of topic or speaker, for example. After presenting a quotation, Paul occasionally makes his own summarizations or conclusions about its message (cf. Rom 11:5). The frame of a quotation may also contain so-called catchwords, expressions that have a pivotal role in the argumentation and connect passages with each other.¹⁴ These verbal links that tie the quotation to nearby sentences strengthen the cohesion of the argumentation. However, in numerous cases Paul does not limit his activity to creating an appropriate frame for the quotation, but he also changes something in its wording to make it more compatible with his argumentation. This may be due to an obvious discrepancy between the quotation and its new context. For example, as will be illustrated below, the personal pronouns in the quotation are sometimes incompatible with its surroundings. In other cases it appears that a change in the wording would not have been absolutely necessary, but it enhances the rhetorical effect of the quotation, making it appear more relevant. In the following, I include examples of both situations.

3. Adjusted to the Argument: Textual Examples

3.1 Coherence by Catchwords

It is characteristic of Paul to enhance the consistency of his argumentation by using catchwords. In Rom 9:6–29, the verb “to call” (καλέω) functions as a catchword that ties different parts of the argumentation together; it is found in Rom 9:7, 12, 24, 25–6. This last occurrence is a combined

¹³ Paul uses the expression “as it is written” (καθὼς γέγραπται) 18 times in his undisputed letters. In non-Jewish literature the expression is rare, whereas in Jewish it is in common use (cf. 2 Kings 14:6). In Qumran, the equivalent phrase כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב is used (Koch, *Schrift*, 25, 29).

¹⁴ Using catchword connections is sometimes presented as a typical rabbinic method: see, for example, E.E. Ellis, *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (WUNT 18; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978), 214–216; W.R. Stegner, “Romans 9:6–29—a Midrash”, *JSNT* 22 (1984) 37–52, on p. 40; R. Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006), 571. However, the phenomenon is also well-attested in non-Jewish literature: see J.S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress 1987), 48, 268, 282. For catchwords in general, see S.J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma: Polebridge 1993), 99–102.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

quotation from Hos 2:23 and 1:10b. At the beginning of the book of Hosea, God orders the prophet to give symbolic names to his children: the daughter is to be called “No Mercy” (Οὐκ-ἠλεημένη) and the younger son “Not My People” (Οὐ-λαός-μου). Although these names refer to Israel’s rejection, that is only temporary, for Hos 2:23 is a promise of the future reversal of Israel’s fate: “And I will have mercy on ‘No Mercy’ and I will say to ‘Not My People’: ‘You are my people.’” Paul quotes this verse and combines it with Hos 1:10, but his wording deviates from the Septuagint:

Figure 1. Rom 9:25/Hos 2:23

Rom 9:24: Οὐς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς οὐ μόνον ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐθνῶν,

Rom 9:25 (NA28)	Hos 2:23 (LXX Göttingen) ¹⁵
καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην.	καὶ ἐλέησω τὴν Οὐκ-ἠλεημένην ¹⁶ καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ-λαῶ-μου Λαός μου εἶ σύ

Rom 9:26 (NA28): καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς· οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς,

ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος (Hos 1:10b).¹⁷

¹⁵ The footnotes do not reproduce the apparatus of the Göttingen edition, but contain only variants that will be discussed in the main text or that are otherwise relevant for the matters at hand.

¹⁶ B V 407 Co Cyr.^p Hil stand for the reading ἀγαπήσω τὴν Οὐκ-ἠγαπημένην, and 239 and Aeth combine the two readings. This is a fine example of a textual problem that raises the question whether the reading is a pre-Pauline textual variant or whether it results from a harmonization of the Septuagint manuscripts with Romans. The case demonstrates how important it is to analyse the relationship between the quoted passage and its context, both original and subsequent. Many commentators have suggested that the verb ἐλέω would have fitted Paul’s argument better than ἀγαπάω, for ἐλέω is repeated five times in Rom 9:15–23, whereas ἀγαπάω occurs only in the quotation from Malachi in Rom. 9:13: “Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated.” However, it is perfectly conceivable that Paul wished to create a verbal connection with Rom 9:13, for the connection implies that a reversal of divine exclusion is possible: God’s call can make the once “Not Beloved” or hated into “Beloved”. Paul’s authorial intention can thus be reconstructed in different ways to support either alternative. As for the context of the verse in the Septuagint, Hos 1–2 refers to the symbolic naming of Hosea’s children several times. However, only some of the witnesses reading ἠγαπημένην in Hos 2:23 (V 407 and certain Coptic versions) consistently also read ἠγαπημένην when the name of the daughter occurs in Hos 1:6, 8 and 2:1. Yet in verses Hos 1:7 and 2:4 these witnesses use ἐλέω to render the finite verb (Wagner, *Heralds*, 81–2 n. 120). By doing so, they break the verbal correspondence between divine action (to have mercy) and the symbolic name of Hosea’s daughter (No Mercy), thus ruining the word play. It is difficult to imagine how and why a reading such as this would have originated if it were pre-Pauline. Therefore, the variation of the name in B was probably caused by unsystematic harmonization with the New Testament. The scribes corrected the name in 2:23, but left it intact in other places, whereas the scribes behind the text of V and 407 were more consistent.

