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SUMMARY

This dissertation examines to what extent the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts shows awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin, and to what extent this awareness played a role in the final formation of this manuscript’s text. The dissertation limits itself to explicit quotations from the Psalms, Isaiah and the Minor Prophets. Each explicit Old Testament quotation of these three books is discussed in the order of their appearance in Codex Bezae. In these discussions, special attention is paid to the layout of the text of the manuscript, the introductory formula of each explicit quotation and the text of each quotation as it appears in the codex. The aim of this discussion is to discern whether the variant readings and layout of the manuscript (i.e., variant as opposed to other Greek New Testament manuscripts) show Old Testament awareness or possible influence from the OT as opposed to the “initial” text of the New Testament. The variant readings of Codex Bezae are therefore measured against the pertinent Old Testament traditions (Hebrew, Greek and Latin). The aim of this investigation is to determine whether Old Testament awareness played any role in the formation of the text of Codex Bezae, not necessarily to solve textual difficulties in the given explicit quotations. By paying close attention to the awareness of the Old Testament in the Bezan tradition, an opportunity is afforded to glimpse into the stages of the transmission history of this text, to learn more about its users and the users of the text of previous manuscripts in its tradition, and to discover more about how the Old Testament was perceived in the early stages of Christianity.
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ABBREVIATIONS

Aside from the standard abbreviations for manuscripts and textual witnesses as found in eclectic editions of the New Testament and the Old Testament, the following abbreviations are used throughout the dissertation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHQ</td>
<td>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D05 / d05</td>
<td>Codex Bezae (Greek and Latin columns, respectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJD</td>
<td>Discoveries in the Judaean Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>Editio Critica Maior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fol</td>
<td>Folio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTF</td>
<td>Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung (Münster)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Lectionary (manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXX</td>
<td>Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LXXGött</td>
<td>Göttingen edition(s) of the Septuagint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA&lt;sup&gt;27&lt;/sup&gt; / NA&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; or 28&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; edition of Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Papyrus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>Migne’s Patrologia Graeca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Oxy.</td>
<td>Papyrus Oxyrhynchus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>Society of Biblical Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Westcott &amp; Hort</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 1:
Introduction

1. Introduction

The present study will attempt to answer the following question: **To what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text?**

Investigating the textual tradition of the New Testament remains a matter of prime concern for New Testament scholars. Not only the recovery of the “initial” text, but also the study of the transmission thereof shed precious light on the history of the early Church and the beginnings of Christianity.¹ Within this greater enterprise, the study of the textual differences of the Old Testament quotations in the New Testament finds its place.

Studies dealing with the textual tradition of the explicit quotations of the Old Testament in the New Testament are mainly concerned with the provenance of the quotations in the “initial” text of the New Testament; that is to say, the Old Testament Vorlagen used by the New Testament authors (e.g., in the case of Acts, Holtz 1968; Steyn 1995). In contrast, the subject of this study is the explicit Old Testament quotations in the Acts of the Apostles of a single bilingual manuscript, Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis.² The question which will be asked can be phrased as follows: **To**

---

¹ In recent years, there has been a shift of emphasis in the discipline of New Testament textual criticism. Traditionally, the aim of this discipline has only been to recover the “original” text, but scholars have lately begun to stress the importance of the history of the textual transmission itself, with special emphasis on the scribes and their interpretation of the text. See, for instance, Epp (2007), Aland (2007) and most recently Hill & Kruger (2012:3-5).
² Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (also known as simply Codex Bezae, or D05), occupies a special, albeit enigmatic, place amongst the array of witnesses to the Greek text of the New Testament. In their introduction to New Testament textual criticism, for instance, the Alands refer to this manuscript as “the most controversial of the New Testament uncial witnesses … ” (Aland & Aland 1989:109). This manuscript is generally dated to the fifth century CE (cf., for instance, the 28th edition of Nestle-Aland). Parker (1992:30), in his excellent monograph on the manuscript, concludes that it was produced circa 400 CE. Codex Bezae has a Greek text on each left hand page and a Latin text on the facing right hand page. The text has been divided into “sense-lines”, thus making the manuscript’s lines of frequently varying length. This division into sense-lines keeps the Greek and Latin texts in step – that is to say, any line of text will contain a text equivalent to the text on the same line on the facing page. Codex Bezae contains the text of the four canonical Gospels, Acts and a small part of 3 John. Despite the fact that the manuscript and its text
what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text? In other words, were the users and copyists of Codex Bezae aware of textual differences between the New Testament and Old Testament traditions in the case of the explicit quotations in Acts, and if so, did someone in the tradition change the text to fit with any known Old Testament tradition? Was there a specific Old Testament tradition to which the New Testament text was adapted? If the text was changed, how and when did this happen?

This chapter will set out the research problem, presuppositions, limitations and methodology by which this study will proceed.

1.1. Frequent abbreviations, references to Scripture and definitions

A number of abbreviations and terms will be used so frequently in this study that it is advisable to discuss them here, even before the research problem is set out in detail.3

The Greek side of Codex Bezae will be designated by D05 in the rest of this study. The Latin side will be designated by d05. The designation D05 will also be used as shorthand for both the Greek and Latin sides where the argument concerns the manuscript or the quotations of both texts as a whole. “New Testament” will be abbreviated as NT and “Old Testament” as OT.

Constant reference will be made to the Göttingen editions of the Greek OT’s text. These editions will be abbreviated as LXXGött; the respective editions and editors will not be named (e.g., Ziegler or Isaias), unless reference is made to the edition’s introduction. The edition referred to

---

3 These expressions are given here in bold type to facilitate recognition, but will appear as normal text in the rest of the study.
will always be clear from the context. The familiar designation NA\textsuperscript{28} will be used when reference is made to the twenty-eighth edition of the Nestle-Aland \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece} (and the same principle will apply to earlier editions of this text, e.g. NA\textsuperscript{27}). References to the Greek text of Westcott and Hort will be abbreviated as WH.\textsuperscript{4}

OT Scripture references will be given according to the use of the Septuagint. However, where a reference to Scripture differs in verse numbers in the Hebrew and Greek traditions, “LXX” will be added in brackets for the sake of clarity.

“D05 tradition” will refer to the transmission history of the manuscript’s Greek text as well as the Greek text on the manuscript itself. That is to say, the “D05 tradition” encapsulates D05’s Vorlage, D05’s Vorlage’s Vorlage, etc., down to the “initial” text of Acts. Similarly, “d05 tradition” will refer to the transmission history of d05. When reference is made to the “Greek NT tradition”, the evidence of Greek manuscript witnesses as a whole is intended. When reference is made to “a” tradition (e.g., “a Greek NT tradition”), the reading (i.e., the variation unit) or scribes (i.e., the users or copyists) of a NT manuscript or group of NT manuscripts in distinction to the rest of the tradition (e.g., “the Greek NT tradition”) is intended. Similarly, “Latin NT tradition”, “Greek OT tradition”, “Latin OT tradition” and “Hebrew tradition” will refer to the collected evidence and / or users of their respective transmission histories.

“OT awareness” will denote the degree to which a NT tradition, at any stage of its transmission history, is aware of a quotation stemming from the OT. This awareness of OT origin may be shown by the physical attributes of a manuscript such as diplés or indentation.\textsuperscript{5} OT awareness can also be shown by a variant reading peculiar to a NT manuscript or group of NT manuscripts if such a reading can be shown not to be original to the NT text, but a later adaptation to the text of an OT tradition instead. In other words, any subsequent change to the “initial” text of Acts toward an OT tradition, in so far this can be proven, will be regarded as showing awareness that the relevant text of Acts is a quotation from the OT.

\textsuperscript{4} Frequent reference to WH will be necessary as an indispensable study of the linguistic character of the Greek text of D05, namely that by James Donald Yoder (1958), took WH as base text against which the text of D05 was collated. The results of Yoder’s study must always be measured against this fact, and it seems prudent to remind the reader of it whenever reference is made to Yoder’s conclusions.

\textsuperscript{5} On diplés and indentation, see the discussion of the limitation of the present study to explicit quotations below.
The term “scribe” will be used to designate both copyists and users of manuscripts. When more precision is needed, the latter two terms will be employed. “Copyist” will refer to those individuals concerned with the production of the original text of a specific manuscript. The term “user”, on the other hand, will be used for those individuals who made use of a manuscript after its production. Copyists, being concerned with the mechanical process of copying the text, could conceivably have altered readings intentionally based on their previous knowledge of other texts, but this need not be the case. Users, who occupy themselves with everyday use and study of a manuscript, had more leisure to compare texts and make intentional changes to readings. Furthermore, something needs to be said about gender. While it is the general assumption, also of this study, that most scribes in the first centuries CE were men, it should not be forgotten that women scribes were occasionally active in the same practices as men.6 The choice for a masculine pronoun where the argument necessitates a singular in the discussion below is not to deny this fact, but merely based on probability.

A word on the representation of Greek letters in this study – and to some extent also Latin – will perhaps prevent puzzlement on the part of readers familiar with the Greek language. As this study will make frequent reference to both the texts and the “meta-data” of individual manuscripts, it seems prudent to partially mirror the type of letters used by these manuscripts. For this reason, the text of majuscule manuscripts8 will be represented with capital letters (e.g. ΕΘΝΕϹΙΝ), the text of miniscule manuscripts with unaccented Greek letters (e.g. εθνεσιν),9 and the text of eclectic editions with accented Greek letters (e.g. ἔθνεσιν). References to a Greek word as a semantic concept when not referring to a specific manuscript or set of manuscripts will

---

6 See Haines-Eitzen (2000:41-52), who convincingly amasses evidence for and provides a description of women as scribes in this period.
7 Any information a manuscript conveys aside from its text, e.g. markings on the page, the size of the folio, palaeographic details, can be labelled “meta-data” (Hurtado 2007:149-150). Larry Hurtado (2006) has made a plea for taking this information into account.
8 Including, of course, the papyri. The distinction between what is normally designated as papyri and majuscule rests on the type of material used for that specific manuscript.
9 Few miniscule manuscripts are in fact completely devoid of accents and punctuation. However, accentuation and punctuation are not consistent in miniscule manuscripts, and frequently not represented in the readings of text-critical apparatuses. It is therefore not always possible to discern the intended accentuation and punctuation of these manuscripts, and it has been deemed best to provide a consistent practice in this study of not supplying accentuation or punctuation for readings of these manuscripts. This approach will also help the reader to distinguish whether a concept or a real reading is intended in this study.
also be represented by accented text. Latin text will be italicised (e.g. *gentibus*), and the text of uncial Latin manuscripts will be capitalised (e.g. *GENTIBUS*).\(^{10}\)

1.2. Research problem

The research problem with which this study concerns itself can be stated, in the form of a question, as follows: *To what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text?* The discussion of this research problem will proceed by pointing out the evident indicators of OT awareness in the D05 text, after which an example will be given to illustrate the nature and the need of the research problem. Two different planes will then be identified that have to be addressed in answering this study’s research question.

1.2.1. Patent indicators of OT awareness in D05: layout and text

A possibly helpful but mostly neglected key in understanding the OT quotations in D05 is the manuscript’s *layout* – that is to say, the way the text has physically been arranged on the manuscript itself. At the time of its production, the Acts text of D05 shows clear awareness of OT quotations in its textual layout by way of indentation – albeit only for quotations from Isaiah and the Psalms (Parker 1992:32).\(^{11}\)

With regard to the manuscript’s *text* itself, D05 shows awareness that at least some of the explicit quotations stem from the OT. In Acts 13:33, for instance, awareness of OT origin is evident in

---

\(^{10}\) Readers familiar with Latin might also wonder about the Latin spelling with regard to *u* or *v* used in this study. The preference in the case of *u* and *v* will be for a clear indication of consonants, i.e., a *v* will be used in words such as *vos*. However, when a manuscript or the text of an edition is cited, the spelling of the original document will be upheld; e.g., *uos* for Wordsworth & White (1905:82) in Acts 7:42 or *UOS* in d05. An *i*, however, will always be represented by an *i* and not a *j*, irrespective of consonantal value (e.g., *iam*).

\(^{11}\) Parker (1992:32) notes the following indented quotations in Acts: 1:20; 2:25-28; 2:34-35; 4:25-26; 7:49; 13:33; 13:34 and 13:35. See also the discussion of diplés and indentation in passage concerning the limitation of this study to explicit quotations below.
D05’s addition of Psalm 2:8 to the quotation of Psalm 2:7.\textsuperscript{12} The addition of Psalm 2:8 was most likely prompted because the text of Acts 13:33 was known to be Psalm 2:7.

\textbf{1.2.2. The quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in D05’s Acts 13:47 as illustration of the research problem}

The interplay between the two indicators of OT awareness identified in the previous section, namely \textit{layout} of the manuscript’s text and the \textit{text} of the manuscript itself, has not received due consideration in the evaluation of the text of D05. At the same time, the possibility of changes occurring at different stages in the transmission history of the text has often been overlooked. These issues can best be illustrated by way of the example of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in D05’s Acts 13:47.\textsuperscript{13} For the sake of comparison, the following table lists the text of Acts 13:47b in D05 and \textit{NA}\textsuperscript{28} (which reads the same as B03), and Isaiah 49:6 in \textit{LXXGött}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts 13:47b (D05)</th>
<th>ΙΔΟΥ ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ ΣΕ ΤΟΙϹ ΕΘΝΕϹΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΨΕ ΕΙϹ ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑΝ ΕΩϹ ΕϹΧΑΤΟΥ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:47b</td>
<td>τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἑθνῶν τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐκφώς ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{NA}\textsuperscript{28} (= B03)</td>
<td>ιδού τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἑθνῶν τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐκφώς ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah 49:6 (LXXGött)</td>
<td>ιδού τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἑθνῶν τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐκφώς ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In an admirable study on the “short” (i.e., a text similar to Codex Vaticanus (B03)) and “long” (i.e., D05) texts of Acts, Delebecque (1986:211; cf. Ropes 1926:128; Zahn 1927:452, footnote 38; Holtz 1968:32-33; Delebecque 1986:296) comments on this quotation, drawing the following conclusion.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{12} See the discussion of the quotation of Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 in the chapter on the Old Testament quotations from Psalms in D05 below.

\textsuperscript{13} For a fuller discussion of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in D05’s Acts 13:47, see the discussion in the chapter on the Old Testament quotations from Isaiah in D05 below.

\textsuperscript{14} Compare the similar statement made by Ropes (1926:128): “[T]he ‘Western’ text altered the form by adding ιδού (LXX; not Hebrew), by improving the barbarous εἰς φῶς ἑθνῶν το φῶς τοις ἐθνεσιν, and by giving φῶς a more prominent position.”
En 13, 47 le texte court emploie un hébraïsme qui est dans le Septante, Isaïe 49, 6, τέθεικά σε είς φῶς ἐθνῶν, « je t’ai établi comme lumière des païens ». L’auteur de D, en supprimant la préposition εἰς, rend à l’attribut son caractère grec normal mais, comme s’il voulait rendre aussi à la citation un peu de son caractère hébraïque, rétablit au début du verset l’habituel ἰδού, « vois », que le texte court avait supprimé.

