

CAUSES OF TEXT VARIATIONS IN OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS IN PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

Hilary B.P. Mijoga

An assessment of quotations can only be done by comparing with the extant texts, the most obvious being the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Septuagint (LXX). In text form, both of these are likely to be later than Paul, although the LXX pre-dates Paul. We know that the present Hebrew consonantal text goes back to about 100A.D.¹ This remained unvocalised for a long time and the use of the vowel system began around the 6th or 7th century A.D.² The process was slow because of opposition voiced in some quarters. So the development was gradual and the decision to regard the text and vocalisation of Ben Asher as standard was only made some time in the 12th century A.D. This shows that Paul would not have used the MT as we have it now. The suggestion being made is that he might have used a Hebrew text similar to what we have today. As for the LXX, the primary evidence of its origin is contained in the so called Letter of Aristeas. This was a letter from Aristeas to his friend Philocrates. Although there have been doubts about this letter, it shows that the translation was an official undertaking initiated by the Jewish authority; for by then the Jews no longer understood Hebrew and therefore they could no longer manage without such a translation.

Up to the 4th century A.D. the LXX had undergone different stages in its history and it is likely that alterations were made in some parts. According to the dates, Paul should have used the LXX. From the quotations, it is evident that Paul largely used the LXX as his scriptures. In short, the proposal being made here is that Paul might have used the Hebrew text behind the MT which also lies behind the LXX.

If one compares Paul's quotations with the texts in the MT and the LXX, one notices: a) that some quotations agree, in their text forms, with both the Greek and the Hebrew texts, suggesting that either or both of these are the sources; b) that other quotations agree with one against the other, implying the use of that source or the use of another version which is common to both; and c) that others disagree with both.

This paper endeavours to discern why there are these differences by arguing that there are many factors which affect text variations in the quotations. Of particular interest here are: a) the author's literary freedom, b) memory citation; and c) the use of sources other than the LXX and MT, for instance what Harris³ calls "Testimonia", other Greek texts, other Hebrew texts and Aramaic Targums.

Rabbinic influence on Paul, especially the literary techniques, will support the use of sources other than the LXX and the MT. If he was still using Rabbinic literary techniques, then it is also possible that he shared in the use of the Jewish literature prevalent during his time. By implication then, the multiplicity of sources will help to support the argument at stake.

A lot of work has been done on the Old Testament (OT) quotations. Ellis has pointed out that quotations can be reproduced "with occasional variations in conformity with the context".⁴ And Lindars, when looking at the Qumran scrolls in connection with the variations, notes that there was "a certain amount of wresting the text"⁵ in their commentaries. This means that "in the course of their exposition they introduced delicate alterations and modifications to accord with their convictions".⁶ In other words, the whole process was "a matter of making the words fit the facts, rather than the facts fit the words."⁷ Although Lindars has said this, he thinks that "it is impossible to say that every variation from the Septuagint is an intentional modification or alternative reading".⁸ He points out three factors that affect the modification of texts; namely deliberate alteration, selection or reading and memory quotation.

J.C. McCullough⁹ undertook a study of the quotations in the Epistle to the Hebrews. He made the following observations: that there are stylistic variations involving spelling, word forms and the substitution of single words to avoid harsh construction; that some variations were made to avoid ambiguity in the interpretation of the passage; and that other variations were made to emphasise what the author considered to be the important points raised in the quotation.

When dealing with explicit OT quotations in Qumran literature and in the New Testament (NT), Fitzmyer noted that quotations can be categorised into four classes.¹⁰ These classes are: a) literal or historical, in which the OT is actually quoted in the same sense in which it was intended by the original writers; b) modernisation, in which the OT text which originally had a reference to some event contemporaneous with the time it was written, was nevertheless vague when applied to some new event in the history of the Qumran sect; c) accommodation, in which the OT text, obviously wrested from its original context, was modified or deliberately changed by the new writer, in order to adapt it to a new situation or purpose; and d) eschatological class, in which the OT quotation expressed a promise or threat about something to be accomplished in the eschaton and which the Qumran writer cited as something still to be accomplished in the eschaton of which he wrote. From this brief survey, it is noted that some text variations are deliberately made to suit the context or the argument or the audience, whereas others are a result of memory quotation. As pointed out above, these are some of the factors which will be considered in this paper.