¹⁷ For the minority reading of the verse, see n. 8.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. *De Septuaginta Investigationes* 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

The Septuagint has the parallel clauses “I will have mercy on ‘No Mercy’” and “I will say to ‘Not My People’: ‘You are my people’”, whereas in Romans “No Mercy” and “Not My People” are both subordinate to the verb *καλέσω*. In consequence, the direct address (“You are my people”) is changed to indirect (“I will call ‘Not My People’ ‘My People’”). There is no support for this syntactical pattern in the textual tradition of the Septuagint or in other versions. The probability of the alteration being Paul’s is increased by the observation that he has a clear motivation for preferring *καλέω* and substituting the original verbs with it. First, in the preceding verse, Paul has stated that God “has called us” from among the Jews and Gentiles. The repetition of the same verb increases the relevance of the quotation, as it seems to confirm exactly what he has just argued. Second, the verb joins – together with the phrase “my people” – the two halves of the combined quotation.¹⁸ On the contrary, it is highly improbable that the reading of Romans represents a pre-Pauline variant reading, for in the immediate literary context of the verse in Hosea there appears to be no incentive that could have inspired a pre-Pauline scribe to alter the syntax and replace the verbs. It is reasonable to conclude that Paul rewrites the syntax and substitutes the original verbs with *καλέω* in order to produce an additional catchword connection that makes his argumentation more consistent and creates the impression that the combined quotation seamlessly supports his statement in 9:24. However, despite this extensive rewriting of the syntax of the verse, its contents and message about the reversal of status remain essentially the same.¹⁹ Nothing in the contents of the quotation necessitates modification, but it is the way of expression and place of emphasis Paul adjusts.

3.2 Prioritizing Relevant Elements

In addition to the syntactical and lexical changes in Rom 9:25, the order of the names of Hosea’s children is also reversed in Romans so that “Not My People” comes first. As was the case with the modifications already discussed, there is no textual support for such a reversal in the Septuagint or in other versions. Again the immediate literary context of the quotation in Romans offers a clue why Paul would have changed the order of the names: in verse 9:24 he affirms that the called ones also

¹⁸ Koch, *Schrift*, 105, 167; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 110; B. Fuß, „Dies ist die Zeit, von der geschrieben ist...“. *Die expliziten Zitate aus dem Buch Hosea in den Handschriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament* (NTAbh 37; Münster: Aschendorff, 2000), 182.

¹⁹ Cf. Stanley’s remark that “the extent to which the wording of a passage has undergone modification is no sure sign of how far Paul has deviated from the ‘original sense’ in his application/interpretation of a given biblical verse” (Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 111).

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

come from amongst Gentiles, and the reversal of the status of “Not My People” into “My People” in the quotation appears to correspond to this calling of Gentiles. Since “Not My People” is connected with the statement that immediately precedes the quotation, it is a more significant item in the quotation than the other name.²⁰ Accordingly, Paul switches the order to advance the more relevant expression.

The probability that the modification is intentional is increased by the observation that Paul makes similar moves elsewhere; he also switches the place of parallel elements in a quotation in Rom 10:20 and 11:3.²¹ In Rom 11:3 he quotes 3 Kgdms 19:10, where Elijah is speaking to the Lord just before the theophany on Horeb. The passage does not belong to the so-called *kaige* sections of Kingdoms that were revised to achieve closer correspondence with the Hebrew text.²²

Figure 2. Rom 11:3/3 Kgdms 19:10²³

Rom 11:3	3 Kgdms 19:10 ²⁴
<p>κύριε, <u>τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν,</u> <u>τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν,</u></p> <p>κἀγὼ ὑπελείφθην <u>μόνος</u> <u>καὶ ζητοῦσιν τὴν ψυχὴν μου.</u></p>	<p><u>τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν</u> <u>καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας σου ἀπέκτειναν</u>²⁵ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ,²⁶ καὶ ὑπολέλειμμαι²⁷ ἐγὼ <u>μονώτατος,</u> <u>καὶ ζητοῦσι τὴν ψυχὴν μου</u> λαβεῖν αὐτήν²⁸.</p>

²⁰ Koch, *Schrift*, 105; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 110.

²¹ On Rom 10:20, see F. Wilk, *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* (FRLANT 179; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 35–6; Wagner, *Heralds*, 211.

²² The *kaige* sections defined by Thackeray are 2 Kgdms 11:2–3 Kgdms 2:11 and 3 Kdms 22:1–4 Kdms 25:30 (H.St.J. Thackeray, “The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings”, *JTS* 8 [1907] 262–78, on p. 263).