There is no prima facie evidence to speak against Delebecque’s assertion. However, it could be questioned whether someone who showed such little regard for both NT and OT text would change the text in such a drastic way – for if Delebecque’s assumption that the same person was responsible for adding ΙΔΟΥ and changing the Greek into a more acceptable style, this person must have known the OT reading. It is more likely that someone in the D05 tradition first recognised Acts 13:47b as a quotation from Isaiah 49:6 and added ἰδού, while the remainder of the changes to the D05 tradition was made at a later stage by someone not recognising Acts 13:47b as a quotation. Moreover, quite different from the other extant explicit Isaiah quotations in the text of D05’s Acts, the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 is not indented in D05. If the change in the text had been made at the time of the production of the manuscript with an awareness of the text stemming from the OT, one would expect the text to be indented. Consequently, the text of Acts 13:47, as it appears on the manuscript of D05, offers a glimpse into at least two, possibly three stages in the D05 tradition.

1.2.3. Explicit OT quotations at the time of D05’s production

Flowing from the example of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in D05’s Acts 13:47 above, it is clear that the tradition of the explicit quotations in D05 needs to be investigated on two planes. The first plane is that of the production of the manuscript itself; that is to say, what can be known about the scribe’s way of copying explicit OT quotations, how the text was printed on the manuscript (including in which layout the text was printed), and what could have been known to the scribe at the time of the manuscript’s production.

Explicit quotations or allusions to the OT in the Gospels or text of D05’s Acts occurring earlier than the quotation in question must, for instance, have been known to the scribe, as they would
have been copied onto the manuscript already and have been available on D05’s Vorlage. That these other quotations or allusions as it appears in D05 had been available to the scribe of D05 is one of few “facts” in the precarious terrain of the textual history of D05’s tradition. For this reason, other quotations of or allusions to the OT in the Gospel or Acts which overlaps with the OT passages’ text quoted in the explicit quotations in D05’s Acts should be kept in mind while investigating the explicit quotations in D05.

Is there any relation between the physical layout of the manuscript and the content of the text it conveys? Does the other outstanding phenomenon in the layout of D05, the division of the text into paragraphs by ekthesis, hold another clue to the scribe or tradition’s handling of quotations stemming from the OT? These questions should also be addressed by a thorough investigation of the text of each OT explicit quotation as it was drawn on D05 by the scribe at the time of the manuscript’s production, coupled with an investigation of the D05 tradition.

1.2.4. Explicit OT quotations during the course of D05’s transmission history

The second plane on which the investigation must proceed, is that of the tradition of the text itself. This plane concerns the history of the text from the “initial” text up to the point of being written in D05 (or D05’s Vorlage). Whereas the first plane has to do with an almost static point in time (the D05 text in its final stage), this second plane has to do with a period of time as a whole. What happened to the text during this time is much harder to define, but an attempt will be made to explain the text’s development by analysing the text of D05 with regard to other NT and OT traditions.

The second plane of this study is thus concerned with how the D05 tradition changed from the “initial” text to D05 itself. This bold statement needs to be tempered at the outset. What the author of Acts really wrote is perhaps beyond our grasp; the only glimpse into how the tradition changed is offered by the differences between D05 and other NT manuscripts. For this reason, D05 needs to be compared to other NT manuscripts, and not a critical text. The opportunity to do so has been afforded by the upcoming Editio Critica Maior (ECM) of the Acts of the Apostles. The Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) in Münster has been kind enough to
provide the data gathered for the ECM of the collated Greek manuscripts for the verses in which explicit OT quotations occur in D05. This thorough treatment of the Greek NT tradition makes the Greek text of D05 a good starting point in an investigation of the history behind the readings of the explicit OT quotations in D05. As the *Vetus Latina* edition of Acts is unfortunately still in preparation, the focus of this study will be on the Greek text of D05. To fully understand the growth of the explicit quotations of the OT text in D05, however, the Latin NT tradition should also be considered.

1.2.5. Summary of the research problem

In light of the discussion of the research problem above, it is clear that D05 shows awareness of the OT in its layout and text, and that only a full investigation of possible knowledge of OT awareness at the time of the manuscript’s production *combined with* an investigation of the textual character of the explicit OT quotations will answer the research question posed by this study, namely, *to what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text?*

1.3. Presuppositions and limitations

In order to ensure a manageable and controlled study, certain presuppositions of this study will have to be drawn from previous scholarly work on D05. By the same token, certain limitations on this study will have to be put in place. These presuppositions and limitations will be clarified below.

---

15 The present author, of course, assumes responsibility for any misreadings of this data, which has been supplied to the author in a raw format.
1.3.1. Presuppositions with regard to the textual history of D05

Two presuppositions with regard to the textual history of D05 with which this study will proceed need to be stated explicitly.

a) This study will take the reworked nature of the D05 tradition as a presupposition. That is to say, the model and mode of thought with which this study will proceed, is that the D05 text is – broadly speaking – secondary to the “initial” text of Acts. That is not to deny the possibility that the D05 text could have retained, in some instances, the “initial” text of Acts. Each reading of D05 will therefore have to be evaluated in its own right. To avoid undue characterisation of readings – also of manuscripts other than D05 – as secondary, terms such as “omission” and “addition” will be used sparingly. Rather, the circumlocution “equivalent to” or “has no equivalent” will be preferred. The use of the term “equivalent” to describe readings within a variation unit will result in a more descriptive assessment of these readings, rather than prejudged conclusions.

b) The presupposition that the Greek and Latin texts of D05 originally stem from two different Vorlagen, i.e., that one is not simply a translation of the other, will be upheld. This is the position of Parker (1992:248-249), after an extensive codicological study of the manuscript. Parker’s proposition has been met with general recognition.

---

16 The textual history of Acts is complicated. The latest comprehensive model of the growth of D05’s (and the “Western”) text is that offered by Georg Gäbel (2011). Gäbel (2011:151) shows that what has been called the “Western” text-type of Acts shows a marked reworking and reuse of old readings, to such an extent that “the relationship between these variants cannot be described in terms of linear development.” Gäbel’s aim is, of course, not to discourage discussion on the “Western” text or the text of D05, nor to dissuade any attempt to understand the development of the manuscript’s transmission history. In any case, as has been shown in the example of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 above, at least some of the stages in the manuscript’s transmission history are discernable.

17 The question of the relationship between the Greek and Latin columns of D05 has received quite a lot of attention. Broadly, scholarly opinions on the relationship between the two texts can be divided into two groups: those who argue for a translation theory, in which one of the two texts was a translation of the other, with minor influences from other textual traditions, and those who favour an adaption theory, in which one of the two texts was adapted to the other. For the research history of the relationship between the two columns, see Panten (1995). For a recent view, albeit before Parker’s study, that D05’s Latin column is a “sklavische Übertragung” of the Greek, or at least of as much worth as such a slavish translation, see Fischer (1972:41). More recently, however, Rius-Camps (1996:290), after studying the first four chapters of Acts, has confirmed Parker’s proposition that the texts stem from different Vorlagen and even concludes that “il semble bien que nous sommes en possession de deux témoins … dans le même codex oncial.” See also Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2004:14).
1.3.2. **The designation of manuscripts, witnesses and textual groupings**

Manuscripts and witnesses will be designated by the sigla chosen by the respective editions from which they were gleaned. The only exception to this rule will be א01, A02 and B03, which will be indicated by their (NT) Gregory-Aland designations (instead of their OT designations – S, A and B). This will be done to facilitate comparison of the OT and NT readings occurring in the same manuscript. In the case of Greek NT manuscripts, the Gregory-Aland system will be used, with both siglum and number for uncial manuscripts (e.g. B03 for Codex Vaticanus) and an “l” placed before the Gregory-Aland number of lectionary manuscripts.

As the available editions for each group of OT quotations vary, the editions which were consulted for each group of OT quotations will be given at the start of each respective chapter of the present study. Generally, previous work on the textual groupings will be accepted as they are presented in these editions (e.g., OT manuscripts identified as belonging to a Lucianic group will be treated as such). For instance, when quoting manuscript evidence from the LXXGött, hyphens between manuscript sigla will be kept intact to indicate related witnesses.

1.3.3. **Limitation of this study to explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah**

The present study will consider only the text of those quotations in the text of D05 marked with explicit introductory formulae (e.g. “as it is written”). These introductory formulae, which have in the past frequently been considered “textual markers” to indicate OT quotations (cf. Steyn 1995:25), have recently been reaffirmed to direct users of manuscripts to the OT by studies on the diplés in the early manuscripts (Schmid 2010b; Schmid 2010c; Schmid 2010d; Sigismund 2010a). The table below is a summary of the occurrences of diplés in Codex Sinaiticus (א01), Codex Alexandrinus (A02) and Codex Vaticanus (B03). The diplés were clearly used to

---

18 In the case of א01, quotations were also indicated by the use of the paragraphus (Schmid 2010b:89), a horizontal line drawn at the left hand margin between the lines of a manuscript’s text.
19 See the respective studies of Schmid (2010b; 2010c) and Sigismund (2010a) for more detailed information and tables, including the number of lines marked with diplés for each quotation. Schmid (2010c) also investigated the occurrence of diplés in the text of Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (C04), but because of the state of preservation of this fifth century CE palimpsest and the unsatisfactory quality of the photos at Schmid’s disposal merely led to a
indicate OT quotations in these manuscripts, as the table below shows. In the case of א01 and B03, the diplés were most likely added during the production of the manuscript (cf. Schmid 2010b:87; 2010c:99), while the exact stage when diplés were added to A02, though manifestly early, is less certain. For this reason, the data is presented in the order א01 – B03 – A02 in the table. The blocks appearing in grey in the table are not extant in D05, but have been included for the sake of a complete overview. The table also includes D05’s indentation for the sake of comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Quotation from:</th>
<th>א01</th>
<th>B03</th>
<th>A02</th>
<th>D05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diplés</td>
<td>Diplés</td>
<td>Diplés</td>
<td>Indentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ps 68:26 (LXX); 108:8 (LXX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:17-21</td>
<td>Joel 3:1-5 (LXX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25-28</td>
<td>Ps 15:8-11 (LXX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:34-35</td>
<td>Ps 109:1 (LXX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:22-23</td>
<td>Dt 18:15-20; Lev 23:29</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:25</td>
<td>Gn 22:18; 26:4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25-26</td>
<td>Ps 2:1-2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:3</td>
<td>Gn 12:1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:6-7</td>
<td>Gn 15:13 / Ex 2:22</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:27-28</td>
<td>Ex 2:14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:32</td>
<td>Ex 3:15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:33-34</td>
<td>Ex 3:5; Ex 3:7-8.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problemanzeige. The diplès are, however, present for at least the following verses in Acts: 3:25 (the reading as found in Schmid – i.e. “13:25” – is a misprint, as can be deduced from the location of the reading in the table); 7:32; 7:33-34; 7:37; 7:40; 7:42-43; 7:49-50; 8:32-33; 13:41; 13:47; 15:16-18. This does not exclude the probability that other quotations and or verses without quotations in this manuscript had been marked.

20 In the case of א01, the diplès were most probably added during the production of the manuscript, but at a later stage than the text itself was written (Schmid 2010b:90-91). That is to say, the diplès were added after the complete manuscript was written, but by the same group of scribes responsible for the manuscript’s production.

21 Only two instances where diplès occur, Acts 13:22 and 26:23, are not identifiable as a direct quotation from the OT, indicated by a question mark in the table below. In both cases, the marked lines are preceded by phraseology similar to introductory formulae. It should be noted that the marked instance of Acts 26:23 in א01 was not produced by the same scribe as the rest of the markings in the manuscript (Schmid 2010b:89-90). In one instance, Acts 17:28 in B03, the quotation is not from the OT, but from Aratus, *Phaenomena* 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Quotation from:</th>
<th>א01</th>
<th>B03</th>
<th>A02</th>
<th>D05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diplés</td>
<td>Diplés</td>
<td>Diplés</td>
<td>Indentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:37</td>
<td>Dt 18:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>Ex 32:1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:42-43</td>
<td>Amos 5:25-27 (LXX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:49-50</td>
<td>Is 66:1-2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:32-33</td>
<td>Is 53:7-8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:22</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:33</td>
<td>Ps 2:7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:34</td>
<td>Is 55:3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>Ps 15:10 (LXX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:41</td>
<td>Hab 1:5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:47</td>
<td>Is 49:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16-18</td>
<td>Amos 9:11-12 (LXX)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:28</td>
<td>Aratus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:5</td>
<td>Ex 22:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:23</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:26-27</td>
<td>Is 6:9-10</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of א01, the sources of some of the OT quotations were added in the manuscript’s margin (e.g., ψαλμω ΡΘ was added next to the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35). The identification of these OT quotations seems to have been called forth by the use of introductory formulae in the text of the manuscript (Sigismund 2010b:149). How early this practice started with regard to the NT is somewhat of an open question, but א01 and B03

---


23 In a summary of the investigation’s findings, Sigismund (2010b:149) states: “Die Analyse ergab codexübergreifend, dass Zitat-Einleitungsformeln . . . Auslöser oder zumindest unterstützende Motivation für die Auszeichnung von Zitaten sind.”

24 Schmid (2010a:78) did not find any markings of OT quotations in NT manuscripts earlier than א01. He notes, however, that the earliest Christian use of the diplé to mark a quotation can be found in P. Oxy. III 405, dated by Grenfell & Hunt (1903:10) to circa 200 CE. The diplés in this text of Irenaeus’s *Adversus Haereses* (3.9) (cf.
offer proof that at least some manuscripts in the latter half of the fourth century CE were produced with an amount of OT awareness partially based on the introductory formulae of the explicit quotations in Acts. The indentation found in D05 is analogous to the use of the diplé in α01, A02 and B03, as indentation was the normal method of indication of quotations in Latin manuscripts (Parker 1992:10; Schmid 2010a:79, following McGurk 1961:6). All of the indented quotations in D05’s Acts are introduced by introductory formulae. Consequently, the same principle of identification by way of introductory formula seems to underlie the D05 tradition’s indication of OT quotations.

The quotations from the Pentateuch in Acts 7 form part of the narrative summary of the history of Israel as presented in Stephen’s speech (Acts 7:2b-50). This material has only been supplied with diplés in B03 (except for the quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15, which has been indented in A02 but not in B03). This shows a lesser degree of OT awareness among early users of these manuscripts; probably on account of the nature of these quotations, which have been interwoven with the narrative as presented in Acts 7:2b-50. The text of these quotations is also more difficult to pinpoint exactly, as many of the quotations seem to be conflations rather than direct quotations of the text of an OT tradition (cf. the quotations in Acts 7:32 and Acts 7:33-34). The two explicit quotations from the Pentateuch in Acts 3:22-23 and Acts 3:25 likewise appear to be conflations of different OT texts. A study of the explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in D05 would therefore require a different methodology than the rest of the explicit quotations. For this reason, the quotations from the Pentateuch in Acts D05 will not be addressed in this study.

In light of the above, the limitation of this study to explicit quotations to investigate the most likely places of OT awareness (and subsequent changes to the text of the NT based on an OT text) in a manuscript appears to be valid against the evidence provided by ancient users. This investigation will also have to take into account those explicit quotations in D05 which have not been indented, as the introductory formulae could, at some point in the D05 tradition, have prompted someone to recognise an OT quotation. The following table documents the explicit

---

Grenfell & Hunt 1904:264) are intended to point out a quotation from the NT (Matthew 3:16-17), although this text contains a clear allusion to Psalm 2:7.