What is quite clear from the above is that Paul knew both Greek and Hebrew. In Acts (9:11; 21:39) we are told that Paul was from Tarsus. As a citizen of Tarsus, we are warranted to suggest that Paul knew Greek because Tarsus was a Greek-speaking town. In Acts 21:37, Paul is asked by the tribune, "So you know Greek?". This suggests that Paul spoke to him in Greek. And an obvious indication that Paul knew Greek is his epistles, which are written in Greek.

It should be noted that during this time the Hebrew language was the language of scholarship. In Acts 22:3, Paul says that he was "brought up in this city at the feet of Gamaliel, educated according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers . . .". This implies that Paul was educated in Jerusalem by the famous rabbi, Gamaliel. We can safely say that Paul was taught in Hebrew and therefore knew the language. It should also be pointed out that in Palestine, in the synagogues, the OT was read in Hebrew with paraphrases in Aramaic and this means that whenever Paul was in Jerusalem, he read the Torah in Hebrew.

The role of Hebrew as an everyday means of communication was taken over by Aramaic. In other words, Aramaic was now the vernacular of Palestine. "Aramaic was not merely the vernacular of Palestine, but was also the lingua franca of those who did not speak Greek in the eastern parts of the Roman Empire."¹¹ Whenever Paul was in Jerusalem, he spoke in Aramaic; for that was the language of everyday business. We are told in Acts 21:40, at the time of Paul's arrest, that he spoke to the people "in the Hebrew language". This is generally taken to mean Aramaic¹² because it was "the language most acceptable to the Jewish traditionalists"¹³ as is seen in the people's response: "And when they heard that he addressed them in the Hebrew language, they were the more quiet" (Acts 22:2). The possibility that Paul knew Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic is very high. The question here is not how much he could speak or write them, but rather that he had some knowledge of them all. It is the factors influencing text variations we now consider.

The first factor is the author's literary freedom. Any author has literary freedom to do whatever he likes with the material at his disposal in accordance with his work. In other words, he can change the material to suit his context, argument, audience or style. The liberty that the author has with his material is what is called here the author's literary freedom. As a writer, Paul also had this freedom. He was dealing with the scriptures and the liberty he had with the scriptures will be supported by the examples below. During his time, changes of text were widespread and this means that Paul is not doing anything extraordinary. For example, it is known that the Rabbis made

deliberate alterations to some Hebrew biblical texts which were perfectly correct. Their aim was to purge expressions regarded by them as indelicate or liable to be construed by the readers as blasphemous when taken in their literal sense. This was done by “directing the substitution of different but inoffensive words for those in the text.”¹⁴

There are several examples of text variations which support the argument being presented, for instance:- 1:17 (Hab 2:4) which does not have any pronomial suffix; and 10:21 (Is 65:1) which transposes “the whole day” and “I stretched my hands”. In verse 20, Paul has been talking about the accessibility of God and now he wants to show that this is not for a time but for “the whole day”, 11:2 quotes Ps 94:14 (or 1 Sm 12:22). In verse 1, Paul is saying that God has not rejected his people and looking at the quotation we see that it is a reply to verse 1 and hence all the changes are made to suit his purpose.