²³ Note the variation between 19:10 and the almost identical verse 19:14: *σε/τὴν διαθήκην σου* and *κατέσκαψαν/καθεῖλαν*. The verb reveals that Paul is quoting 19:10.

²⁴ The text is that of Rahlfs with noteworthy variant readings cited in the footnotes. The readings are taken from the critical apparatus of the forthcoming Göttingen edition of 3–4 Kgdms by Julio Treballe and Pablo Torijano, reproduced with their permission.

²⁵ Justin and Origen add the vocative *κύριε* and follow Paul’s order of the parallel clauses, but they are in all probability dependent on Paul, cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 148 n. 217. On the phenomenon of patristic authors harmonizing readings of the Old and the New Testament, see M. Meiser, “Relevanz der Kirchenväterzitate für die Textgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Zitate aus der Septuaginta,” in M. Karrer et al. (ed.), *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen* (ANTF 43 Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010) 283–316.

²⁶ The words *ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ* are omitted only in Priscilian’s quotation, probably due to the influence of Romans.

²⁷ *L* (the Lucianic manuscripts 19-82-93-108-127) reads here *ὑπελείφθην*.

²⁸ The words *λαβεῖν αὐτήν* are omitted in the Sahidic and Ethiopic versions and in a quotation from Justin but in no Greek manuscript. All three are probably dependent on Paul.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

The sins of the people, destroying the altars and killing the prophets, are found in Romans in reversed order. Since the only witnesses supporting this word order are Justin and Origen,²⁹ it can in all probability be ascribed to Paul. The killing of prophets seems to be an idea that can be linked to the experience of some early Christ-followers and has relevance to their identity (cf. 1 Thess 2:15; Matt 10:17–21; 23:29–39; Luke 11:47–51; 13:34–5).³⁰ Paul further enables this connection with his own time by eliminating the expression “by the sword”;³¹ this specification of the manner of killing is unnecessarily concrete and inappropriate in the contemporary situation. In contrast to “killing the prophets”, demolishing the altars of God would probably not have offered similar connections to the situation of Paul and his audience, which is why he reverses the order of the clauses and begins with the more interesting accusation.³²

Prioritizing certain elements in a quotation is not specifically a Pauline technique. There are examples of modifications in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Greek Jewish literature where the position of an important element is advanced in a direct quotation.³³ It is thus a practice that accords with the literary conventions of Paul’s time. Therefore, the parallel cases of switched elements in his letters cannot be used as an argument for the Pauline origin of an alteration. Instead, what they demonstrate is, first, that the modification *could* be Pauline, for the technique belongs to his toolkit, and second (if other reasons already suggest Pauline origin), that the modification is probably intentional, for it is less plausible that Paul repeatedly remembers clauses in reversed order.

3.3 Adding Clarifications

Romans 11:3 also demonstrates how Paul can compensate for the loss of information caused by the change in the network of relations. In the quotation, an unidentified person is complaining to someone about violent persons who have attacked the addressee’s altars and prophets. Paul crafts a lengthy introduction formula that contains exceptionally many elements that guide the interpretation of the quotation: “Or do you not know what the Scripture says in Elijah [narratives], how it appeals to God against Israel” (ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε ἐν Ἡλίας τί λέγει ἡ γραφή, ὡς ἐντυγχάνει τῷ θεῷ κατὰ

²⁹ See above n. 25.

³⁰ Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 149.

³¹ Koch, *Schrift*, 75; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 150.

³² E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1974), 290; Koch, *Schrift*, 74 n. 83, 104.

³³ For examples, see Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 301, 318, 327, 331.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). The core is a typical formulaic introduction, λέγει ἡ γραφή,³⁴ but Paul has tailored its other parts. The introduction begins with a rhetorical question (“Or do you not know”) that anticipates proof or reasoning of some kind. Paul also specifies the location of the quotation: it can be found in the Elijah narratives.³⁵ The rest of the introduction identifies whom the words are directed at and what they concern: they are addressed to God and contain an accusation “against Israel”. By offering these specifications, Paul selectively invokes certain key aspects of the original context that are central for following the heavily abridged dialogue in Rom 11:3–4.³⁶ Yet although the introduction formula supplies all of this information about location, subject matter, and the addressee of the words of the quotation, for the sake of clarity Paul also makes an alteration to the actual wording of the quotation. In Romans, the quotation begins with the vocative κύριε, which has no equivalent in the Septuagint.³⁷ The vocative is in all probability a Pauline clarification intended to help readers follow the dialogue between Elijah and the Lord, for the vocative makes it unambiguous that second-person singular forms (“your prophets”, “your altars”) refer to the Lord. It is much more characteristic of Paul to omit words in a quotation than to add any, but there are several parallel cases of additions like this.³⁸

3.4 Concise Conflated Quotations

Paul not only combines texts from different sources and presents them one after another as one quotation (as is the case in Rom 9:25–26), but he also conflates passages, inserting elements from another scriptural text into a quotation. The source texts become tightly interwoven, so that they usually form one single sentence. Instead of presenting two separate quotations or a single combination, Paul creates a completely new textual entity.