25 The use of this Latin practice is not strange, as the scribe of D05 was evidently “one who was trained in the Latin tradition” (Parker 1992:23). See the discussion in Parker (1992:7-23) for more examples of Latin practices in D05, e.g. the position of the quire signatures (p. 9).
quotations found in the text of D05, with their introductory formulae. The explicit quotations from the Pentateuch have been included in this table for the sake of a complete overview. The quotation in Acts 7:33-34 has been included as this quotation could have been perceived as an explicit quotation in an earlier form in the D05 tradition.²⁶ The introductory formulae of explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in D05 have been shaded in the table to indicate that they will not form part of the present study. The present study will be limited to the quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05, the rows of which have not been shaded in the table below. Note the similarity of all these quotations, chosen on a textual basis only (i.e., without reference to the meta-data such as diplés and indentations provided by the manuscripts), with the evidence in the previous table.²⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Bulk of quotation from:</th>
<th>Introductory formula in D05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ps 68:26 (LXX)</td>
<td>ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ps 108:8 (LXX)</td>
<td>(Ps 108:8 (LXX) shares the introductory formula with that of Ps 68:26 (LXX) as quoted above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25-28</td>
<td>Ps 15:8-11 (LXX)</td>
<td>ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΓΑΡ ΛΕΓΕΙ EI (sic) ΑΥΤΟΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:34-35</td>
<td>Ps 109:1 (LXX)</td>
<td>ΟΥ ΓΑΡ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΑΝΕΒΗ ΕΙϹ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥϹ / ΕΙΡΗΚΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΑΥΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:22-23</td>
<td>Dt 18:15-20 / Lev 23:29</td>
<td>ΜΩΥϹΗϹ ΜΕΝ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΠΡΟϹ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥϹ ΠΑΤΕΡΑϹ ΗΜΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:25</td>
<td>Gn 22:18; 26:4</td>
<td>ΛΕΙϹΩΝ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²⁶ Compare the text of NA²⁸’s Acts 7:31b (read by most manuscripts – ἐγένετο φωνή κυρίου) with D05’s Ο ΚΣΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΛΕΙϹΩΝ and NA²⁸’s Acts 7:33a (also read by most manuscripts – εἶπεν δὲ σιτὰρ ο κύριος) with D05’s ΚΑΙ ΕΤΕΝΕΤΟ ΦΩΝΗ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ. Although seemingly transposed in its current state, the D05 tradition’s version could possibly have read similar to a text such as NA²⁸ at some point in its transmission history.

²⁷ The only text not marked with diplés among the cumulated evidence of א⁰¹, א⁰² and ב⁰³ is the quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:35. The same OT text, however, is quoted in Acts 7:27-28, so awareness of this text as a quotation from the OT cannot be excluded in the transmission history of these manuscripts. The quotations of Isaiah 53:7-8 in Acts 8:32-33, Exodus 22:27 in Acts 23:5 and Isaiah 6:9-10 are not extant in D05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Bulk of quotation from:</th>
<th>Introductory formula in D05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:25-26</td>
<td>Ps 2:1-2 (LXX)</td>
<td>ὍϹ ΔΙΑ ΠΙΝϹ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΣΤΟΜΑΤΟϹ ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ / ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΠΑΙΔΟϹ ΑΥΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:3</td>
<td>Gn 12:1</td>
<td>ΕΠΙΕΝ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:6-7</td>
<td>Gn 15:13-14 / Ex 2:22</td>
<td>ΕΛΑΛΗϹΕΝ ΕϹ ΟΥΤΩϹ Ω ΘϹ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:27-28</td>
<td>Ex 2:14</td>
<td>Ο ΔΕ ΑΔΙΚΩΝ ΤΟΝ ΠΛΗϹΙΟΝ / ΑΠΩϹΑΤΟ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΠΙΑϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:32*</td>
<td>Ex 3:6.15-16</td>
<td>Ο ΚϹ ΕΠΙΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΛΕΓΩΝ (Acts 7:31b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:33-34*</td>
<td>Ex 3:5; Ex 3:7-8.10</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΦΩΝΗ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>Ex 2:14</td>
<td>ΤΟΥΤΟΝ ΤΟΝ ΜΩΥϹΗΝ / ΟΝ ΗΡΝΗϹΑΝΤΟ ΕΠΙΟΝΤΕϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:37</td>
<td>Dt 18:15</td>
<td>ΟΥΤΩϹ ΕΠΙϹ ΜΩΥϹΗϹ Ω ΕΠΙΑϹ ΤΟΙϹ ΥΙΟΙϹ ΊϹΡΑΗΛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>Ex 32:1.23</td>
<td>ΕΠΙΟΝΤΕϹ ΤΩ ΑΑΡΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:42-43</td>
<td>Amos 5:25-27 (LXX)</td>
<td>ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΙΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:33</td>
<td>Ps 2:7-8</td>
<td>ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΡΩΤΩ ΨΆΛΜΩ ΓΕΓΡΑΙΤΑΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:34</td>
<td>Is 55:3-4</td>
<td>ΟΥΤΩϹ ΕΙΡΗΚΕΝ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>Ps 15:10 (LXX)</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΤΕΡΩϹ ΛΕΓΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:41</td>
<td>Hab 1:5</td>
<td>ΤΟ ΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΙΤΑΙ (Acts 13:40b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:47</td>
<td>Is 49:6</td>
<td>ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΤΕΤΑΛΚΕΝ Ω ΚϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16-18</td>
<td>Amos 9:11-12 (LXX)</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΥΤΩϹ ΣΥΝΦΩΝΗϹΟΥϹΙΝ / ΟΙ ΛΟΓΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΙΤΑΙ (Acts 15:15b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28 The extent of this introductory formula may include the preceding text, but a new clause is clearly introduced by ΟΥΤΩϹ. See also Bock’s (1987:248) argument for the repunctuation of Acts 13:33-35 (in the “initial” text). Bock proposes, for instance, that a full stop should precede οὕτως in Acts 13:34.
1.3.4. Limitations and presuppositions with regard to the codicological and palaeographical study of D05

Although this study will make frequent reference to palaeographical features of D05, it is not an attempt to revise previous codicological and palaeographical studies of the manuscript. The conclusions of the comprehensive codicological study of David Parker (1992)\(^\text{29}\) will be taken as correct, unless explicitly stated otherwise.\(^\text{30}\) Parker drew conclusions about the *Vorlage* of D05 that will have implications for this study; the most important find in this regard is Parker’s (1992:81-82) conclusion that both the Greek and the Latin texts of Acts are derived from a different *Vorlage* than the text of the Gospels.\(^\text{31}\) This *Vorlage* of D05’s Acts, according to Parker, was also a bilingual manuscript divided into sense-lines. Furthermore, Parker (1992:85) was able to assess that the sense-lines of this *Vorlage* of Acts were mostly kept intact when copied to Codex Bezae.

1.3.5. Limitations with regard to the correctors of D05

As the present study is interested in the history of the D05 tradition up to the point of the manuscript’s production, correctors, as identified by Scrivener (1864:429-447) and Parker (1992:121-163), will be noted in the footnotes, but the impact of their corrections on the text of D05 will not be discussed in depth.\(^\text{32}\) The only exception will be corrections made by corrector G, whom Parker (1992:30, 125-130) has identified as having had access to the manuscript which served as *Vorlage* for D05.\(^\text{33}\) This provides a glimpse even earlier than D05 in the D05 tradition

\(^{29}\) Parker’s study has been well received and “will, without doubt, remain for many generations the definitive codicological study of the manuscript” (Ehrman & Metzger 2005:70). Parker (2003) reiterates many of his statements in a later essay and gives a summary in his recent handbook, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts* (2008:289).

\(^{30}\) This study will further assume that, unless Parker indicates otherwise, he is in agreement with the older study of D05 by Scrivener (1864). Parker’s corrections to Scrivener’s transcription can be found in Parker (1992:287-290) and his corrections to Scrivener’s notes in Parker (1992:291-297).

\(^{31}\) Arriving at a similar conclusion with regard to the translator of the Latin based on linguistic arguments were Clark (1922:205-210) and Stone (1946:65-66). The latter’s full treatment of the linguistic anomalies in d05 is still invaluable to any investigation which concerns the usage of Latin in the manuscript.

\(^{32}\) Parker’s (1992:37-49) dating for the correctors will be accepted. Apart from G, which was contemporaneous with the production of D05, Parker dates A, B and C to the first half of the fifth century, D, E, F, J and H to the latter half of the fifth century, and all the other correctors later than the fifth century.

\(^{33}\) Apart from Parker, also see Stone (1946:11) for a summary of the proposed dates for corrector G. Stone cautiously follows Burkitt (1901-1902:505-506), contra Kenyon (1899-1900:296), in assigning corrector G to a
(to D05’s *Vorlage*) and makes the corrections by corrector G of especial importance in understanding the D05 tradition.

1.3.6. Limitation with regard to OT quotations and allusions

This study will use the NA²⁸ list of *loci citati vel allegati* (Appendix III), which has been revised for the 28ᵗʰ edition, as source for quotations and allusions to the OT. The choice of this list is not unproblematic, as the nature of some of these quotations and allusions are debated and will be continued to be debated, but it is assumed that any clear quotation or allusion from the OT would at least have been noticed and added to this list. The list will provide a satisfactory degree of accuracy for the purposes of the present study.

1.3.7. Limitations with regard to hermeneutics

The aim of this study is not to understand the hermeneutics of the explicit OT quotations within their context in the text of D05. Although such a study will be fascinating in itself, the function of the explicit OT quotations within their context in D05 will only be remarked upon in passing, or when the context of the explicit OT quotation in D05’s text will help elucidate the transmission history or degree of OT awareness in the D05 tradition.

1.4. Research History

The amount of labor exerted over the problem of the Western text, whose chief representative is Codex Bezae, is staggering and the complexity and variety of solutions offered can cause one to be dizzy (Yoder 1958:16). 

---

period simultaneous with the production of D05. Kenyon (1899-1900:296), in turn, in a review article of the 1899 facsimile edition of D05, had reassigned to the seventh century the very late date for corrector G offered by Scrivener (1864:xxvi) (eleventh century).
The remark above, found at the beginning of Yoder’s thoroughgoing study of the linguistic nature of the D05 Greek text, is even more valid today, more than half a century later.\textsuperscript{34} The research history of the whole of Codex Bezae up to 1995, with special emphasis on Acts, has been treated at length in the dissertation of \textbf{Kenneth E. Panten} (1995). The mere fact that a whole dissertation can be devoted to such an enterprise should alert the reader to the large amount of research that has already been done on this manuscript. As Panten thoroughly discusses every aspect of research on the manuscript up to 1992, only a succinct overview of the studies dealing with the explicit quotations of the OT in Acts in D05 – or especially pertinent to the research question at hand – will be given here.\textsuperscript{35} It is worthy of note that Panten’s (1995:218-366) analysis of the research history up to 1992 does not include a section on the explicit OT quotations in D05 (or any discussion of the subsequent influence of the OT on the D05 tradition, for that matter). As Panten’s categories grew out of his analysis of previous research on D05, his lack of any discussion of the explicit OT quotations in the manuscript provides the most salient testimony for the need of the present study.

The first study that needs to be mentioned is that of \textbf{Willam Kemp Lowther Clarke} (1922). In a study on the use of the Septuagint in Acts as part of the \textit{Beginnings of Christianity} series,\textsuperscript{36} Clarke compared the unique vocabulary of D05 against the Septuagint. Clarke concludes that, at least with regard to the use of vocabulary, “the evidence … does not suggest any marked difference between the α [i.e. “Alexandrian”] and β [i.e. D05] texts in their relation towards the LXX.” Clarke did not attempt an in-depth comparison of the text of the explicit quotations of D05 (or the “Alexandrian” text) with different manuscripts of the Greek OT tradition, nor did he take into account the possible influence of the Latin NT and Latin OT traditions on the text of D05 in the text of the explicit OT quotations.

\textsuperscript{34} Yoder’s (1961) concordance to the Greek text of D05 remains valid today, and was much consulted in the writing of the present study.

\textsuperscript{35} For a more general survey of studies dealing with the explicit OT quotations in Acts, including the text-critical aspects thereof, see Steyn (1995). More recently, Rusam (2003) and Meek (2008) provide useful bibliographies of general studies of the explicit OT quotations in Acts, although there subject matter differs from that of the present study.

\textsuperscript{36} Only Part I (Acts) of \textit{The Beginnings of Christianity} series was ever published. Clarke’s contribution is in Volume 2 of this series. The contribution by Ropes (1926), as will be discussed below, formed Volume 3 of the same series.
In the same series, published four years later, James Hardy Ropes (1926) provided an edition of the text of Acts, accompanied by a thorough study of text-critical matters. Although Ropes upheld the primacy of the “Alexandrian” text, he nevertheless printed the Greek of D05 (as the prime witness to the “Western” tradition) on the right hand side of each page of his edition. Facing the text of D05, on the left hand side of each page, was the text of B03, which Ropes considered the prime witness of the “Alexandrian” tradition. Ropes provided a (useful albeit limited) apparatus for each of these two texts, containing commentary on the text itself as footnotes. Ropes’s study is especially useful as it provided a systematic study of the text of Acts, including each explicit OT quotation. However, Ropes did not have at his disposal a text as thorough as LXXGött. Moreover, although Ropes paid due attention to the Latin NT tradition, he did not consult the Latin OT tradition (nor would it have been an easy task, as the Vetus Latina editions of the Old Testament and the Vulgate editions prepared by the Benedictine Abbey of St. Jerome in Rome had not been published at this early stage).

A few years after Ropes, Albert C. Clark (1933) published a critical edition of Acts, of which the text was based on the “Western” text (primarily D05). Clark was convinced that the text of D05 in essence preserved the original text of Acts, and that the shorter version (i.e. the “Alexandrian” version) originated through the loss of whole sense-lines of a text similar to D05. Clark’s theory did not meet with universal approval, but the usefulness of his extensive notes – in which he frequently discusses the explicit OT quotations in Acts – transcends his theory.

The first systematic study of the explicit quotations of the OT as found in D05 was offered by Lucien Cerfaux (1950) in the form of a nine page essay. Although the title of his essay creates the impression that he is dealing with explicit quotations of the OT in the whole text of Acts, Cerfaux was mostly concerned with the explicit OT quotations in Acts as found in B03 and D05. He did, however, make frequent reference to other manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition and

---

39 Ropes also did not have access to the important manuscripts later found at Qumran.
40 For a summary of Clark’s position and his study, see Panten (1995:168-177).
41 See, for instance, the convincing counterargument for Clark’s theory by Kenyon (1938:passim).
42 The title of Cerfaux’s essay is Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Actes.
consulted the critical apparatus of Acts provided by Ropes (see above). Cerfaux proposed to use the text of the “LXX” as a fixed point against which the readings of the text of Acts can be measured. Fully aware of the fact that there is not only one homogenous text of the Greek OT tradition, Cerfaux made extensive use of LXXGött. He further made a plea that the context of OT quotations should be borne in mind, and that some variant readings should be considered in unison rather than separately. However, Cerfaux did not take the Latin text of d05 into account.43 Cerfaux proceeded in a systematic manner, first discussing those quotations which appear to be direct, non-conflated quotations (including quotations from the Psalms, Isaiah and the Minor Prophets), and then the quotations which appear to be conflations (including quotations from the Pentateuch, the Psalms, Isaiah and the Minor Prophets). Cerfaux ends his essay on a very positive note towards the text of the explicit OT quotations in Acts in D05. The text of this manuscript, according to him, stems from the time when the NT documents were still being collected, while a text such as B03 stems from much later and is the product of revision by the Alexandrian school. However, Cerfaux’s analysis suffers from a lack of critical discussion with regard to some of his text-critical choices. To be fair, the format of his study – an essay of merely nine pages – precluded him from thorough discussion. He furthermore relies too heavily on the text of Scrivener without an in-depth analysis of the textual layout of D05.