Other variations are due to conflation of texts. The aim of these conflated quotations is to serve as proof texts in relation to the arguments being put forward. Because some of these fit in well with what Paul is talking about we might attribute the changes to Paul, for example, 9:9 quotes Gen 18:10, 14. In this passage Paul has been talking about the promise and when he comes to verse 9, he says “For this is what the promise said” and he quotes. In other words, he tells the audience what he means by constructing a quotation. Other conflated quotations are :- 9:27-28 which reflects Is 10:22ff and Hos 2:1; 10:15 which appears to be a conflation of Nah 2:1 and Is 52:7; 14:11 appears to be constructed from Is 49:18, 45:25.

There are other text variations which seem to be created because of the context in which they are being used. Instances of this are seen in the changes of tense, number and person, the addition of connectives, and transposition of words and phrases for emphasis. It should be noted that “unaccountable changes of person are quite normal in ancient Near Eastern literature”¹⁵, but this is not the case with Paul’s changes. Instances of this include 2:6 which quotes Ps 61:13 where the LXX and MT use the second person singular; 10:7 quotes Ps 107:26 where the LXX and the MT both use third person plural, but Paul’s quotation uses third person singular; 10:19 quotes Deut 32:21 where the LXX has “them”, but Paul’s quotation has changed it to “you” (plural); 11:4 quotes 1 Kg 19:10-14. In this quotation God is speaking and therefore Paul has changed it from second to first person. The change is made because of the context. 11:8 appears to be a conflation of passages from Deut 29:3 and Is 29:10. If this is the case then Paul has changed “to you” to “to them”. 11:26-27 reflects passages from Is 27:9 and Is 59:20ff. Is 27:9 has “his” but Paul has changed it to “their”. Here Paul is talking about the Israelites and not only Jacob and therefore the plural “their”. Quoting Ps

117:1, 15:11 has third person plural imperative whereas the LXX text has second person plural imperative. Paul is not only concerned with the Gentiles, but also with all the people and that is why he turns to indirect speech.

Some variations involve tenses. The tenses change because of the context of the quotation. For example 10:7 (Ps 107:26) uses the future tense because of the context whereas the LXX shows that it is present. Other examples of change of tenses because of context are :- 11:2 which quotes Ps 94:14; and 11:4 which quotes 1 Kg 19:18.

Other changes involve addition or removal of words or letters. This also has something to do with the context; for example, quoting Is 52:5, 2:24 adds "for" and omits "continually"; 4:3 which quotes Gen 15:6 has spelt Abraham with two "a"s whereas the LXX spells it with one "a". (Other examples are in Romans :- 4:1, 9, 12, 13, 16). Referring to Is 20:6, 9:20 has introduced a question tag under the influence of the context because in verses 19 and 29 there is the question tag. 10:7 which quotes Ps 107:26 is a question whereas the LXX text is not. Because the context shows that it is a question, we see the introduction of the question tag. Other quotations where omissions are made include:- 10:8 (Deut 30:14); 11:9 (Ps 68:23); 15:9 (Ps 17:50 or 2Sm 22:50) and 15:12 (Is 11:10) Examples of quotations where additions have been made include:- 10:11 (Is 28:16); 10:13 (Joel 3:5); and 11:3 (1Kg 19:10, 14).

Some text variations are due to transposition of words or phrases. Transposition generally indicates emphasis and as a result we have differences in word order. Examples of quotations where this is the case are:- 2:24 (Is 52:5); 9:13 (Mal 1:2); 9:25 (Hons 2:25); 10:8 (Deut 30:14); 10:20 (Is 65:1); 10:21 (Is 65:2); 11:3 (1Kg 19:10, 14); 14:11 (Is 49:18; Jer 22:24; Ezek 5:11; Is 45:23) and 15:11 (Ps 117:1).

There are other variations which are due to substitution of words or phrases for example 4:3 (Gen 15:6); 9:17 (Ex 9:16).

All these examples have shown that some of the text variations were created by Paul himself. We have seen that some text variations were made to suit his arguments and others to suit his context. This fits in well with the claim that a writer has freedom to change the material to suit his argument or context or audience. Paul has done this and therefore we should account for some of the text variations in the OT quotations in this epistle as due to Paul exercising his literary freedom.