In Rom 11:7–8, Paul is wrestling with the question of God’s faithfulness in a situation where the majority of Israel is mysteriously insensitive and unreceptive towards the gospel. In 11:7 Paul explains that this unreceptiveness is caused by divine hardening: “Israel failed to obtain what it was

³⁴ Paul also uses the expression λέγει ἡ γραφή in Rom 4:3; 9:17; 10:11; 11:2, and Gal. 4:30.

³⁵ Koch 1986, 27 n. 17. Usually Paul mentions the name of the alleged author, not the location of the quotation, but this introduction formula has parallels in Rom 9:25 and 1 Cor 9:9. Cf. also Mark 12:26 and Luke 20:37.

³⁶ In contrast, certain aspects of the narrative in 3 Kgdms 19:10–18 are either irrelevant or even counterproductive for Paul’s purposes: there is no reference in Romans to the anointing of the kings of Syria and Israel or to the killing of the renegades (3 Kgdms 19:15–17).

³⁷ On Justin’s and Origen’s quotations (that contain the vocative), see n. 25 above.

³⁸ See Koch, *Schrift*, 132–9.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

seeking. The elect obtained it, but the rest were hardened (ἐπωρώθησαν).” That the passive form is to be interpreted as *passivum divinum* is made unambiguous in the following catena of two quotations (Rom 11:8–10).³⁹ Together the quotations not only offer scriptural support for Paul’s claim that God himself has hardened part of his people, but they also describe the nature and consequences of this hardening. The latter quotation is from Ps 68:23–24 (69:23–24 MT), but the first one is a conflation. While the bulk of the quotation derives from Deut 29:4 (29:3 MT), the expression καρδίαν εἰδέναι is replaced with πνεῦμα κατανύξεως (“spirit of stupefaction”),⁴⁰ which instead comes from Isa 29:10.

Figure 3. Rom 11:8/Deut 29:4 + Isa 29:10

Rom 11:8 NA28	Deut 29:4 (29:3 MT) (LXX Göttingen)	Isa 29:10 (LXX Göttingen)
<u>ἔδωκεν</u> αὐτοῖς <u>ὁ θεός</u> <u>πνεῦμα κατανύξεως,</u> ὀφθαλμούς τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν <u>καὶ ὅσα</u> τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν, <u>ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας.</u>	καὶ οὐκ <u>ἔδωκεν</u> κύριος <u>ὁ θεός</u> ὑμῖν καρδίαν εἰδέναι καὶ ὀφθαλμούς <u>βλέπειν</u> ⁴¹ <u>καὶ ὅσα ἀκούειν</u> <u>ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης</u>	ὅτι πεπότικεν ὑμᾶς κύριος <u>πνεύματι</u> ⁴² <u>κατανύξεως</u> καὶ καμύσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν προφητῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν οἱ ὀρώντες τὰ κρυπτά

single underline = agreement between Rom 11:8 and Deut 29:4

double underline = agreement between Rom 11:8 and Isa 29:10

bold = agreement between all three

³⁹ C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962), 210; H. Hübner, *Gottes Ich und Israel: Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9–11* (FRLANT 136; Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 106; O. Hofius, "Das Evangelium und Israel: Erwägungen zu Römer 9–11", *ZTK* 83 (1986) 297–324, on p. 303 n. 20.

⁴⁰ The Hebrew word נִרְדַּמְתָּ used in Isa 29:10 can be rendered as ‘deep sleep’; see C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; vol. 2; Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1983), 550. However, *κατανύξις* should, in light of normal Greek usage, probably be translated as ‘bewilderment’ or ‘stupefaction’ (LSJ) rather than ‘deep sleep’. The Greek translator of Isaiah may have noticed that in Isa 29:9–10 the spirit actually results in people being “faint and confused” (ἐκλύθητε καὶ ἔκστητε), not asleep.

⁴¹ The article τοῦ before βλέπειν occurs only in A (which, inconsistently, does not have an article before εἰδέναι or ἀκούειν).