**Ernst Haenchen** (1954) explicitly objected to Cerfaux’s essay (see above) in a journal article bearing the same title as Cerfaux’s essay.44 Assessing the text of the explicit OT quotations in D05 as a secondary development, Haenchen generally arrived at different conclusions than Cerfaux. Although his methods aren’t explained in great depth (again on account of space – his article is a mere fifteen pages long), he does provide somewhat more of a methodology than Cerfaux. Furthermore, Haenchen occasionally takes d05 into account, as well as the nature of D05 as a bilingual manuscript (although only where he deems it applicable). However, similar to Cerfaux, Haenchen does not take the layout of D05 or the physical text as it appears on the

---

43 Cerfaux was furthermore hampered by the lack of accessible data on the recently discovered Qumran manuscripts at the time of his study.

44 Haenchen (1954:154) makes explicit mention of his taking over of Cerfaux’s title, indicating his desire to readdress the evidence. As Haenchen’s article was written in German, it bears the name *Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte.*
manuscript into consideration. He also did not inquire into the possibility of influence by the Latin OT tradition on the text of D05 (and d05). 45

A study worth mentioning, although it deals only partially with the explicit OT quotations in Acts in D05, 46 is that of George Dunbar Kilpatrick (1963). Kilpatrick, a noteworthy proponent of the eclectic method, 47 presented a number of solutions to text-critical issues in Acts based on his method. Kilpatrick’s study, with his high regard for internal evidence, purports to give the text of any manuscript a fair judgement. This stance of Kilpatrick led him to believe that D05, in many instances, preserve the “initial” text. Kilpatrick did not take into account the physical properties of D05, and did not pursue questions of the use of the OT in this manuscript as a whole, as his interest lay with the “initial” text.

Although Jan de Waard (1966) did not do a focused study on the explicit OT quotations in Acts in D05, his work on the text of the OT quotations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the text of the explicit OT quotations in the NT was the first to comprehensively take note of the manuscript findings in the Judaean Desert. De Waard did not draw conclusions with regard to the D05 text, but his study is indispensable for a study on the text of the explicit quotations in Acts in any manuscript of the NT. De Waard’s study is somewhat dated as subsequent editions of the Dead Sea Scrolls have subsequently seen the light, but his detailed discussion remains useful.

In a fairly short essay (8 pages, including notes and a table) published in a Festschrift dedicated to Paul Schubert, Albertus Frederik Johannes Klijn (1966) provided a summary of the research history on the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21, together with its introductory formula in Acts 2:16. Klijn used the research and its results on this text as an example of the text-critical methodologies applied to the text of Acts in general. Klijn’s essay, as

45 As Haenchen wrote only four years after Cerfau, his access to the text of the Qumran manuscripts was also limited. In any case, he makes nothing of these documents in his enquiry.
46 Only three quotations are studied by Kilpatrick in this study: the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 (and its introductory formula as found in Acts 2:16), the quotation of Psalm 2:7(-8) in Acts 13:33 (and its introductory formula) and the quotation of Acts Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41. The latter two quotations are only mentioned as illustration. Of these three, Kilpatrick only takes the quotation of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41 in D05 as secondary.
47 More properly, the eclectic method proposed by Kilpatrick will today be described as thoroughgoing eclecticism. This is to be distinguished from rational eclecticism, which places a higher premium on the textual worth of external evidence.
he himself admits, was more of a summary than a detailed new proposal, but the essay is important as it served as an impetus for a response and further research on other quotations from Kilpatrick (see below).

A landmark study with regard to explicit OT quotations in Acts (and Luke) is that of Traugott Holtz (1968). Holtz’s study, in essence his Habilitationsschrift (already completed in 1964), systematically works through all the explicit quotations in Luke and Acts to determine where the quotations stem from (that is, whether taken directly from the OT or through a written tradition in the form of a Testimoniumvorlage or perhaps orally) and whether this text was altered by the author of Acts. In other words, Holtz was interested in the use of the OT by the author of Acts and consequently with the “initial” text. However, in the course of his study, Holtz frequently refers to questions surrounding the explicit quotations of the OT in D05. His concern is, of course, not exclusively with the explicit OT quotations in Acts in D05, and many of his notes on the variant readings of D05 have been relegated to his footnotes. More often than not, Holtz opts against D05 in determining the “initial” text, and consequently does not pursue the origin of the text as it is found in D05, nor does he systematically investigate the use of the OT in D05. Furthermore, Holtz did not take into account the layout and the physical properties of the manuscript (or the physical properties of other manuscripts referred to in his study).

More than a decade after the essay of Klijn (see above), G. D. Kilpatrick (1979) offered a response in the form of a more detailed study on the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 (and its introductory formula). Kilpatrick was also inspired to further study selected quotations of the OT in the text of Acts. 48 Still concerned with the “initial” text of Acts, Kilpatrick does not neglect to give due attention to the text of D05 but does not study the text of the manuscript systematically. Kilpatrick’s eclectic method provides a critical voice to studies relying heavily on external evidence, and his suggestions need to be considered. However, Kilpatrick’s interest in internal evidence needs to be balanced with a systematic study of the physical aspects of D05 (e.g. the layout).

A monumental study on the “two texts” of Acts was published by Édouard Delebecque (1986). Delebecque worked his way through the “shorter” text of Acts (mainly based on B03) and the “longer” text of Acts (mostly based on D05), noting differences between the two and categorising these differences. Delebecque’s study is perhaps not comprehensive with regard to the complete textual tradition of the Greek NT, but he does take seriously the text and character of D05 as a whole instead of viewing the manuscripts as a repository for isolated variant readings. Apart from mentioning the text of the explicit OT quotations under the section of each category of difference between the “short” and the “long” text (as identified by Delebecque), he also provides a section dealing exclusively with “Les citations des Septante et leurs changements” (1986:291-297). Delebecque’s comments are insightful and often provide grammatical reasons for variants in D05, but he does not take due account of the possible layeredness of the text (as illustrated in the discussion of the example of the research problem, the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47, given above). Although Delebecque pays close attention to the text of D05, he regrettably does not take the layout and other physical properties of D05 into account.

A year after Delebecque (see above), Darrell L. Bock (1987) published an updated version of his PhD dissertation (originally accepted in 1982). Bock’s study deals with the Christology of the author(s) of Luke and Acts as evidenced by the OT quotations in these two books. Although the subject of Bock’s study is far removed from the study at hand, Bock’s study, and particularly his endnotes, is of some value, as he duly took text-critical matters into consideration. However, Bock’s ultimate purpose was not text-critical and he did not systematically pursue the origin of the variant readings of manuscripts. In fact, Bock’s discussion of text-critical matters relies heavily on other secondary sources (e.g. Metzger 1975). Nevertheless, Bock often proposes his own conclusions based on the evidence available to him.

---

49 Delebecque often views the D05 text synchronically and explains how a difference in the text of D05 (against a B03-like text) can be sensibly understood. To offer but one example, see Delebecque’s discussion of (ΚΑΙ) ΕΓΩ in D05 (where B03 reads ΚΑΙ ΓΕ) in the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21, where Delebecque takes this ΕΓΩ as an affirmation (“I will pour out”). See also the discussion of the form of the text of this quotation in D05 in the present study in the chapter on explicit quotations of the Minor Prophets in D05.

50 Bock, not uncritically, takes the author of Luke and Acts to be the same. The present study, however, is not concerned with the question of the authorship of Luke and Acts. The brackets above indicating a possible plural (“author(s)”) should not be taken to indicate a position for or against shared authorship between these books. For this same reason, the author of the “initial” text of Acts will be referred to as the author of Acts in the present study.
The study by Gert Jacobus Steyn (1995), an essentially unaltered version of his doctoral dissertation (accepted in 1994), is similar to that of Bock (see above), but has a more focused scope in addressing only the explicit OT quotations found in the Petrine and Pauline speeches in Acts. Steyn’s study is aimed at the “initial” text of the relevant explicit OT quotations, but he necessarily touches on the variant readings found in D05 and comments on D05 are frequently found in his footnotes. Nevertheless, Steyn did not pursue the text of D05 as such and also did not take the physical properties of D05 into consideration.

In a study originally presented as a doctoral dissertation, Jenny Read-Heimerdinger (2002; accepted as dissertation 1994) was not concerned with the explicit OT quotations in Acts as such, but applied discourse analysis to the text Acts in D05. Read-Heimerdinger’s method is useful, as it provides an intensive study of the text of Acts – and takes seriously the text of the manuscript as it is found today. Read-Heimerdinger did not comprehensively study the text of the explicit quotations in Acts in D05 against the Greek, Latin and Hebrew OT traditions, and, like her predecessors, did not take into account the layout of D05. Nevertheless, Read-Heimerdinger’s study is extremely helpful because of her thorough study of the text of Acts in D05.

Soon after the publication of her doctoral thesis (see above), Read-Heimerdinger collaborated with Josep Rius-Camps on a four volume commentary series on the text of Acts in B03 and D05 (Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2004; 2006; 2007; 2009). Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps provide, for each section of text, a text-critical apparatus, translation (of both B03 and D05), and commentary. In the case of explicit quotations of the OT, they also provide text-critical data pertinent to the OT traditions in their apparatus. Similar to the earlier study by Read-Heimerdinger (see above), the study by Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps is valuable on account of its thorough study of the text of D05. Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps (similar to Kilpatrick – see above) provide a critical voice to scholars who attach too much weight to external evidence. It should be stated, however, that Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps did not purport to trace out the transmission and tradition of the text of the explicit OT quotations, and also did not consider the layout of D05 in their investigation.
The studies noted above illustrate the need for an in-depth investigation of the explicit quotations of the OT in the Acts of D05 which takes into account the meta-data of the manuscript, most notably the layout of the text. In order to understand the perception of the OT in the D05 tradition, it is necessary to inquire about the OT awareness in this text as shown by the interplay between layout, text (as measured against the Greek and Latin NT and Greek, Latin and Hebrew OT traditions) and introductory formulae in D05 – a study which has hitherto not thoroughly been done.

Certainly, more studies on the explicit OT quotations in Acts can be named (e.g. Rusam 2003; Meek 2008)\(^{51}\) which contain scattered suggestions on the tradition of the explicit quotations of the OT in Acts in D05. Commentaries on the text of Acts also offer the occasional text-critical excursus or footnote, but as the aim of most commentaries are far removed from the research problem of the present study, these are mostly of a cursory nature.\(^{52}\) Furthermore, studies dealing with specific OT quotations in the text of Acts frequently provide a more detailed discussion of the text-critical aspects of the specific quotation and consequently the text of D05 (e.g. Rodgers 1987; Steyn 2004). These studies have not been listed above as they do not provide a systematic study of the explicit OT quotations in D05 (or other pertinent questions). Nevertheless, these studies will be noted in the discussion and footnotes of the present study where they are applicable.

1.5. Methodology

1.5.1. Division of chapters based on OT books

The present study is on the text of a NT manuscript. However, the research question concerns the occurrence of OT traditions in this NT manuscript’s text. Therefore, it would be beneficial to group OT quotations from the same book or genre of books together. In this way, should there be any tendencies peculiar to a specific OT tradition, such tendencies will be easier to identify. Each chapter of this study, then, will deal with a set of quotations from the same book or genre of

\(^{51}\) Also consult the bibliography of the present study.

\(^{52}\) Two commentaries with extensive text-critical notes and discussion worthy of mention are Haenchen (1977) and the more recent study by Richard Pervo (2009).
books. Such a division has the added bonus of yielding chapters of relatively equal length, at least with regard to the number of quotations discussed in each chapter. The three groups of books, with the number of quotations to be discussed in brackets, are: Psalms (7), the Minor Prophets53 (4) and Isaiah (3). The quotations within each chapter will be discussed according to the order in which they appear in the text of Acts.

1.5.2. The structure of the investigation

The discussion of each explicit quotation will follow a set pattern in order to be as thorough as possible. This pattern will take into account both the layout (steps a to e below) and the text of D05 (step f below), as these two areas have been identified in the research problems as the two planes along which the investigation should proceed. Finally, conclusions will be drawn on the interplay between layout and text for each quotation discussed (step g below). The investigation of each explicit quotation will thus be of both an analytical nature (steps a to f below) and an interpretative nature (step g below). At the end of each chapter, conclusions will be drawn with regard to the OT awareness and transmission history of the respective set of quotations covered by that chapter; the same will be done in the concluding chapter of this study. The pattern which discussions of individual can be set out as follows:

a) At the start of the discussion of each explicit quotation, a transcription of the text as it is found in D05 – that is, the text of the original hand of D05, not the corrections – will be given. This transcription will follow the layout of the text as it is printed in D05, except for the addition of spaces between words to facilitate reading.54

---

53 The Minor Prophets are known to have circulated as a single book. See Shepherd (2011:2-3), who gives a list of historical evidence for the “Unity of the Twelve”. He points to the fact that there is a growing tendency to view the Minor Prophets as a unit. This is then, of course, also true for the circulation of the book during and after the writing of the NT. See also De Villiers (2008, esp. p. 1383).

54 Of course, the letters are printed in scriptio continua on D05. However, because the difference in size between the font used for the transcription and the letters in the manuscript, the representation of the D05 text’s letters in proportion to one another is inevitably inaccurate from the start. Accordingly, the minor loss of accurate representation of the text created by the inclusion of spaces between words is negligible when compared to the reading facility gained for the modern reader.
b) The discussion of the text in D05 will then probe the two most likely indicators of OT awareness in the text for the quotation under investigation: indentation and paragraph markers. This will be done for both the text of D05 and d05.

c) The next step will be to identify and describe any corrections to the text. The corrections by the first hand and that made by corrector G will be especially noted, as these may shed light on the D05 tradition up to the point of the manuscript’s production.

d) Next, other quotations and allusions in the text of D05, whether in the Gospels or Acts, will be investigated with a view to the likelihood of these quotations and allusions contributing to an OT awareness in the D05 tradition. This discussion, then, will not primarily be concerned with the provenance or textual history of these other quotations or allusions to the OT, but rather whether these quotations or allusions played a role in the formation of the text of D05’s explicit OT quotations in Acts.

e) The next step will be to investigate the introductory formula of D05 against the backdrop of the introductory formula in other NT traditions, to determine whether the introductory formula as found in D05 betrays any additional OT awareness in the D05 text.

f) The D05 text of the relevant explicit quotation (and in some cases, where it relates, the d05 text) will then be discussed with regard to the variants which could show OT awareness or are unique to D05 (and in some cases, d05). The aim of this discussion is to discern whether the variant readings (i.e., variant as opposed to other Greek NT manuscripts) show OT awareness or possible influence from the OT as opposed to the “initial” text of the NT. Although this discussion will be as thorough as possible, not all variants will be discussed. Differences in orthography, for instance, have little to offer with regard to the question at hand. Similarly, where D05 agrees with all early Greek NT manuscripts against a single late manuscript or group of late manuscripts, there is very little information to be gained about the D05 tradition. Of course, during this step, the readings of D05 will have to be measured against the pertinent OT traditions. Where applicable, alternative explanations for the variant readings in D05 (or other manuscripts)
will be sought. These explanations will serve to measure the likelihood of the D05 readings’ influence by the OT traditions. It should be stressed that the aim of this investigation is to determine whether OT awareness played any role in the formation of the text of D05, not to solve all the textual difficulties in the given explicit quotations.

g) Finally, a conclusion will be drawn on the possibility of OT awareness for each explicit quotation, and whether any OT traditions influenced the explicit quotation as it can be found in D05.