Memory citation is also one of the factors that causes textual variations. It is evident that in most cases Paul was quoting from memory. This statement can only

hold water if it can be shown how far scriptural language is woven in his language. In other words, if his language resembles that of the scriptures then it is quite possible that he was quoting from memory. Some people, for instance Roepe, have claimed that Paul “quotes almost without exception from the LXX and this is often from memory”¹⁶. He continues to say that “combined quotations are the result of memory citation”¹⁷. Ellis¹⁸ points out that the desire for early Christian missionaries to use a translation acceptable to Hellenistic Jews made it imperative that the LXX be used. However Roepe’s conclusion is questionable because it has been suggested by other scholars like Harris, that Paul might have also used testimonia.

A.T. Hanson¹⁹ however claims that where Paul has changed the text itself, he is quoting from memory. To him this shows that Paul does not think the citation of great importance or that he is referring to a text which is so well known that no one would imagine that he is quoting accurately. Hanson cannot be right here. When Paul quotes, it means that he thinks the quotation is pertinent to his argument and therefore we cannot say that he does not consider the citation of great importance. As we have already seen above, some of the variations he made were deliberate, for example, so that they could suit the argument or context.

Lindars²⁰ is of the view that when the approximate date of composition of documents, for example the partistic literature, is possible, it is noticeable that the writer quotes from memory. This would not apply to Paul; for his so-called genuine epistles are considered to be much earlier than most of the Christian literature.

The bulky nature of the scrolls makes it possible that Paul was using his memory more often than what scholars would have us believe. It would have been difficult for him to have all the scrolls before him and check each and every quotation. For example, when it comes to Psalms, it is very likely that Paul cited from memory. This is because most of the Psalms were commonly used in prayers and therefore he had them at his finger tips. It is to the scriptural language in Romans that the paper now turns for consideration.

In 1:3, Paul links the Messiah with David. This link is also evident in the OT, for example Mic 5:2; 2 Sm 7:16; Ps 89:3f, 19; Jer 23:5f; and Deut 33:14, 18. All these examples point to a link between David and the one who is to come and therefore “it is clear that the expectation that the Messiah would belong to the family of David was strongly established.”²¹

In 1:7, we have the idea of God’s calling. This is also in the OT, for example Is 49:1; 50:2; 65:12; 66:4; Jer 7:13; Ex 12:16; Lev 23:2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 21, 24, 28, 35, 36;

and Num 28:25. In 1:8, we have the personal relationship between Paul and God. This is also true in the OT, for example Ps 3:7, 5:2; 7:1, 3; 13:3; and 22:1, 2, 10. Other examples where scriptural reflection is evident are, among others:- 1:20 (Gen 32:30; 24:10f; Judg 6:22f; 13:20ff; and Is 6:5); 1:21 (2Kg 17:15; Jer 2:5; Ps 106:20; Jer 2:11); 1:27 (Lev 18:22); 2:4 (1 Kg 8:22f; Neh 9:17); 2:9 (Num 19:20; 31:40; Deut 10:22); 2:15 (Jer 31:33; Is 51:7); 2:16 (1Sm 16:7; 1Chron 28:9; Ps 138:1f; 139:23; Jer 17:10; Eccles 12:14); 2:29 (Lev 26:41; Deut 10:16; Jer 4:14; Is 9:26); 3:2 (Ps 103:7; 147:19; Deut 4:5); 4:9 (Gen 15:6); 4:17 (Gen 17:5); 4:19 (Gen 17:17); 5:5 (Ps 25:3; 119:116; Is 28:16); 6:4 (Ex 15:6); 1Chron 16:28; Ps 145:11); 7:22 (Ps 19:8; 119:14); 8:3 (Is 53:10 (MT)); 8:31 (Ps 23:4; 56:9); 9:1 (Num 35:30; Deut 17:6); 9:4 (Ex 4:2f; Jer 31:9; Gen 15:17ff cf Ex 2:24; Gen 19:5; Deut 29:1ff; Josh 8:30ff; Gen 6:18; 2Sm 23:5; Ps 89:3f, 28f, 132:11f); 10:2 (Num 25:13; 1Kg 19:10, 10; Ps 69:9; 119:139; Eccles 45:23); (1 Sm 12:22; Jer 31:37; 33:24-26; Ps 94:14); 11:29 (Num 23:19; Is 15:29 Ps 110:4; Jer 4:28; Zech 8:14); 12:1 (Is 1:10-17; 58:1-11; Amos 5:21-24; Is 1:10; Hos 6:6; Amos 5:21f); 13:12 (Ps 43:3; Is 2:5; 9:2; 42:6; 60:1); 13:14 (2Chron 6:41; Ps 35:26; (LXX 34) Is 52:5); 14:4 (Ps 130:3; Mal 3:2); 14:19 (Ps 147:2; 102:16; 89:4; Jer 31:4; 1:10); 15:53 (Lev 26:6; Num 6:26; Judg 6:24; Ps 26:12; 29:11; Jer 16:5; Gen 21:22; 31:3, 5; Ex 3:12; Josh 1:5; 1Chron 11:9; Job 29:5; Ps 23:4; 46:7; Is 8:10).