⁴² The following witnesses read πνεῦμα: S 93 309 301 538 Or. X 51 Wirc. Spec. According to Eusebius, Symmachus also uses the accusative form, but with a different main verb.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

In addition to this conflation, the wording in Romans also deviates from Deut 29:4 in several other ways. Here I will concentrate on the most consequential modification, the relocation of the negation in the sentence and the effect it causes together with the conflation. While in Deut 29:4 the negation precedes the finite verb (οὐκ ἔδωκεν), in Rom 11:8 it is the infinitives that are negated (τοῦ μὴ βλέπειν, τοῦ μὴ ἀκούειν). This greatly affects the way in which the divine action is described. In Deut 29:4, Moses is addressing the people of Israel and recounting their experience in the desert. Although Israel had seen the great deeds of the Lord in Egypt, the Lord had not given them understanding (Deut 29:2–3). The situation has lasted “until this day”, that is, until the day Moses is addressing the people. On that day Moses places the two options, life or death, clearly before the people as they stand before God, entering into the covenant (Deut 29:10–12; 30:15). When Paul omits the word οὐκ and negates the infinitive forms instead, the nature of the divine action changes. In Romans, God actively gives a spirit of stupefaction that causes lack of understanding, whereas in Deuteronomy it is simply stated that God “has not given” understanding. The Pauline origin of these modifications is relatively secure, for there is no evidence at all for a pre–Pauline reading that would omit the negation οὐκ and negate the infinitives instead. Although the idea that God actively deprives Jews of understanding is present in the gospels,⁴³ there is no evidence whatsoever that the actual wording of Rom 11:8 would be dependent on an early Christian reformulation of Deut 29:4.⁴⁴ The removal of the negation from the beginning of the sentence strengthens the parallel with Isa 29:10, in which God’s action against Israel is expressed without negations. Therefore, it is probable that Isa 29:10 has offered Paul the stimulus to reformulate the sentence.

As a result of the relocation of the negation, the three parallel items that God has *not* given his people become three items that God *has* given. The “heart of understanding” of Deut 29:4 would have accorded well with the other items in his list, as long as it was negated like the other infinitives; God has given a heart that would not understand.⁴⁵ Why has Paul replaced the expression? The reason for the conflation lies probably more in the connotations of πνεῦμα κατανύξεως than Paul’s

⁴³ See the use of Isa 6:9–10 in Mark 4:12/Luke 8:10/Matt 13:13–15; John 12:40; Acts 28:26 (Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 159 n. 252).

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 159.

⁴⁵ Jewett suggests that the phrase would have caused confusion because of Paul’s earlier references to “senseless heart” (ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία) in 1:21 and “impenitent heart” (ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν) in 2:5 (Jewett, *Romans*, 662). However, these references do not contain anything that contradicts Paul’s message in Rom 11, and, moreover, they are far away in the letter.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

dissatisfaction with καρδίαν εἰδέναι. Later in the argument Paul presents Israel’s unbelief and disobedience as a temporary condition that will change (11:11–12, 15, 25–7). Isaiah’s concept of “spirit of stupefaction” may have appealed to him, because it sounds like resulting in a temporary and passing condition that comes from outside: when the time comes, Israel will awaken from its stupor.⁴⁶ Thus, the concept offers Paul a medium to explain the source of Israel’s current disbelief and to present it as provisional. When he conflates the two passages, he gives priority to a phrase that he considers more enlightening.

Why does Paul not present the Deut 29:4 and Isa 29:10 one after another instead of conflating them? It seems that he had an idea about the interplay of Deut 29:4 and the following Psalm quotation. However, the unmodified wording of Deut 29:4 would perhaps have had too harsh of a ring in its new context in Rom 11. In their original literary setting in Deuteronomy, the words are not as severe, for they explain Israel’s *former* lack of understanding, whereas in Romans the focus is on Israel’s *current* unbelief. These different frames of the quoted words influence their message. If Paul’s explanation for the reasons behind Israel’s unbelief was that “God did not give them a heart to understand and eyes to see and ears to hear”, it would sound more like a categorical statement without much hope of change. Instead, when he interweaves the “spirit of stupefaction” with the quotation and modifies the negations, he prepares the way for the development of his argumentation: although God now actively gives the spirit of stupefaction that causes the unreceptive condition, there is hope that he will allow the stupefaction to pass in the future.

In summary, Paul conflates the two texts to include in the quotation an idea that is consistent with the following argumentation. What was observed with regard to Rom 11:8 also applies to other conflated quotations (e.g. Rom 9:33; 11:26–27): neither quotation would have exactly the effect that Paul wishes to create, but when conflated, they form a concise entity that is more suitable for his argumentation than either of the texts would be separately.

⁴⁶ Cf. Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 161; Wilk, *Bedeutung*, 54; S.-L. Shum, *Paul’s Use of Isaiah in Romans. A Comparative Study of Paul’s Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts* (WUNT II 156; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 234; M.A. Seifrid, “Romans,” in G.K. Beale/D.A. Carson (ed.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007) 607–694, on p. 670.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. *De Septuaginta Investigationes* 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

3.5 Consistency in Grammatical Forms

The quotation in Rom 11:8 also exemplifies how the change of the network of relations may cause grammatical inconsistencies. If a quotation lacks an introduction formula, these inconsistencies can be useful, for they signal to the audience that Paul is quoting from an external source.⁴⁷ However, in order to avoid unnecessary confusion caused by variation in tenses and persons, he frequently harmonizes grammatical forms in a quotation with those of surrounding statements.