1.5.3. Engagement with secondary literature

Because of the present study’s analytical and descriptive nature, there will be little engagement with secondary literature in the main text of the study itself. Critical engagement with secondary literature, however, will be found throughout in this study’s footnotes.

1.6. Conclusion

There is clear need for an investigation of the text of the explicit quotations of D05 which keeps in mind both the layout and the text of this unique manuscript. In doing so, and asking to what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text, an opportunity is afforded to glimpse into the stages of the transmission history of this text, to learn more about its users and the users of the text of previous manuscripts in its tradition, and to discover more about how the OT was perceived in the early stages of Christianity.
Chapter 2:
Explicit quotations from the Psalms in D05

1. Introduction

1.1. General Introduction

The present chapter is concerned with the explicit quotations of the Psalms in the Acts of D05. The quotations will be discussed in the order of their appearance in the text of Acts D05, namely: Acts 1:20 / Psalm 68:26 (LXX); Acts 1:20 / Psalm 108:8 (LXX); Acts 2:25-28 / Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX); Acts 2:34-35 / Psalm 109:1 (LXX); Acts 4:25-26 / Psalm 2:1-2; Acts 13:33 / Psalm 2:7-8; Acts 13:35 / Psalm 15:10 (LXX). The widespread appearance of explicit quotations makes it clear that the Book of the Psalms is integral to the understanding of Acts. This use of the Psalms in Acts makes for an interesting inquiry into the explicit quotations of the Psalms in D05, especially as quotations from two psalms are quoted more than once (Acts 2:25-28 / Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) and Acts 13:35 / Psalm 15:10 (LXX); Acts 4:25-26 / Psalm 2:1-2 and Acts 13:33 / Psalm 2:7-8). Apart from these explicit quotations in Acts, some explicit quotations of the same psalm (Psalm 109:1 LXX) are also extant in the Gospels of D05. In comparing these quotations and allusions in the text of D05, some conclusions can be drawn with regard to the OT awareness of the scribe of the manuscript.

1.2 Text-critical sources used for this chapter

The text-critical sources utilised for the Greek NT in this chapter are the collations made for the ECM by the INTF in Münster, with occasional recourse to Tischendorf’s (1869; 1872) 8th edition of his Novum Testamentum Graece. For the Latin NT, Wordsworth & White’s edition of Acts has been the main source of variant readings. The progress in textual-criticism with regard to the OT has been slightly slower with regard to the Psalms, owing to the large amount of witnesses available to this book’s text. Nevertheless, in light of the frequent allusions to and quotations of the psalms in the NT, the state of inquiry into the textual tradition of the Book of the Psalms is lamentable. The 3rd edition of Rahlfs’s critical text of the Old Greek Psalms (1979) in the
LXXGött has not been thoroughly revised, and is, in essence, a publication dating from 1931. The *Vetus Latina* edition of the Psalms is not yet available, as is the Psalms fascicle of the *BHQ*. Variant readings in the Latin OT tradition were culled from the edition of the Psalms prepared by the Benedictine Abbey of St. Jerome in Rome (Libreria Editrice Vaticana 1953). For the Hebrew tradition, *BHS* was the main source. Evidence from the Judaean Desert has been culled from the *DJD* series.

2. Acts 1:20 / Psalm 68:26 (LXX)¹

2.1. The physical text of D05

| ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ | SCRIPTUM EST ENIM IN LIBRO PSALMORUM |
| GΕΝΗΘΤΟΝ ΕΠΑΥΑΙϹ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΡΗΜΟϹ | FIAT HABITATIO EORUM DESERTA |
| ΚΑΙ ΜΗ Η Ο ΚΑΤΟΙΚΩΝ ΕΝ ΑΥΤΗ | ET NON SIT QUI INHABITET IN EA |

2.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of both the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) and the quotation of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) is found on Folio 417b. The quotation(s) is clearly indicated in the manuscript through indentation, by a space of about four letters from the margin. The Γ of this quotation’s introductory formula (ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ) is written outside the margin and slightly larger than the other letters – a standard way of indicating a paragraph in D05. The next paragraph starts three verses down, at ΚΑΙ ΕϹΤΗϹΕΝ ΔΥΟ ΙΩϹΗΡ (Acts 1:23).

2.1.2. Corrections in D05

The last line, the quotation from Psalm 108:8 (LXX), runs far into the right of the page. The two Ε’s and ΠΟϹ of ΕΤΕΡΟϹ have been written slightly smaller in anticipation of the end of the line.

¹ For an investigation of the text and hermeneutics of the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 as it was found in the “initial” text of Acts, see Steyn (1995:46-54). Brawley (1995:61-74) offers a much broader discussion of the quotations of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) and Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in their respective contexts and Acts, albeit without much reflection on the text-critical aspects of these texts.
(the whole of ΕΤΕΡΟϹ is given in smaller font in Scrivener 1864:42). There are two corrections (cf. Scrivener 1864:440). The first correction (H for N) is marked by a diagonal tick to the right of the N. The second correction, MH ECTΩ for MH H, was done by writing in smaller letters above the line, with the H rubbed out.

2.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of Acts 1:20 is on Folio 418a. The quotation is indented by the space of about four letters, and the first two letters of the introductory formula (SCRIPTUM EST ENIM IN LIBRO PSALMORUM)’s both stand in the margin, indicating a new paragraph. The next paragraph starts, as is the case with the Greek, at Acts 1:23.

2.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are a number of corrections on this page, including EIUS for the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX)’s EORUM. The correction has been made by cancelling out the final letters of the word, ORUM, by light diagonal strokes, and IUS is written above the line to the right of the remaining E (cf. Scrivener 1864:440). On account of the obelisks (i.e., the diagonal strokes), Parker (1992:127) identifies the whole correction as being from corrector G. This correction will thus have to be considered together with the original d05 text in the discussion below.

2.2. Other quotations or allusions to Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in the text of D05

In the list of loci citati vel allegati of NA28, only Luke 13:35 is listed as an allusion to Psalm 68:26 (LXX).
2.2.1. Luke 13:35 / Psalm 68:26 (LXX)

The text of Luke 13:35 contains one notable instance of variance in the D05 reading EPHMOC at the end of the first phrase of this verse (i.e., ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν – NA²⁸).² D05 is not the only Greek NT witness reading EPHMOC. Similarly, the DESERTA of d05 is also reflected in manuscripts of the Vulgate (cf. the apparatus of Wordsworth & White 1898:409-410) and the Itala (cf. Jülicher 1976:166). The NA²⁸ apparatus refers the reader to Jeremiah 22:5,³ which has ἔρημωσιν in its text,⁴ but Tobit 14:4⁵ and Psalm 68:26 (LXX) (both noted in the margin of NA²⁸) should also be noted. Furthermore, the text of Acts 1:20 should not be overlooked; at least the phrase in Acts 1:20a itself (but not its context) is similar in its meaning to Luke 13:35a.⁶ All of these could have influenced a scribe to add EPHMOC at the end of the phrase in Luke 13:35a. However, no matter where the origins of the EPHMOC of D05 in Luke 13:35a may lie, neither the context of the phrase in Luke nor the phrase itself seems to have influenced the reading the other way around. That is to say, the text of Luke 13:35 in D05 did not influence the reading of D05 in Acts 1:20.

2.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) (and Psalm 108:8 (LXX)) shows very little deviation in the Greek NT tradition. Certainly, D05 is in line with the overwhelming majority of manuscripts in reading ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ. The same can be said of the Latin NT tradition and the SCRIPTUM EST ENIM IN LIBRO PSALMORUM in d05, against which no noteworthy variation is listed.

---

² Apart from a difference in word order (ἰδοὺ με – NA²⁸ / ME ΙΔΗΤΕ), D05 reads the same as NA²⁸ in the rest of this verse.
³ Jeremiah 22:5 reads, in LXXGött, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσητε τοὺς λόγους τούτους, κατ’ ἐμαυτοῦ ἄμοσα, λέγει κύριος, ὅτι εἰς ἔρημωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος.
⁴ Only 62 reads ἔρημον. The reading of this witnesses is unlikely to have been widely known; however, ἔρημον occurs in the following verse, Jeremiah 22:6.
⁵ The relevant part of Tobit 14:4 reads, in G¹, καὶ Ἰεροσόλυμα ἔσται ἔρημος, καί ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ κατακαῆσεται καὶ ἔρημος ἔσται μέχρι χρόνου. The relevant G⁰ text of Tobit 14:4 reads: καὶ ἔσται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἔρημος, καὶ Ἰαβάννα καὶ Ἰεροσολύμα ἔσται ἔρημος καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν λύπῃ καὶ καυθήσεται μέχρι χρόνου.
The final phrase of the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 is divided in the OT and NT traditions. The following table illustrates the difference by example of the LXXGött and NA 28 texts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalm 68:26 (LXXGött)</th>
<th>Acts 1:20a (NA 28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γενηθήτω ἡ ἐπαυλίς αὐτῶν ἡ ἡμημομένη,</td>
<td>γενηθήτω ἡ ἐπαυλίς αὐτῶν ἡ ἡρημος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμαισιν αὐτῶν</td>
<td>καὶ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν</td>
<td>μὴ ἔστω ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν αὐτῇ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The author of Acts may have abbreviated the quotation by exchanging ἐν αὐτῇ for ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμαισιν αὐτῶν. The gender of ἐν αὐτῇ now implicitly refers to ἡ ἐπαυλίς (cf. Holtz 1968:47; Steyn 1995:49-50), effectively removing the reference to the plural “dwelling places” and making the psalm fit its new context with regard to the situation of Judas. Of interest here is that no manuscript of the Greek NT or Latin NT tradition, including D05, has adjusted this quotation’s text to fit with an existing OT tradition. Perhaps this reluctance to change the NT text towards an OT tradition could be explained because of the quotation’s context in the NT rather than a lack of knowledge about the quotation’s OT provenance. Nevertheless, within the text of Acts 1:20 D05 and Acts 1:20 d05, there are a few variant readings which deserve attention.

2.4.1. D05 ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩΝ ΕΙΠΑΥΛΙΚ

The ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩΝ of D05 is unique in the Greek NT manuscript tradition. The form of the word is reminiscent of a participle (with a nominative ending on –ων). However, there is nothing in the Latin NT, Greek OT or Hebrew OT traditions to give the impression that the

---

7 With regard to Acts 1:20, but probably intended as a warning note for all the psalms, Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2004:126, footnote 16) notes: “… the argument that the text of the Psalms quoted is LXX is ill-founded for there was considerable fluidity in the text of the Scriptures in first-century Judaism and the differences between MT and LXX could well have derived from alternative Aramaic versions of the Psalms …” Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps’s warning should not be left out of sight in the investigation of the “initial” text of Acts. However, the present study is concerned with the possible subsequent influence of the Greek, Latin or Hebrew OT traditions on the text of D05 and the Aramaic tradition will consequently not be pursued.
ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩΝ of D05 should be viewed as some aberrant attempt at creating a participle. Rather, the best explanation for the N of D05 is that it was a simple scribal error: Most probably, the Vorlage of D05 read

ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩΝΕΠΑΥΛΙϹ, which was then mistakenly copied as ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩΝΕΠΑΥΛΙϹ.

This explanation would also explain the absence of an equivalent for the article (ἡ) before the ΕΠΑΥΛΙϹ of D05 – another reading which is unique in the Greek NT (and OT) tradition.9

2.4.2. D05 ΑΥΤΟΥ / d05 EORUM

There is a difference in number between the ΑΥΤΟΥ (a singular form) of D05 and the EORUM (a plural form) of d05. The ΑΥΤΟΥ of D05 does not stand out against the rest of the Greek NT tradition.10 The Latin NT tradition is divided: A number of witnesses are in line with the EORUM of d05,11 but a large quantity of witnesses has a singular form.12 The OT traditions have

---

8 Yoder (1958:75) lists ΓΕΝΗΘΗΤΩΝ under a category of “miscellaneous cases of variation involving consonants” and offers no grammatical explanation for this word’s appearance. However, Yoder mistakenly supplies the article after the word in his list – resulting in γενηθήτων ἡ – and so missed the palaeographical origin of this reading.

9 The lack of an article is unlikely to be because of the Hebrew tradition’s ירפה, which, with the pronominal suffix, is in the status constructus, implying a definite article in translation. Holtz (1968:47), in arguing the inability to prove the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX)’s stemming from the Hebrew tradition or the Greek OT tradition, takes the translation of the ἐπαυλίς of the Greek OT tradition to be in line with the Hebrew tradition (and consequently the Greek NT tradition). See Nellesen (1975:215-216) for an argument that the word could be understood as a fixed structure in Hellenistic times; i.e., the translation of the Greek OT tradition is correct, but semantically opens up a greater range for understanding the term.

10 Only a few Greek NT manuscripts have a plural form (αὐτῶν), namely 049 61 69 180 326 630 1751 1837 2495. Of these, 049 61 69 180 have all been corrected to read the singular (αὐτοῦ). The change to the singular in the initial text of the Greek NT tradition is most likely due to the new context of this quotation (so Clarke 1922:94; Steyn 1995:50, 53; see Steyn’s footnote 66 on page 50 for more support for this view). This difference between the NT and Greek OT tradition, together with Acts 1:20’s ἐν αὐτῇ as equivalent for Psalm 68:26 (LXX)’s ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν “sind für die Beziehung des Zitats auf Judas notwendig” (Nellesen 1975:215).

11 Eorum is also the reading opted for by Wordsworth & White in their critical edition of the Vulgate text of Acts. They give as support for this NT reading, apart from d05, the following witnesses: BFIKR\*VW c t cor. uat. mg. (which reads ‘eorum non eius’).

12 Most witnesses with a singular form read eius. These witnesses are: ACDGΘMOR\*STU. Two witnesses, e08 and Codex Gigas, read illius. See also the discussion in Kilpatrick (1979:87-88) for some additional Latin witnesses and a discussion of the origin of the singular form in the Greek NT tradition (as opposed to the plural form in the Greek OT tradition). Kilpatrick deems the singular to be taken over from the Vorlage of the author of Acts (and not a change wrought by the author of Acts himself). According to Kilpatrick, this Vorlage, a manuscript of the Greek OT tradition, could have contained Psalm 68:26 (LXX) between Psalm 108:7 and Psalm 108:8.
a plural form across the board: The Greek OT tradition reads αὐτῶν, the Latin OT tradition reads eorum and the Hebrew tradition has a plural pronominal suffix (the complete reading thus resulting in רָשָׁם). Even though the OT tradition is homogenous, the plural form of d05 is most likely – on account of the divided Latin NT tradition – a vestige of the Latin NT tradition from which it stems, rather than a direct adaptation of the manuscript’s text to an OT tradition. However, the correction made by corrector G also needs to be taken into account. This correction of EORUM (plural) to EIUS (singular) was made at a time close to the production of the manuscript, and it is possible that the Vorlage of d05 had EIUS in its text. Nevertheless, it is more likely that the Vorlage of d05 had EORUM in agreement with other Latin NT witnesses, and that corrector G spotted and corrected an incongruity between the D05 and d05 texts than to assume that the d05 scribe changed the term based on his knowledge of the OT text.13

2.4.3. D05 MH H

D05 is the only Greek NT manuscript which at this point has H, most likely to be understood as ἦ, a third person present subjunctive of εἰμί. The rest of the Greek NT tradition prefers μὴ ἔστω, a third person imperative of the same verb. The Latin NT tradition, including d05, has the present subjunctive, sit. There appears to be no influence from the Greek OT tradition, which agrees with the rest of the Greek NT tradition in reading μὴ ἔστω. The Latin OT tradition is in agreement with the Latin NT and d05, which leaves the possibility that D05 was recast into a modal mood on account of the Latin traditions’ subjunctive. However, in the quotation from Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in the same verse (Acts 1:20) in D05, D05 reads ΛΑΒΕΤΩ, a third person imperative, as an equivalent for the SUMAT of d05,14 a third person subjunctive. It is difficult to explain why one reading would be changed based on the Latin’s subjunctive, and not the other. The only difference between the H of D05 and ΛΑΒΕΤΩ seems to be the presence of MH before

---

13 There are a number of cases where the grammatical categories of singular and plural are confused in the text of d05, but most of these pertain to collective nouns. Stone (1946:31-32) lists the EORUM of d05 in Acts 1:20 among the few examples of confusion in number which do not pertain to collective nouns. It is, however, much more likely that this plural is on account of the OT tradition, whether directly or indirectly, than a simple error by the scribe.
14 Most Latin NT manuscripts read accipiat at this point in Acts 1:20, which is also a third person subjunctive. See the discussion of the quotation of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 below.
H; this MH is consequently the most likely explanation for a change to the subjunctive, as μή regularly takes this mood.\textsuperscript{15}

An argument of influence on D05 is possible with the Hebrew tradition’s reading, namely אִם followed by the jussive form of יֵהָי (i.e., אִם יֵהָי). Conceivably, the Hebrew’s modal statement could have influenced D05 to read a subjunctive rather than an imperative. However, influence from the Hebrew tradition is less likely on account of the word order of D05, which agrees with the whole NT tradition against the whole OT tradition.