A detailed analysis of the above examples will reveal that Paul's language is in fact interwoven with the scriptural language. The allusions to the OT, whether consciously or not, suggest that Paul was using his memory. A full analysis of the epistle reveals that in chapters 1 - 8, where there are about a quarter of all the direct quotations, the total number of allusions amounts to three quarters of the sum total. Chapters 9 - 11, containing over half of the direct quotations, has about a quarter of the allusions; and chapters 12 - 16, which has a quarter of the explicit quotations, has less than a quarter of the allusions of the sum total. This means that in the first section we have clear evidence of memory work; in the second we see that Paul was sticking to the text and straying as it were, once in a while. This might be because of the nature of the arguments being presented here which need concrete support from the Scriptures. The last section of the epistle mainly involves beseeching people to do something in the light of the examples set by Jesus. This does not necessarily need direct evidence from the OT and that is possibly why we have fewer explicit quotations, as well as fewer allusions.

Having established that Paul did use his memory, we now look at the examples of quotations with text variations, which are caused by citing from memory. According to Paul, the quotation from 9:27 - 28 is taken from Isaiah. But looking at it, we see that there is a bit from Hos 2:1. This confusion could only have arisen if he was quoting from memory. Other examples are :- 9:20 (Is 29:16); 9:25 (Hos 2:25); 11:3 (1 Kg

19:10). In 11:4 Paul quotes 1Kg 19:18. In 1Kg 19:15 - 18, the words "I have . . . to Baal" are a continuation of the instruction to Jehu and Hazael. But Paul has quoted them as an answer of God to the complaint of Elijah. This misplacement seems to have arisen from the words "I am left alone" and the allusion to the worshippers of Baal²². This confusion could only be possible if he were quoting from memory. 11:8 appears to be a conflation of Deut 29:3 and Is 29:3. The similarity of ideas between these two texts can easily lead to confusion. This confusion is similar to the preceding one. Here also we might be looking at another example of Paul quoting from memory.

From the above discussion, we have seen that Paul's language is sometimes interwoven with Scriptural language. This suggests that memory was at work. The few examples have further raised the possibility of explaining some of the textual variations in the OT quotations as being due to memory citation.

Having discussed the memory factor, let us now look at the use of sources other than the LXX and the MT as contributing to some text variations in the OT quotations. It is possible that apart from the LXX and the precursor of the MT, Paul also used other sources which were circulating during his time. The sources in mind here are Testimonia, Greek, Hebrew and Aramaic texts. If it can be shown that Paul used any of these other sources, then we might also attribute some of the changes to that.