In Rom 11:8, Paul changes the personal pronoun from the second-person plural to the third-person plural, from *ὑμῖν* to *αὐτοῖς*. This substitution can be attributed to Paul with confidence, for there is absolutely no support for it in the textual transmission of the Septuagint and it is obvious why he needs to modify the pronoun. In Deuteronomy, Moses is giving his speech to the people of Israel, whereas in Rom 11 Paul speaks of the unbelieving Israel in the third person (cf. Rom 11:7, 9–14). For Paul it is crucial that the audience of Romans does not feel itself addressed by a quotation that is meant to account for the unbelief of the majority of Israel.⁴⁸ By changing the pronoun, he makes it unequivocal that *αὐτοῖς* refers to the hardened “others” (*οἱ λοιποὶ*) of the previous verse, who have not acquired what they sought (11:7). Moreover, in the next verses (9–10), Paul quotes Ps 68:23–24 (69:23–24 MT) in such a form that the third-person plural pronoun occurs four times. For Paul’s purposes it is important that both quotations seem to refer to the same group, “the others”. After his adjustment, the personal pronoun of Deut 29:4 is consistent with what stands both before and after it.

Furthermore, the accusative (instead of dative) form of *πνεῦμα κατανύξεως* in Rom 11:8 is in all probability related to the change of the network of relations, although in this case the textual tradition of the Septuagint is divided. In contrast to the personal pronoun discussed above, here the expression from Isa 29:10 is not harmonized with Paul’s statements surrounding the quotation but with the other scriptural text in the conflated quotation, Deut 29:4. Since Paul conflates the two texts and begins the quotation with *ἔδωκεν* (from Deut 29:4) – and not with *πεπότικεν* as in Isa 29:10 – he has to replace the *dativus instrumentalis* with an accusative.⁴⁹ As this alteration is obviously

⁴⁷ Cf. the definition of quotation in n. 1; see also Koch, *Schrift*, 13; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 37.

⁴⁸ Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 111; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 159–60.

⁴⁹ Cf. Wilk, *Bedeutung*, 18 n. 6.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. *De Septuaginta Investigationes* 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

necessitated by the conflation, it is improbable that Paul was influenced by the minority reading of the Septuagint with *πνεῦμα* in the accusative.⁵⁰

4. Conclusions

This article has presented examples of different types of deliberate changes that Paul makes to the wording of scriptural quotations: how he substitutes original verbs in order to create a catchword connection, switches the place of parallel items in order to present the more relevant one first, adds a word for the sake of clarity, conflates two passages to create a quotation that better suits his argument, and changes grammatical forms to improve the consistency between the quotation and the rest of the argumentation. These alterations only serve as examples, for the list of Paul’s techniques of modifying wording could be extended to include different kinds of omissions and changes in word order, for example. Similarly, the list of Paul’s motives for committing the changes is far from exhaustive. All of the modifications examined here are connected to the change in the network of relations (to use Sternberg’s terminology) that surrounds the quoted passage. The modifications of grammatical forms are directly necessitated by the new frame of the quotation, but there are numerous cases in which Paul could have managed with the original wording as well. However, the modifications improve the aptness of the quotations and the consistency and flow of the argumentation.

In most of the cases addressed above, there are no serious textual problems, for the manuscript evidence suggests that the changes do not represent pre-Pauline variants, but should be attributed to Paul. This, however, is not always the case. In some cases it is probable that Paul’s wording

⁵⁰ See above n. 42. Even if the accusative form of the minority reading were pre-Pauline, there is still no need to assume that Paul’s *Vorlage* contained it (cf. Wagner, *Heralds*, 243 n. 73). The variant is not especially widespread, and, according to Koch, in general Paul’s quotations of Isaiah are closest to the text type represented by uncials A and Q (Koch, *Schrift*, 48–51, 170 n. 48), which here contain the dative form. The variant may be a linguistic improvement (ibid., 170 n. 48; Wagner, *Heralds*, 243 n. 73) that corresponds to the normal usage of the verb, for *ποτιζω* is typically used with a double accusative; see BDR 155:7 n. 7; R. Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta: Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Koinē* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928), 49. Cf. Gen 19:32; Judg 4:19; 1 Kgdms 30:11; and Sir 15:3. The construction where the drink is in the dative is rarer: see 3 Macc 5:2 (Bauer). Therefore, it appears that Paul ended up with the same form as some revisers of the Septuagint text, but for different reasons; Paul had to adapt the case to match the verb, whereas the revisers were motivated by improving the language.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

represents a Greek text that had been revised in order to bring it closer to a Hebrew text.⁵¹

Moreover, the transmission of both the text of Romans and of the Septuagint shows traces of harmonizations. Where Paul’s reading of a quotation differed from that of the Septuagint, scribes occasionally “corrected” the wording. The reverse phenomenon took place when scribes gave priority to Paul’s wording and harmonized the wording of a Septuagint manuscript with it.⁵² This two-way influence in the textual transmission of Paul’s letters and the Septuagint has produced several intriguing cases in which one has to ask which alternative is more probable: did Paul quote a pre-Pauline variant reading of the Septuagint, or did the influence of the New Testament create the textual variant in the manuscript tradition? Or with regard to the text of Romans, which one is the original reading, the one agreeing with the Septuagint or the one deviating from it?⁵³ It is crucial

⁵¹ A well-known example is Paul’s conflated quotation in 9:33, the middle part of which derives from Isa 8:14. Paul’s wording follows the Hebrew closely and greatly resembles the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, but it clearly diverges from the Septuagint, the translation of which completely rewrites the passage.