2.5. Conclusion

The layout of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 in D05 shows clear OT awareness, as the quoted text is indented. However, it is worth noting that this happens even though the quoted text does not fully agree with the Greek and Latin OT traditions, and the indentation also includes the text of the following OT quotation, Psalm 108:8 (LXX), treating these two texts as a unity. The introductory formula of this quotation starts a new paragraph in D05, but this paragraph is not confined to the text of the quotation and continues for a number of verses before a new paragraph is introduced.

The only allusion to Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in text extant in D05, Luke 13:35, did not influence the text of the quotation in Acts 1:20. There is a slight possibility that the form of the text of Luke 13:35 in D05 was influenced by the text of Acts 1:20, but this influence does not necessarily stem from the text as it is found in D05.

The D05 text shows no more or less OT awareness than the rest of the Greek NT tradition in its introductory formula, as its text shows no variation. The introductory formula of this quotation would surely have pointed scribes to the OT, as the book from which the quotation is drawn is

\textsuperscript{15} Read-Heimerding & Rius-Camps (2004:112) points out that the change of the imperative (in the OT text) to a subjunctive form “could be a way of adapting the Scripture to suit the new situation better.” Yoder (1958:429) calls this difference in D05 “self-explanatory”; however, the change of an indicative verb to subjunctive does not seem to be a tendency in D05 when measured against WH. Of course, both the future indicative and the aorist subjunctive are grammatically correct in this case (cf. Blass, Debrunner & Rehkopf 1984:355, paragraph 427; Smyth 1963:614, paragraphs 2708-2709), but someone could possibly have “corrected” the indicative to a subjunctive after μή.
identified in the text. However, this did not seem to effect any changes to the text. In fact, influence from the OT on the text of the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 is at a minimum. As became apparent in the discussion above, there are only a few differences between the quoted text of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in D05 and d05 and the rest of the Greek and Latin NT traditions in any case. Only in one instance, the *EORUM* of d05 (where D05 has *ΑΥΤΟΥ*) is there a possibility of OT awareness, but this reading and its possible origin from the OT is shared by the whole Latin NT tradition, and does not have anything to contribute specifically with regard to the D05 tradition.

3. Acts 1:20 / Psalm 108:8 (LXX)\(^\text{16}\)

3.1. The physical text of D05

| ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΕΠΙΚΟΠΗΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΛΑΒΕΤΩ ΕΤΕΡΟ | ET EPISCOPATUM ILLIUS SUMAT ALIUS |

The description of this quotation’s text in the manuscript can be found under the discussion of Acts 1:20 / Psalm 68:26 (LXX) above, as well as its introductory formula. There are no corrections to the text of either D05 or d05 in the text quoted from Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in Acts 1:20.

\(^{16}\) The introductory formula to the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 also serves for the quotation of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in this same verse. In fact, the quotation should probably be taken as one quotation. This is the case in the text as it stands in D05, as the TAYTHN being read after ΤΗΝ ΓΡΑΦΗΝ in Acts 1:16 (which refers to the quotation in Acts 1:20) makes clear (Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2004:126). This would support the view, at least for D05, that the KAI at the start of the quotation from Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 should be taken as part of the quotation (cf. Steyn 1995:58 for a more cautious approach with an eye to the “initial” text of Acts 1:20; see also Holtz 1968:46 for the view that the kai in the “initial” text is not to be understood as part of the quotation). Whether the KAI is part of the quotation or not, however, has very little consequence for this study’s primary goal. In general, see (Steyn 1995:54-61) and Holtz (1968:46-48) for an in-depth and text-critically sensitive explication of the hermeneutics of the quotation of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in the “initial” text of Acts 1:20.
3.2. Other quotations or allusions to Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in the text of D05

No allusions to or quotations of Psalm 108:8 other than Acts 1:20 are listed in NA's list of loci citati vel allegati.

3.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) has been discussed above under the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20.

3.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

3.4.1. D05 ΛΑΒΕΤΩ / d05 SUMAT

Although D05 reads ΛΑΒΕΤΩ in the quotation of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 in agreement with what is probably the “initial” text of the Greek NT tradition, one should take note of the large number of Greek NT manuscripts that read λαβοι. These manuscripts were most probably

17 Unfortunately, no noteworthy evidence of this psalm has been preserved from the finds in the Judaean Desert. Fragment 10 of 4QPs might contain some text of this Psalm, but it is marked with a bracketed question mark in the DJD edition (cf. Ulrich, Flint & Skehan 2000:73). The only text extant (with the supposed words from Psalm 108:8 (LXX), reads: יְקַח פָּדָתוֹ. For a discussion of the difference between the Greek OT tradition (reading mostly λάβοι) and the Greek NT tradition (reading mostly λαβέτω), see Holtz (1968:47, footnote 6). According to him, the difference is “im Höchstfall eine formale Korrektur gewesen …, nicht aber ein Zeichen bemerkenswerter Freiheit dem LXX-Text gegenüber.” He further points out the fact that the optative was in the process of being replaced in the vernacular (cf. Blass & Debrunner 1984:311, paragraph 384). Holtz is followed by Nellesen (1975:217), who adds that “die Übersetzung des hebr. Imperfekts [war] nebeneinander durch Optativ … und Imperativ … möglich.” Nellesen argues that this could point to a possible Aramaic (or Hebrew) source in which the two psalm verses quoted in Acts 1:20, Psalm 68:26 (LXX) and Psalm 108:8 (LXX), were already combined with regard to Judas’s death. See, however, Steyn (1995:58; similarly Pervo 2009:54), who notes that the “stylistic change in Ac was … probably made by Luke in order to support the connection between the two quoted texts by way of the imperative forms of the verbs.” Steyn’s view is preferable to Haenchen, who supposes that a divine command can only be present in the text if it is in the imperative, not the optative (similarly Schneider 1980:218; Roloff 1981:33). This, however, is not necessarily the case.

18 The text is supported by all the earliest majuscule manuscripts (א01 א02 ב03 ג04 ד05), and the external evidence is simply overwhelming. Moreover, the persistence of this reading in the face of its difference with the reading of the strong Greek OT tradition tips the balance even more in favour of the reading as found in D05.

19 These manuscripts are all rather late. The uncial, for instance, are E08 014 044 049 0142. For a discussion of the reading ΛΑΒΟΙ in E08, see Van der Bergh (2013:141). There are also some Greek NT manuscripts which read λαβη – e.g. 61 522 614 996 2412.
influenced by the Greek OT tradition, which reads λάβοι with the exception of one witness.\(^{21}\) Notably, D05 was not influenced by the Greek OT tradition’s reading of λάβοι – but the rest of the quotation reads the same in D05 and the Greek OT tradition. The reading of d05, SUMAT, is unique in the Latin NT tradition, which has accipiat in the rest of its witnesses,\(^ {22}\) while the Latin OT tradition likewise reads accipiat.\(^ {23}\) The Hebrew tradition has a jussive (📖 – which has the same form as the imperfect), making the reading most often found in the Greek OT tradition (λάβοι) the better translation of the Hebrew. There is nothing to suggest that the SUMAT of d05 should not be explained as a straightforward (and independent) translation of the Greek NT tradition’s λαβέτω.

3.5. Conclusion

Little remains to be said about the quotation of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 in D05. The quotation seems to have been treated as part of the same quotation as Psalm 68:26 (LXX) (which is discussed above); however, the quoted text of Psalm 108:8 (LXX) occupies its own line in D05. The text of D05 is in agreement with what can be seen as the “initial” text, and there has been no attempt to bring the ΛΑΒΕΤΩ found in D05, which stands at odds with the Greek OT tradition, into conformity with the Greek OT tradition. This fact, together with the results of the investigation of the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20 above, shows that, even though there was a high degree of OT awareness in these texts (e.g., the shared introductory formula to these quotations), there was a reluctance in the D05 tradition to change the text towards the Greek OT tradition.

\(^{21}\) The manuscript in question is R. Rahlfs (1979:274) correctly indicates that this manuscript has been influenced by the NT. Holtz (1968:47) reminds the reader that R sometimes contain readings of some value, but notes that R must be later in the case of its reading λαβέτω, since “die Entstehung der v.l. λάβοι wäre anders schwer verständlich.”

\(^{22}\) Only one witness, B, has accipiet.

\(^{23}\) One witness, Φ\(r\), reads accipiet. The complete Latin OT tradition reads eius as equivalent for the ILLIUS of d05, which is also read by the Latin NT tradition. The reading of d05 is thus further away from the Latin OT tradition then from the Latin NT tradition.
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4.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΓΑΡ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΕΙ AYTON</th>
<th>DAVID ENIM DICIT IN EUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΠΙΡΟΟΡΩΜΗΝ ΤΟΝ ΚΝ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>PROVIDEBAM ĐΝΜ MEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΝΩΠΙΟΝ ΜΟΥ ΔΙΑ ΠΑΝΤΟC</td>
<td>IN CONSPECTU MEO SEMPER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΤΙ Ε[Κ] ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΟΥ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΊΝΑ ΜΗ ΚΑΛΕΥΘΩ</td>
<td>QUIA A DEXTRA MEA EST UT NON COMMOUEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥΤΟ ΗΥΦΑΝΘΗ Η ΚΑΡΔΙΑ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>PROPTEREA LAETATUM EST COR MEUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΓΑΛΛΙΑΣΑΤΟ Η ΓΑΩΣΣΑ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>ET EXULTAUT LINGUA MEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΤΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ Η ΣΑΡΗ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>AHDUC AUTEM ET CARO MEA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΤΑΚΧΗΝΩΣΕΙ ΕΦ ΕΛΠΙΔΕΙ</td>
<td>INHABITUAUT IN SPSEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΤΙ ΟΥΚ ΕΝΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΨΕΙϹ</td>
<td>QUIA NON DERELINQUES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ ΜΟΥ ΕΙϹ ΔΑΗΝ</td>
<td>ANIMAM MEAM APUT INFEROS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΟΥΔΕ ΔΟΧΕΙϹ ΤΟΝ ΟϹΙΟΝ ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>NEQUAE DABIS SANCTUM TUUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΙΔΕΙΝ ΔΙΑΓΦΟΡΑΝ</td>
<td>UIDERE CORRUPTIONEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ ΜΟΙ ΟΔΟΥϹ ΖΩΗϹ</td>
<td>NOTAS FECISTI MIHI ULAS UITAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΠΑΡΘΕΙϹΕΙϹ ΜΕ ΕΥΡΟϹΥΝΗϹ</td>
<td>INPLEUIS ME IUCUNDITATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΜΕΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟϹΩΠΟΥ ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>CUM FACIE TUA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28 runs across two folios in D05, namely Folio 420b and 421b. The whole quotation is indented by the space of about three letters and the paragraph begins at the quotation’s introductory formula (ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΓΑΡ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΕΙ (sic, 24


25 Yoder (1958:64) concludes from the ΕΦ before ΕΛΠΙΔΕΙ that the latter term was wrongly aspirated: for ἐλπίδι, ἐλπίδ(ε) must have been read. (The EI for I in D05 is an itacism.) Yoder (1958:64) gives several other examples of wrong aspiration, but these are mostly confined to Mark and Acts. This could imply that the wrong aspiration was already present in the Vorlage of the Acts of D05.
corrected *secunda manu* to EIC) AYTON). The next unindented paragraph follows directly after this quotation, starting at Acts 2:29’s ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ ΕΞΟΝ ΕΙΠΕΙΝ.

### 4.1.2. Corrections in D05

In the introductory formula, a C has been supplied above the line between EI and AYTON to produce EIC AYTON.\(^{26}\) In the quoted text itself, ΕΚΔΙΞΙΩΝ’s K is written above and between the E and the Δ; this seems to be a correction at the time of the manuscript’s production by the scribe of D05 himself.\(^{27}\) Two corrections have been made by placing an E before the start of the line, but by different scribes:\(^{28}\) ΙΔΕΙΝ has been corrected to ΕΙΔΕΙΝ,\(^{29}\) and ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ has been corrected to ΕΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ. The EI of ΙΔΕΙΝ was the result of an *in scribendo* correction, too (see the picture below).\(^{30}\)

\(^{26}\) This was done, according to Scrivener (1864:439), by corrector B. Scrivener notes that the C has already faded in his day.

\(^{27}\) The K, although printed above the line in Scrivener’s (1864:333), is not indicated as a correction by either Scrivener or Parker.

\(^{28}\) Scrivener (1864:440) attributes the correction of ΙΔΕΙΝ to corrector H and the correction of ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ to corrector B.

\(^{29}\) The difference in meaning between the two spellings of this word is negligible. Even though the change could be based on a perceived difference between οἶδα (“know”) and ὤραο (“see”), the resultant word could be read as both these terms on the grounds of itacism (cf., in any case, Liddell & Scott 1883:414, where the stem of both terms as it would appear in this form ΙΔΕΙΝ or ΕΙΔΕΙΝ is given as εἴδω).

\(^{30}\) Supporting the view that the correction was made *in scribendo* is the large space between the uttermost left of the E (or the intended I) and the following I. Had an original I been in the manuscript and only later corrected, the space between the two letters would have been much smaller.
The scribe drew a vertical line after drawing the Δ of ΙΔΕΙΝ, but then immediately drew a curved E on top of this line. Most likely, I was intended – which, being an itacism, would not have changed the meaning of the word.

4.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin of this quotation is found on Folio 421a and 422a. The quotation is indented by the space of about three letters on Folio 421a and by the space of about four letters on Folio 422a. The paragraph markers are in agreement with D05, with the D of DAVID ENIM DICIT IN EUM, the quotation’s introductory formula, written slightly larger and placed in the margin. The next paragraph starts at Acts 2:29, directly after the end of the quotation.