As regards testimonia, it should be pointed out that the early Christian propaganda produced or adopted, for its own purpose, short collections of extracts, Messianic and otherwise, for the use of those who had to argue from the OT²³. Hatch²⁴ had expressed this view earlier on. Rendel Harris²⁵ has argued for the existence of a Testimony Book. This contained the early collections of testimonia taken from the OT, and were originally oral and later lumped together, possibly under topics. There might have existed testimonies for and against the Jews. Harris' emphasis is on those which were against the Jews. The existence of this part could be explained when we consider that for any reasonable debate between the church and the synagogue to take place, collections of OT quotations were inevitable²⁶.

Harris argues that the presence of this book influenced the oldest Christian literature like the Gospel of Mark and the Epistle of Paul to the Romans²⁷. If this is the case, then this book should have existed before the whole of the NT was written.

Dodd acknowledges the significance of Harris' hypothesis on the testimony book in so far as it allows evidence of the primitive traditional character of the OT in the NT. However, he is sceptical about the hypothesis; he thinks "that his theory outruns the evidence, which is not sufficient to prove so formidable a literary enterprise

at so early a date"²⁸. His view is that there was a kerygma with reference to the OT, which proved that Jesus was foretold in the Scriptures and that the prophecies were fulfilled. Dodd insists that these testimonies were oral and were only written gradually as the need arose (contrary to Harris' view).

Ellis criticises Harris' theory for underrating Paul's originality and his importance for the later writers, who may well have used Paul and varied their texts to suit their own purpose, and secondly the possibility of a key word rather than "testimonies" as the occasion for text combinations had not been sufficiently considered.²⁹

Lindars agrees with Harris that the primitive testimonies are often anti-Judaic in nature; he believes that they have an apologetic purpose³⁰. Hanson points out that Paul inherited from those who were before him an interest in certain parts of Scripture, and even probably certain conflation of Scripture texts, which apologists had used before him³¹. This does not exclude the fact that he made the texts his own.³²

Harris suggests the following ways of knowing quotations from the testimonia:- i) by looking at the Christian writers, we come across texts which recur; ii) by looking at the NT itself in those instances where the writers agree with each other against the LXX; iii) by looking at the combined quotations; and iv) by looking at passages which appear with key words or ideas recurring.

Using these principles, the following quotations have been identified as belonging to the testimonia: 1:17 of Heb 10:38; Gal 3:11 (Hab 2:24)³³; 3:10 - 18 (a chain of quotations - verses 13 - 18 do not appear in the MT); and 9:25 (Hos 2:25); 9:33 of 1Pet 2:6,8 (composite quotation : Is 8:14; 28:16)³⁴. Apart from these examples, there are other examples which do not have textual variations but are thought to have been part of the testimonia, for example, 2:24; 4:17; 9:12; 10:13 (of Acts 1:21); 10:16 (of Jn 12:38); 11:4; 15:3, 10. This shows how far the testimonia could have been used in the Epistle to the Romans. This might then explain some of the textual variations in the quotations.

Although it is difficult to come up with concrete examples on the existence of other Greek texts, we will, however, look at the possibilities. It should be noted that quotations show considerable distribution among the LXX text forms, none being followed consistently (LXXA, LXXB, LXXF)³⁵. When referring to the Synoptics, Swete ³⁶ states that there is evidence in favour of the belief that the evangelists employed a recension of the LXX which came nearer to the text of Codex A than to that of the oldest uncial B. This could also apply to Paul.

Roepe³⁷ is reported to have concluded that the LXX variants are attributed to other Greek versions, whereas Kautzsch adds that Paul always used the Alexandrian version with the exception of the two Job citations (Rom 11:25; 1 Cor 5:19).