Rom 9:33 (Isa 28:16 + 8:14)	Isa 8:14 LXX	Isa 8:14 MT
<p>ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ καταισχυθήσεται.</p>	<p>καὶ ἐὰν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ πεποιθὼς ᾖς, ἔσται σοι εἰς ἀγίασμα, καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι</p>	<p>וְהָיָה לְמַקְדָּשׁ וּלְאֶבֶן נִגְוָה וּלְצוּר מַכְשׁוֹל</p>

The Hebrew wording contains a striking tension: “And he [=God] will become a sanctuary and a stone of offense and a rock of stumbling.” That God becomes at the same time a sanctuary and a stone of offense causes an interpretative problem, which the Greek translator solves by inserting a conditional clause, a new main verb, and negations before the stone and the rock: “And if you trust/believe in him, he will become a sanctuary for you, and you will not encounter him as a stone of stumbling, nor as a rock of falling...” Paul’s wording has neither such an if-clause nor negations before the stone and the rock, but instead preserves the harshness of the Hebrew. In addition, with its genitive constructions (λίθου προσκόμματος, πέτραν σκανδάλου) Paul’s syntax diverges from that of the Septuagint (λίθου προσκόμματι, πέτρας πτώματι) and represents an approximation towards the Hebrew construct chains (Koch, *Schrift*, 60; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 123). The same syntax can also be found in Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, which makes it probable that Paul renders here unaltered the wording of his *Vorlage*. Another deviation from the Septuagint is Paul’s use of σκάνδαλον instead of πρόσκομμα. As σκάνδαλον seems to be a word favoured by Paul (Rom 11:9; 14:13; 16:17; 1 Cor 1:23; Gal 5:11), the possibility cannot be excluded that he substituted the word himself. However, since σκάνδαλον is also used by Aquila (and, according to Eusebius, by Symmachus as well), it is more probable that the word derives from the pre-Pauline Hebraizing revision (Wilk, *Bedeutung*, 23 n. 14). Traces of Hebraizing revision can be found especially in quotations from Isaiah, but the phenomenon is not limited to that book. On Job 41:3 in Rom 11:35, see B. Schaller, “Zum Textcharakter der Hiobzitate im paulinischen Schrifttum”, *ZNW* 71 (1980) 21–26. On the phenomenon in general, see Koch, *Schrift*, 57–9; Stanley, *Paul and the Language*, 14–15; Wilk, *Bedeutung*, 19–20.

⁵² For an example of the former phenomenon, see n. 8, and, for the latter, n. 16.

⁵³ Martin Karrer and Ulrich Schmid rightly emphasize that *in general* in early Christian codices the Old Testament and the New Testament were copied independently of each other, that is, without harmonizing tendencies: M. Karrer & U. Schmid, “Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament and the Textual History of the Bible – the Wuppertal Research Project,” in M. Karrer, et al. (ed.), *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen* (ANTF 43 Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010) 165–196, on pp. 167, 185. However, this overall picture cannot be used as a rule of thumb to solve each particular case.

This is the post-print version of the article “Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul’s Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations.” Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

to examine the less problematic cases, as has been done in this paper, to form a general idea of Paul’s “style”. Which techniques of modification are characteristic of him, and what are his typical reasons for changing something in the wording? In text-critically ambiguous cases, it is helpful to have parallels with both similar modifications in other quotations and similar motives for committing the change. If there are several probable cases in which Paul changes personal pronouns, these parallels can serve in an ambiguous case as an additional argument in favour of the Pauline origin of the alteration. Similarly, if it can be demonstrated that catchword connections are important for Paul and that he alters the wording of quotations in order to create them, this observation may help to determine whether a reading is more likely to originate from Paul or a scribe transmitting the text. Such arguments cannot be used as *proof* of Pauline origin, for Paul was not the only author in antiquity to alter personal pronouns in a quotation or create catchword connections. However, conformity with Paul’s well-attested tendencies and practices increases the *probability* that Paul is behind the modifications. In conclusion, analysis of Paul’s intentions in all cases in which he modifies the wording of quotations is integral to solving the textually obscure quotations.