4.1.4. Corrections in d05

The erroneous S of SPSEM has been deleted first by the placement of a dot above the letter, and later by rubbing out of the letter. NEQUAE has been changed to NEQUE by way of an oblique

---

31 This image is reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.
32 Scrivener (1864:440) does not identify that the corrector responsible for this changes, but explicitly notes that the responsible corrector(s) was not corrector G. Stone (1946:22) notes the spelling of SPSEM under his discussion of
stroke drawn partially over the A. This was done by corrector G, according to Scrivener (1864:440). Finally, the original INPLEUIS of d05 was changed to INPLEBIS by closing the open top of the U and lengthening the U’s left vertical line.

4.2. Other quotations or allusions to Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in the text of D05

No other allusions are listed in NA\(^28\) loci citati vel allegati (except for the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35, which will be discussed below\(^33\)). However, as Acts 2:31 is a commentary on Acts 2:27 following the explicit OT quotation, it is also an allusion to Psalm 15:10.\(^34\) Consequently, the text of Acts 2:31 begs closer investigation.

4.2.1. Psalm 15:10 (LXX) / Acts 2:31

The text of Acts 2:31 in D05 can be found on Folio 421b and in d05 on Folio 422a, the same folios on which the quotation from Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28 ends. At the start of Acts 2:31, the manuscript shows a copying error: The equivalents of προειδον ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς (NA\(^28\)) and prouidens locutus est de (Wordsworth & White), both of which probably occupied a line, were not copied.\(^35\) The remaining text of D05 / d05 reads as follows:

---

anomalies with regard to the letter s in d05, but does not offer a solution. He merely speaks of “[i]ncorrect insertion of s …”

\(^33\) See the discussion of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35 in the discussion below.

\(^34\) That Acts 2:31 is not listed as an allusion to Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in the loci citati vel allegati of NA\(^28\) may be due to a slight oversight. In the margin of NA\(^28\) at Acts 2:31, the reader is referred to Acts 2:27 as a so-called “reference point” (indicated by an exclamation mark next to the verse referenced – cf Aland et al. 2012:83'). Most probably, the allusion was not taken up in the list of loci citati vel allegati because the compiler, going through a previous edition of the NA, did not find an allusion printed explicitly in the margin. Acts 2:31 is, in any case, treated as an allusion to Psalm 15 (LXX) by scholars. Cf., for instance, Wilckens (1974:35), who notes that in Acts 2:31 “[wird die] entscheidende erste Aussage des Psalmzitat [d.h., Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX)] als Abschluß des Schriftbeweises … wiederholt.”

\(^35\) That this is a copying error is shown by the difference in the remaining text between D05 and d05. Whereas the ΑΝΑϹΤΑϹΕΩϹ ΤΟΥ Χ̅Ρ̅Υ̅ (resulting, awkwardly, in the sense “on his throne, (the throne) of the resurrection of the Christ”), the RESURRECTIONE X̅ R̅ I̅ (to be understood as “through the resurrection of Christ”) after SUPER THRONUM EΙUS does not make sense in this context, especially in d05, where the phrase SECUNDUM CARNE SUSBITARE X̅ R̅ M (KATA CAPKA ANACTHCAI TON XPΝ in D05) is present in Acts 2:30. At any rate, the difference between the two columns and the well attested readings in the Greek NT tradition and the Latin NT tradition provides some certainty that the phrase was part of the D05 tradition at some stage (cf. Metzger 1994:260). The text of D05 has subsequently been corrected by, according to Scrivener (1864:440), corrector F, through the addition of ΠΡΟΕΙΔΩϹ ΕΛΑΛΗϹΕΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΘΗC in the margin after the ΑΥΤΟΥ of D05 of the previous verse (Acts 2:30).
Noteworthy is the EIC AΔΟΥ of Acts 2:31 D05 (as opposed to the EIC AΔΗΝ of Acts 2:27 D05) and the *APUT INFEROS* of Acts 2:31 d05 (which reads the same as Acts 2:27 d05). Holtz (1968:50) is of the opinion that the D05 reading in Acts 2:31, EIC AΔΟΥ, is original. According to Holtz, this reading is too widespread to be the influence of an early form of the “Western” text. Rather, witnesses reading εἰς ᾅδην at this point have been harmonised with the reading of Acts 2:27 (as it is also found in D05) on account of stylistic grounds. In the case of D05, Holtz’s point is bolstered by the D05 reading in Acts 2:27. If the reading of D05 in Acts 2:31 is on account of a stylistic change, it would be hard to explain why the reading in Acts 2:27, being in such close proximity, has not been changed. A possible explanation for such a change of Acts 2:31 and not Acts 2:27 could be an awareness of the text in Acts 2:27 as a quotation from the OT and a reluctance to change that text because of reverence for the OT; such a reluctance based on OT awareness, however, could just as easily be ascribed to the author of Acts (who undoubtedly knew that the text of Acts 2:27 was a quotation from the OT). More to the point: Acts 2:27 and Acts 2:31 in D05 did not influence each other in this matter. Furthermore, although the reading occurs on the same page, D05 shows a difference in orthography in ΕΙΔΕΙΝ (Acts 2:27) and ΕΙΔΕΙΝ (Acts 2:31). These divergences between the two texts are visible even though the scribe of D05 must have been aware of the text of Acts 2:27, as he has just copied it on the same page.

There is no correction in d05, but the word *NOTA* has been written in a “most recent hand” (Scrivener 1864:440 – *recentissima manus*). Parker (1992:297) corrects Scrivener’s note with regard to the line on which *NOTA* occurs (it is on line 24, not line 23). Unfortunately, a misprint slipped into his reference to the folio: *NOTA* occurs on Folio 422a, not 421b.

36 In Holtz’s (1968:50) words: “[D]enn die D-Lesarten sind eben in der Regel nicht in die meisten Handschriften übergegangen.”

37 Holtz (1950:50) uses the difference between these two readings to argue for two different sources underlying these two texts. However, as Steyn (1995:108) warns, this conclusion is “speculative”, as Acts 2:31 manifestly forms part of the commentary on the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28. No matter what the form of the reading is, the two texts stand in correlation to each other in the final text of Acts as produced by the author.

38 This statement is true for other Greek NT manuscripts as well: there is a great probability that the “initial” text of Acts 2:27 originally read εἰς ᾅδην, while Acts 2:31 might have read εἰς ᾅδου. The difference between the two texts has good (but not majority) manuscript support: for instance, A02 and C04. See further the discussion of the EIC AΔΗΝ of D05 below.
The similarity between Acts 2:27 and Acts 2:31 in d05 with regard to *APUT INFEROS* can best be described as a translation choice (see the discussion below). Consequently, there does not seem to be influence either way between the text of Acts 2:27 and Acts 2:31 in the Acts of D05.39

4.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula to the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28 (ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΓΑΡ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ) does not stand out against the Greek NT tradition, showing little variation of consequence. The ΕΙ of D05 is manifestly a scribal blunder for εἰς αὐτόν, the reading of the rest of the Greek NT tradition. The Latin NT tradition is also in accord with the text of the introductory formula in d05 (*DAUID ENIM DICIT IN EUM*).40

---

39 One should add that the D05 tradition resisted the temptation of adding ἡ ψυχή (αὐτοῦ) before ΕΙϹ ΑΔΟΥ, as some manuscripts (e.g. E08) have done.

40 The equivalents for *in eum*, e.g. *in illum* in e08, Codex Gigas and *p*, are all different translations choices for the εἰς αὐτόν of the Greek NT tradition.
4.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

4.4.1. D05 ΚΝΜΟΥ / d05 ΔΝΜ ΜΕUME

A reading shared only by 801 in the Greek NT tradition is the MOY after ΚΝ of D05 in the first line of the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28. The reading of d05, MEUM after ΔΝΜ, is not shared at all in the Latin NT tradition. Both D05 and d05 find no allies whatsoever in any of the OT traditions.

The D05 reading and the 801 reading could have arisen independently and a relation of some sort does not need to be suggested. 42 Chase (1893:21; similarly Bock 1987:348 and Barrett 1994:144) 43 argue the probability that both manuscripts 44 were changed on account of Acts 2:34,

41 For an investigation into the initial text of this psalm, see Holtz (1968:48-51). Holtz (1968:48) is convinced that the psalm stems from the Greek OT tradition (“LXX”). A different view is espoused by Bock (172-181, 348); for a summary and evaluation of Bock’s views, see Bellinger (1990:128-136; the discussion of Bock on pp. 132-134), in a larger discussion of the quotation against the OT background of the Psalm.

A reading which has received a generous amount of discussion is that of ΜΟΥ ΚΑΡΔΙΑ in 801 and B03. These two manuscripts, however, are the only Greek NT manuscripts with this order: the rest of the Greek NT tradition agrees with the D05 order of these words, namely Η ΚΑΡΔΙΑ MOY – which is also the order of d05 (COR MEUM) and the Latin NT tradition. The order attested by D05 is also the unanimous order of the Greek OT and Latin OT, as well as the Hebrew tradition with its pronominal suffix (“v”). The weak attestation for the 801 and B03 reading makes it safe to assume that this reading was the one that was changed, and that D05 and the rest of the Greek NT tradition preserve the reading of the “initial” text. Strengthening this argument is Holtz’s (1968:48-49) choice for the 801 and B03 reading as secondary even despite his Nestle-Aland text reading the order of these two manuscripts. Holtz laments the negligence of the Nestle-Aland text of his day to even include a text-critical note at this juncture, “als sei μου η καρδία überhaupt nicht angefochten.” Following Haenchen (1954:154, footnote 5; Haenchen, in turn, agrees with Cerfauex 1950:44), Holtz remarks that the difference in word order could simply have been to give the text “einen eleganteren Ton.” Read-Heimerdinger (2002:108-109; cf. Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2004:172) notes that a possessive pronoun in the MOY Η ΚΑΡΔΙΑ position normally results in a more intimate expression, but that the difference in this text cannot be explained in this way. Bock (1987:348) further notes that, although the 801 and B03 reading is the harder one as it differs from the Greek OT tradition, its divergence from the pattern of the other noun-pronoun occurrences in the quotation makes it suspect. See further Steyn (1995:104, especially footnotes 198 and 199) for examples of people for and against the 801 and B03 reading, as well as readings in the older critical editions.

A further difference of lesser consequence can be seen between the general Greek OT and Greek NT text. The difference between προωρώμην (LXXGött) and προορώμην (NA28) is negligible, as the “difference between -o- and -ω- was not a major issue during these times and both were used interchangeably” (Steyn 1995:109; cf. Holtz 1968:49). One should also remember that to portray or not to portray these differences in a critical apparatus is the choice of an editor of a critical text, and minor issues like these are sometimes not included.

42 D05 and 801 differ with regard to the phrase Η ΚΑΡΔΙΑ MOY (D05) / MOY Η ΚΑΡΔΙΑ (801) in Acts 2:26, as well as the ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ in Acts 2:28 in D05. On both these readings, see the discussion below. According to Delebecque (1986:293), the D05 reading (MOY) reinforces the idea of ἐνάπτων μου in the next line.

43 Chase (1893:21) further notes that an equivalent for the 801 and D05 reading is the more common reading in the Syriac tradition. However, D05 has not necessarily been influenced by the Syriac tradition in this case, as – per
where the “Lord” (i.e., Jesus) is defined as “my Lord”. If this is the case, which seems likely, the D05 reading should be classified as a difference based on the Greek NT context.

### 4.4.2. D05 E(K) ΔΕΞΙΩΝ MOY / d05 A DEXTRA MEA

As seen in the discussion above, the correction of ΕΔΕΞΙΩΝ to ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ in the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 in Acts 2:25-28 D05 was probably made at the time of the production of the manuscript by the scribe of D05 himself. The reading should thus be read ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ, especially as there is no evidence to the contrary: all Greek NT manuscripts have an equivalent of ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ, as do witnesses to the Greek OT tradition. However, the reading is still of some interest, as d05 is the only Latin NT manuscript with the singular DEXTRA; the rest of the Latin NT tradition has the plural, dextris, and the Latin OT tradition likewise knows no other reading than the plural (dextris). In the Hebrew tradition, the noun is in the singular, with a pronominal suffix: ימין. The d05 reading is thus closer to the Hebrew tradition with regard to number. However, the singular in d05 is a translation choice rather than influence from a Hebrew tradition on d05.

Chase’s own admission – the addition of “my” to “Lord” is fairly common, and the reading of א01 also counts against clear influence of the Syriac on D05. Barrett (1994:144) mistakenly also lists 614 and a few other manuscripts (“pc”) as having this reading. This, however, is not the case. Bock (1987:348) points out that, if this is the case, the point of the matter has been missed: the “Lord” in Acts 2:25 is the one who raises Jesus (Acts 2:34’s “my Lord”), according to Acts 2:32. The only text critical note in the Wordsworth & White apparatus, apart from the d05 reading of DEXTRA, is that the Latin manuscript D reads dexteris.

There are no other readings known in the OT tradition. The OT and NT traditions, however, differ with regard to word order in a number of manuscripts; for this difference, see the text critical apparatus of the respective text critical editions.

Although the Greek NT tradition sometimes prefer the plural for indication of location, as is the case here in D05 (ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ), the d05 translator consistently employs a singular. Δεξίος in the sense of “right (hand)” occurs in D05 in Acts 2:25 (ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ / A DEXTRA), Acts 2:33 (TH ΔΕΞΙΑ / DEXTERA), Acts 2:34 (ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ / AD DEXTERAM), Acts 3:7 (THC ΔΕΞΙΑΚ ΧΕΙΡΟϹ / DEXTERA MANU), Acts 7:55 (ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ / AD DEXTERAM) and Acts 7:56 (ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ / AD DEXTERAM). In all of these cases, whether the Greek is plural or not, d05 translated with a singular. Whether the same is true for the pair εὐώνυμος / sinister is impossible to say, as the only occurrence of this pair is in Acts 21:3, of which the Greek is not extant (but normally reads a singular εὐώνυμον in any case) and d05 has the singular A SINISTRO. The occurrence of τῇ δεξιᾷ in Acts 5:31 in almost all manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition reads TH ΔΟΞΗ / CARITATE in D05.

Another possible explanation for the singular DEXTRA of d05 is provided by the OT traditions: the final part of Psalm 15:11 (LXX), which is not quoted in the NT, has a singular equivalent for “hand”: the Greek OT tradition reads ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου, the Latin OT tradition: in dextera tua, and the Hebrew tradition בימינך (with no known variants in the OT traditions). It is possible that this singular reading could have influenced the other occurrence of the term “hand” in Acts 2:26 in d05, but it should then be explained why the phrase is not quoted in d05;
The MEA of d05, which is unique in the Latin NT tradition, proves that DEXTRA was intentional and understood as a singular ablative form. Although at first glance the ablative with ab seems not to conform to the usual Latin idiom to indicate “place where” (cf. Allen & Greenough 1903:268-269, paragraph 426), it should be kept in mind that the ablative is the normal translation in the later Latin tradition in Acts for the Greek expression ἐκ δεξιῶν.50 There is a difference in the Hebrew tradition which might explain the difference in case: In contrast to the מימיני of Psalm 15:8 (LXX), Psalm 109:1 (LXX) reads לימיני. The difference in prepositions in the Hebrew tradition (ן “from”) in Psalm 15:8 (LXX) vs. לו (“to”) in Psalm 109:1 (LXX) could explain the difference in the case of the readings of d05 in Acts 2:25 (A DEXTRA MEA – in the ablative) and Acts 2:34 (AD DEXTERAM MEAM – in the accusative). However, “the accusative and ablative cases are very frequently confused” in d05, according to Stone (1946:38),51 and the influence from the Hebrew tradition cannot be plausibly shown.