Bleddyn Roberts argues that since the quotations from Greek versions do not agree with the present LXX this indicates that there existed a number of early texts in Greek³⁸. Shemaryhu Talmon also says, according to Rabbinic testimony, that the "model codices that were kept in the Temple precincts . . . not only exhibited divergent readings, but represented conflicting text - types"³⁹. It has also been suggested that the Greek speaking diaspora needed targumic phrases, as did the Palestinian Jews. From these the first Greek texts might have appeared. It must also be noted that as only one book was permitted on a roll, it was quite possible to have various text-forms in one collection⁴⁰.

So, although all these possibilities are difficult to support, we cannot rule out the possibility that other Greek texts ever existed during the time of Paul. Lack of concrete evidence, on the existence of these, does not make it impossible that they ever existed. As Paul travelled, it is highly probable that he came into contact with other texts. We cannot say that different churches had the same scriptural texts. Individual needs of the communities and theological reasons could affect the text of the Scriptures. In other words, Paul would have been acquainted with different texts as he travelled on his mission campaigns⁴¹. It is difficult to come up with quotations which have variations due to the use of other Greek texts except for 11:35 (Job 41:3) which itself is a problem.

Other text variations could be a result of using other Hebrew texts or Aramaic targums. It has been said that there existed other Hebrew texts (Klein⁴², James Barr⁴³, Ralmon⁴⁴). The other side of the coin is the possibility of the use of Aramaic targums. As time went by, many Jews lost command of the Hebrew language and therefore the Scriptures had to be put in an intelligible language. In other words, to meet the needs of the people, Aramaic targums came into existence. So these paraphrases were eventually written. Some examples of quotations with text variations which are due to the influence of targums are :- 12:19 (Deut 32:35; Ellis⁴⁵; Cranfield⁴⁶): 14:11 (Ellis⁴⁷). From the above discussion, we have seen the possibilities of the use of other sources.

Rabbinic influence on Paul is partly revealed in his literary techniques, for example wresting texts for his own purposes, memorisation, use of collections of OT quotations, use of Aramaic Targums etc.

W.D. Davies⁴⁸ and E.P. Sanders⁴⁹ have successfully shown how far Paul was grounded in the Rabbinic world of thought. Some examples of concepts and ideas which show this are :- the distinction of the old and new humanity⁵⁰; the idea that the spirit comes on a worthy community⁵¹; the use of sacrificial language⁵²; the idea that Judaism is not a religion of legalistic works - righteousness; the idea that the entrance into the covenant was before the fulfilment of the commandments;⁵³ the requirement of obedience of God's election; and the conflict of predestination and free will ⁵⁴.

On Rabbinic literary techniques, we have formulas introducing OT quotations; the amalgamated quotations; the chain quotations and Midrash. Bruce Metzger⁵⁵ and Joseph Fitzmyer⁵⁶ have shown that the introductory formulas used in Mishnah and in Qumran, respectively, (in Jewish literature), were also used in the NT. One of the writers who benefited from this usage is Paul, for instance:- 1:17; 2:24; 3:4; 3:10; 4:3, 17, 18; 8:36; 9:25; 10:18, 19, 20, 21; 11:2, 4, 26,; 12:19; 14:11; and 19: 3, 19, 21. Examples of merged or amalgamated quotations in the Epistle to the Romans are :- 9:9, 27 - 28, 33; 10:15; 11:8; 10:18 - 21; 11: 8 - 10; and 15:9 - 12, Paul also used the Midrashim, for example, 10:6ff, 11; 11 :3 - 4, 8, 34 - 35; and 12:19, 20. All the above were used in the Jewish literature. So Paul is not doing anything extraordinary. Paul should probably have known the materials on which these literary techniques were used.

The main aim of this paper has been to demonstrate that there are many factors that cause text variations of the OT quotations in the Epistle to the Romans. It has been shown that the following factors account for the changes :- i) the author's literary freedom; ii) citation from memory; and iii) the use of sources other than the LXX and the MT. These sources are :- a) testimonia/apostolic kerygma; b) other Greek texts; c) other Hebrew texts; and d) Aramaic targums. Paul's grounding in Rabbinic thought has helped to confirm the above factors.