Finally, the fact that Paul alters the wording of quotations does not imply that he considered the exact wording to be insignificant. On the contrary, the frequency of alterations rather indicates that the wording of the quotations is important, and sometimes even crucial, for his argument.⁵⁴ For the effectiveness of argumentation, it is advantageous that there are verbal links with his own statements, that interesting matters are presented first in the quotations, that the quotations bring into discussion new concepts and themes, that it is clear who is speaking to whom, that there are no syntactical problems in the quotations, and that personal pronouns refer to the right groups. Therefore, Paul’s attitude towards the wording is not indifferent – he shows great care in modifying wording so that the quotation expresses exactly what he intends it to convey. Consequently, although the scriptures of Israel are without doubt authoritative for Paul, it appears that their authority does not lie in the immutability of their wording. If Paul has to decide between preserving the original wording or highlighting the relevance and suitability of the quotation for the matter at

⁵⁴ Cf. Koch, *Schrift*, 347: “Gerade weil der Wortlaut der Zitate selbst für Paulus eine so große Bedeutung hat, verändert er ihn z. T. massiv.”

This is the post-print version of the article "Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul's Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations." Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

hand, Paul tends to choose relevance. This readiness to actualize the quotation by adjusting its wording enables him to use quotations in important argumentative functions.

Bibliography

Barrett, C.K., *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1962).

Bauer, W., *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (6th edn, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988).

Cranfield, C.E.B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Vol. 2, ICC Edinburgh: T&T Clark 1983).

Ellis, E.E., *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (WUNT 18; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1978).

Fuß, B., „Dies ist die Zeit, von der geschrieben ist...“. *Die expliziten Zitate aus dem Buch Hosea in den Handschriften von Qumran und im Neuen Testament* (NTAbh Neue Folge 37; Münster: Aschendorff, 2000).

Helbing, R., *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta: Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Koinē* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928).

Hofius, O., "Das Evangelium und Israel: Erwägungen zu Römer 9–11", *ZTK* 83 (1986) 297–324.

Hübner, H., *Gottes Ich und Israel: Zum Schriftgebrauch des Paulus in Römer 9–11* (FRLANT 136; Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).

Jewett, R., *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary of the Bible; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006).

Karrer, M. and U. Schmid, "Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament and the Textual History of the Bible – the Wuppertal Research Project," in M. Karrer/S. Kreuzer/M. Sigismund (ed.), *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, (ANTF 43 Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010) 165–196.

Kautzsch, A.F., *De Veteris Testamenti Locis a Paulo Apostolo Allegatis* (Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publishing, 2010 [reprint, original 1869]).

Kloppenber, J.S., *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity Philadelphia: Fortress 1987).

Koch, D.-A., *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus* (BHT 69; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr 1986).

This is the post-print version of the article "Adjusted to the Argument: Tracing Paul's Motives for Modifying the Wording of Scriptural Quotations." Pages 201-219 in *From Scribal Error to Rewriting: How Ancient Texts Could and Could Not Be Changed*. Edited by Aejmelaeus, A., Longacre, D. & Mirotadze, N. De Septuaginta Investigationes 12. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Käsemann, E., *An die Römer* (2nd edn, HNT 8a; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1974).

Meiser, M., "Relevanz der Kirchenväterzitate für die Textgeschichte der neutestamentlichen Zitate aus der Septuaginta," in M. Karrer/S. Kreuzer/M. Sigismund (ed.), *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, (ANTF 43 Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010) 283–316.

Norton, J.D.H., *Contours in the Text: Textual Variation in the Writings of Paul, Josephus and the Yahad* (LNTS 430; New York: T&T Clark, 2011).

Patterson, S.J., *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma: Polebridge 1993).

Schaller, B., "Zum Textcharakter der Hiobzitate im paulinischen Schrifttum", *ZNW* 71 (1980) 21–26.

Seifrid, M.A., "Romans," in G.K. Beale/D.A. Carson (ed.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007) 607–694.

Shum, S.-L., *Paul's Use of Isaiah in Romans. A Comparative Study of Paul's Letter to the Romans and the Sibylline and Qumran Sectarian Texts* (WUNT II 156; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002).

Stanley, C.D., *Paul and the Language of Scripture. Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature* (SNTSMS 74; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

Stegner, W.R., "Romans 9:6–29—a Midrash", *JSNT* 22 (1984) 37–52.

Sternberg, M., "Proteus in Quotation-Land: Mimesis and the Forms of Reported Discourse", *Poetics Today* 3 (1982) 107–56.

Thackeray, H.St.J., "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings", *JTS* 8 (1907) 262–78.

Wagner, R.J., *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans* (NTS 101; Leiden: Brill, 2002).

Wilk, F., *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus* (FRLANT 179; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998).

---, "Letters of Paul as Witnesses to and for the Septuagint Text," in W. Kraus/R.G. Wooden (ed.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, (SCS 53 Atlanta: SBL, 2006) 253–271.

Zuntz, G., *The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum: The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1946* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953).