FOOTNOTES

1. Ernst Wurthwein, *The text of the Old Testament*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957, p.12.
2. Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions*, Cardiff: University of Wales, 1951, p.52.
3. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, 1, 2, Cambridge: University Press, 1916, 1920.
4. E.W. Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, London: Oliver and Boyd, 1957, p.11.

5. B. Lindars, **New Testament Apologetic**, London: SCM, 1961, p.15.
6. **Ibid.**, p.25.
7. **Loc. cit.**,
8. **Ibid.** p.26.
9. J.c. McCullough, 'The Old Testament quotations in Hebrew', **New Testament Studies**, vol.26, 1979, p.378.
- 10 J.A.Fitzmyer, 'The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament', **New Testament Studies**. vol.70, 1961, p.305.
11. New Century Bible, **The Acts of the Apostles**, Oliphants, Marshall: Morgan and Scott, 1973, p.223.
12. The Cambridge Bible Commentary, **The Acts of the Apostles**, Cambridge: University Press, 1966, p.182.
13. New Century Bible, **Op. cit.**, p.225.
14. J. Weingreen, **Introduction to the Critical Study of the Hebrew Bible**, Oxford: University Press, 1982, pp.6-7.
15. International Critical Commentary, **Romans, 2**, Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1979, p.545.
16. E.E. Ellis, **Op. cit.**, p.15.
17. **Ibid.**, p.4.
18. **Ibid.**, p.12.
19. A.T. Hanson, **Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology**, London: SPCK, 1974, p.148.
20. B. Lindars, **Op. cit.**, p.26.

21. International Critical Commentary, *Op. cit.*, p.58.
22. J.A. Bengel, *Gnomon of the New Testament*, vol.2, Edinburgh: T and T Clark, MDCLXXVII, pp.194 - 195.
23. Ellis, *Op. cit.*, p.99.
24. *Ibid.*, p.98.
25. Harris, *Op. cit.*
26. *Ibid.*, 2, p.1
27. *Ibid.*, p.2.
28. C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, London: Nisbet, 1952, p.26.
29. Ellis, *Op. cit.*, p.102.
30. Lindars, *Op. cit.*, p.12.
31. Hanson, *Op. cit.*, p.191.
32. *Ibid.*, p.193.
33. Harris, *Op. cit.*, 2. p.14.
34. *Ibid.*, p.19.
35. Ellis, *Op. cit.*, p.13.
36. H.B. Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge: University Press, 1902, p.395.
37. Ellis, *Op. cit.*, pp.4 - 5
38. Roberts, *Op. cit.*, p.104.
39. Shemaryhu Talmon, 'The Old Testament Text', *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol.1, 1970, p.185.

40. Ellis, *Op. cit.*, pp. 19 - 20.
41. *Ibid.*, p.19.
42. Ralph W. Klein, **Textual Criticism of the Old Testament from the Septuagint to Qumran**, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974, p.27.
43. James Barr, **Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament**, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
44. Talmon, *Op. cit.*, p. 168
45. Ellis, *Op. cit.*, p. 144.
46. International Critical Commentary, *Op. cit.*, vol.2, p.647.
47. Ellis, *Op. cit.* p.144.
48. W.D. Davies, **Paul and Rabbinic Judaism**, London: SCM, 1962.
49. E.P. Sanders, **Paul and Palestinian Judaism**, London: SCM, 1977.
50. Davies, *Op. cit.*, p.37.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 205.
52. *Ibid.*, p. 273.
53. Sanders, *Op. cit.*, p.86.
54. *Ibid.*, p.257.
55. Bruce M. Metzger, 'The Formulas Introducing Quotations in the OT and the Mishnah', **Journal of Biblical Literature**, vol.70, 1951, pp.297 - 307.
56. Fitzmyer, *Op. cit.*, pp. 297 - 333.