4.4.3. D05 EIC AAHN / d05 APUT INFEROS

The AΔHN of D05 is read by almost all the great NT uncials, although there are a number of manuscripts with αδου as an equivalent.52 The Greek OT is divided between these two readings, but the evidence points to the greater likelihood of the author of Acts reading ἃδην in his

Furthermore, there are a number of differences between the Latin OT tradition’s text and d05 (e.g. vultu in the Latin OT with an equivalent of facie in d05 and in the Latin NT.)

50 The Vulgate, for instance, translates Acts 2:25, Acts 2:34, Acts 7:55 and Acts 7:56 with a dextris. This practice is not always consistent for other books (cf. Matthew 20:21 – ad dexteram), but is very frequent. The strange construction might be due to a desire to provide a translation for the preposition. Ab is frequently used for the translation of ἐκ (Nunn 1922:100, paragraph 206).

51 Stone (1946:38) notes that a difference in ablative and accusative case was often caused where a final m, which was “unstable”, dropped out by accident. That such a confusion could lie behind A DEXTRA MEA is a possibility, as the reading AD DEXTERAM MEAM could have accidentally lost the D of AD (compare A DEXTERAM in Luke 20:42 in D05), resulting in A DEXTERAM MEAM. A subsequent loss of one of the final m’s could have left A DEXTERA MEAM or A DEXTERAM MEA. This, in turn, could have prompted a scribe (or corrector) to correct the word remaining in the accusative to the ablative, and dropping the additional E of DEXTERA(M) to form DEXTRA. However, this process involves far more steps than a change based on style or perhaps because of the original translator’s choice.

52 Notable manuscripts in the Greek NT tradition with αδου are, amongst others, E08 014ε 025 044 049 0142. On the reading αδου, see Karrer & Schmid (2010:174-176), who argue for either influence from a “classicist revival” or influence from the Greek OT tradition, although the latter option is less likely in their view. Also see Van der Bergh (2013:134-135) for a preliminary assessment of the reading AΔOY in E08.
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The reading of D05 (ΔΔΗΝ) was therefore probably left unchanged, even though the reading ἀδου as read by a considerable part of the Greek OT tradition may have been known to scribes in the D05 tradition.

The *APUT INFEROS* found in d05 presents a more puzzling case. *APUT* is only found in d05, in both the Latin NT and OT traditions. The Latin NT tradition mostly reads *in inferno*, although some manuscripts have an accusative, *in infernum*, akin to the Greek ἀδην. *INFEROS*, as it stands in d05, is an accusative of the adjective inferus, while the rest of the Latin NT tradition only reads a form of the adjective *infernus*. Inferus is an older form than *infernus*, but both could conceivably be used as translation for the ΔΔΗΝ of D05. The interest, however, lies with the plural form of d05, which is not reproduced elsewhere in the Latin NT tradition. In the Latin OT tradition, Cyprian’s reading, *ad inferos*, is the only comparable text. The plural form of *INFEROS* could make the term refer to people (i.e. “the dead”) or “the shades” (cf. Lewis & Short 1879:944) instead of a place. Such an understanding – namely, that the soul would not be left with “the dead (people)” – would give sense to the *APUT* of d05 if it is understood in the sense of “with”. However, the “nether regions” is also a translation possibility (Lewis & Short 1879:944) and should most likely be preferred for d05. The Hebrew tradition’s הָאָדָם לָשָׂאֵר, even if not wholly incompatible with the d05 reading, does not provide much help in explaining the divergence of d05 from the rest of the Latin NT tradition.

**4.4.4. D05 ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ**

The ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ of D05 is unique in the Greek NT tradition (where the rest of the tradition reads ἔγνωρισας). If ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ is understood as an aorist participle instead of an indicative, the

---

53 Witnesses to the Greek OT tradition reading αδην are: A B R U and most of the miniscule manuscripts, while αδου is read in A Z. Cf. Karrer & Schmid (2010:174-176). That ἀδην was the reading in the author of Acts’s Vorlage is also the conclusion of Holtz (1968:49), who thoroughly discusses the matter with reference to the Greek OT witnesses.

54 *APUT* is an orthographic variant for *apud* – “d and t at the end of words are regularly confused” (Parker 1992:107; cf. Stone 1946:81, who lists Acts 2:27 under *apud*; also see his discussion of d <> t orthographic shifts on page 20). The spelling with t, however, is listed in Lewis & Short (1879:145) as an alternative to *apud* from the middle of the first century BCE onwards.

55 Namely, CDΘΙ p’ t. The accusative form, denoting motion, is unusual in the face of the static concept of “leave” expressed by *derelinques*.

56 See Lewis & Short (1879:944) with regard to the terms’ uses, synonymous or otherwise.
sense of the passage is not changed in a drastic way. However, the reading might be a simple copying error as there is nothing to explain the reading’s origin in the Latin NT tradition nor in the Greek, Latin and Hebrew OT traditions (cf. Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2004:172).

4.5. Conclusion

Similar to the quotations of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) and Psalm 108:8 (LXX) in Acts 1:20, the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 in Acts 2:25-28 shows clear OT awareness in its layout in D05. The text has been indented, and together with its introductory formula, forms a complete paragraph in the text of D05. The layout of this quotation shows that indented text as such should not be taken to signify a paragraph, as the following paragraph is still indicated by ekthesis even though the previous text has been indented. Rather, paragraphs in D05 seem to be always indicated by ekthesis, even if it follows a quotation that has been indented.

There is only one other allusion to a verse from Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in the extant text of D05, namely an allusion to Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 2:31. This verse can be found on the same page as the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) itself. A closer look at this passage has shown that the influence between Acts 2:27 (which is the equivalent of Psalm 15:10 (LXX)) and Acts 2:31 is minimal. In fact, a disagreement in the text with some importance has been left unchanged: The ΑΔΗΝ of D05 in Acts 2:27 has not been changed to agree with ΑΔΟΥ (2:31), or vice

---

57 Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2004:172) notes the possibility of the reading being a copying error, but note that, should the reading be intentional, it would result in verb referring “to a future time, ‘When you have made known to me…’”, rather than the past, which matches the future tense of the verbs in v. 27.”

58 The d05 reading, NOTAS FECISTI, is in line with most Latin NT witnesses. There are only two witnesses with different readings, namely: DEMONSTRasti MIHI in e08, OSTENDisti MIHI in Codex Gigas. There are also some differences in word order (for which see the apparatus of the text critical edition of Wordsworth & White), but these readings do not pertain to the question of origin of the ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ of D05.

59 This is also the conclusion of Steyn (1995:105), who, in commenting on all three of the readings in D05 identified by him as differences (ΕΦ ΕΛΠΙΔΕΙ, ΕΝΚΑΤΑΛΕΙΠΕΙϹ and ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ), remarks that these readings “might have been the result of hearing-errors during the rewriting process of the manuscript at later stages.” Also see Stone (1946:10, footnote 13), who note the possibility of such errors of hearing occurring in d05. Yoder (1958:49-50) includes ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ in a list of 16 cases in which D05 presents a possible case of aphaeresis (i.e., the loss of a vowel at the beginning of a word), but notes the difficulty of determining whether these cases are “true aphaeresis” or scribal error. In the case of ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ, he explicitly notes that the word starts at the beginning of the line.
versa. 60 This disagreement within the text of D05 is instructive: The scribe of D05 was probably not concerned about making divergent readings agree, even when such readings were in close proximity.

No added sense of OT awareness is evidenced by the introductory formula of this quotation, when measured against the rest of the Greek NT tradition, as D05 is in perfect agreement with the majority of witnesses in this tradition. The same can be said of d05 and the Latin NT tradition. Nevertheless, the introductory formula could have directed scribes toward the Psalms, as the keyword “David” is explicitly mentioned.

The discussion of the text of this quotation in D05 has brought some interesting points to light. The text is mostly in agreement with the Greek OT tradition, and few changes have been made to the text of D05. No clear change based on OT awareness can be shown. Rather, the changes to the D05 and d05 text seem to be contextual (as in the case of Κ̅Ν̅ΜΟΥ in D05 and Δ̅Ν̅Μ̅ΕΥΜ in d05), translation choice specific to d05 (A DEXTRA MEA and APUT INFEROS) or made by mistake (ΓΝΩΡΙϹΑϹ in D05). In the case of A DEXTRA MEA in d05, there is a slight possibility of influence from the Hebrew tradition, 61 but this has proven less likely based on the general character of the Latin language of d05. Finally, no conclusion regarding OT awareness can be drawn with reference to the different reading in a part of the Greek OT tradition of ὂδου (cf. Acts 2:31 in D05) where D05 has ΑΔΗΝ. Although the ὂδου could have been known to scribes in the D05 tradition, the ΑΔΗΝ of D05 was left unchanged. However, it is equally possible that the reading was not changed because scribes were aware that the other reading in the Greek OT tradition, ὂνην, was in line with D05.

60 The difference in spelling between ΙΔΕΙΝ (Acts 2:27) and ΕΙΔΕΙΝ (Acts 2:31) is a matter of smaller importance, but serves to show that the scribe of D05 probably did not refer back to the text of Acts 2:27 while copying Acts 2:31.

61 At least with regard to the “initial” text of Acts 2:25-28, Steyn (1995:105-106; cf. Steyn 1995:105, footnote 3) has argued that the text of the Greek OT tradition has been followed by the author of Acts. For instance, Steyn identifies a difference between the Hebrew tradition and the Greek OT tradition here in שִׁוֵיתִי (‘kept before’) and προορώμην (‘sees’). This difference has not been rectified in any version of the OT or the NT text.
5. Acts 2:34-35 / Psalm 109:1 (LXX)\(^62\)

5.1. The physical text of D05

| OY ΓΑΡ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΑΝΕΒΗ ΕΙC ΤΟΥC ΟΥΠΑΝΟΥC | NON ENIM DAUID ASCENDIT IN CAELOS |
| EΙΡΗΚΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΑΥΤΟC | DIXIT ENIM IPSE |
| ΛΕΓΕΙ Κ€ΤΩ ΚΠΜΟΥ | DIXIT DΝΣ DΝΩ MEΩ |
| ΚΑΘΟΥ ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΟΥ | SEDE AD DEXTERAM MEAM |
| ΕΩC ΘΩ ΤΟΥ ΕΚΘΡΟΥC COY | DONEC PONAM INIMICOS TUOS |
| ΥΠΟΠΩΛΙΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ COY | SCAMILLUM PEDUM TUORUM |

5.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The introductory formula of the Greek text of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 D05 is on Folio 421b, while the text of the quotation proper starts on the following Greek folio. The text of the quotation is indented by the space of about four letters. The previous paragraph begins on the previous Greek folio before the introductory formula of the quotation at ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ ΕΞΟΝ ΕΙΠΕΙΝ (Acts 2:29). The next paragraph starts directly after the quotation (at Acts 2:36 / ΑϹΦΑΛΩC ΟΥΝ ΓΕΙΝΩϹΚΕΤΩ ΠΑϹ ΟΙΚΟC ΙϹΡΑΗΛ), with the initial Α written slightly larger than the rest of the text.

5.1.2. Corrections in D05

The text of the quotation has two corrections in D05. An AN has been written on top of the line, starting slightly to the right of ΕΩC, and on the same line, an original ΤΟΥ has been changed to ΤΟΥϹ by adding a small C on top of the line between the Y of TOY and the E of EΚΘΡΟΥ.\(^63\)

---


\(^63\) The corrector responsible for both corrections, according to Scrivener (1864:440), is corrector B. The context, and the following word, makes it clear that τούς was here intended for TOYC in the original text, as is the case in the
5.1.3. **Indentation and paragraph markers in d05**

The quotation’s Latin text can be found on Folio 423a. The text of the quotation is indented by the space of about five letters. The start of the paragraph in which the quotation is contained starts at Acts 2:29 (*DAUID ENIM DICT IN EUM*), but different from D05, the next paragraph is only indicated to begin at *TUNC OMNES QUI CONUENERANT* (the beginning of the text of Acts 2:37 in d05) and not directly after the quotation.

5.1.4. ** Corrections in d05**

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 d05.

5.2. **Other quotations or allusions to Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in the text of D05**

The popularity of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in the early stages of the spread of Christianity is shown by the numerous quotations of or allusions to this text by NT authors.\(^{64}\) In D05, note should be taken of the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Matthew 22:44, Luke 20:42 and Mark 12:36, and allusions to this text in Matthew 26:64, Luke 22:69, and Mark 14:62.\(^{65}\) As the quotations and allusions are found in respective parallel passages in the synoptic Gospels, the discussion below will first consider Matthew 22:44, Luke 20:42-43 and Mark 12:36 and then Matthew 26:64, Luke 22:69 and Mark 14:62.\(^{66}\)

---

\(^{64}\) Cf. Steyn (1995:116): “Ps 109(110) is probably the text most used in early Christianity in connection with Jesus’ exaltation….”

\(^{65}\) The Psalm is listed in the NA\(^{28}\)’s *loci citati vel allegati* as quoted in 1 Corinthians 15:25 and Hebrews 1:13, and alluded to in Romans 8:34, Ephesians 1:20, Hebrews 1:3, Hebrews 8:1 and Hebrews 10:12, but these texts are not contained in D05. A possible allusion to Psalm 109:1 (LXX) is also listed for Mark 16:19, but the original folios containing Mark 16:15-20 in D05 / d05 are unfortunately lost. The possible link of Mark 16:19 with Psalm 109:1 (LXX) (and Acts 2:34-35) rests on the phrase εκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ. The equivalent text on the supplement folio of D05 reads ΕΚΑΣΙΔΕΝ ἘΝ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΘΥ, with the d05 supplement reading *SEDIT A DEXTRIS DĪ*.

\(^{66}\) Matthew 22:41-45, Mark 12:35-37a and Luke 20:41-44 are identified as parallel passages in the margin of NA\(^{28}\), and the same is true for Matthew 26:57-68, Mark 14:53-65 and Luke 22:54-55, 66b-71 and 63-65. These passages are also indicated as respective parallels in the Ammonian Sections, but this help would not necessarily have been

Although the similarities between the text of Acts 2:34-35 and Luke 20:42-43 in D05 have been pointed out by scholars, especially with regard to their shared reading of ΛΕΓΕΙ (e.g., Cerfaux 1950:44; Haenchen 1954:155; Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2004:175), the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Matthew 22:44 and Mark 12:36 have mostly been overlooked. However, these two passages might have influenced the scribe of D05 even more than that of Luke 20:42-43, as Matthew 22:44 shows signs of OT awareness and Mark 12:36 is located closer to Acts in the manuscript and thus likely to have been written at a point in time closer to the scribe’s writing of Acts 2:34-35. As the four passages are quotations of the same text, it will be helpful to present them in one table in the order of their appearance in D05:

available to the scribe of D05 or the D05 tradition, since the Ammonian Sections were only added to the manuscript in the second half of the sixth century CE (cf. Parker 1992:41-43). Dautzenberg (1983:160-162) takes Acts 7:55-56 to contain a further allusion to Psalm 110:1 (LXX), suggesting that the allusion could be taken from the Gospels’ trial scene, especially Luke 22:69 (cf. Mark 14:62). The link is primarily discernible on the grounds of the two occurrences of the phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν (τοῦ θεοῦ), but the context is also similar – even though Psalm 110:1 (LXX) has “sit” (κάθου), while Acts 7:55-56 has “standing” (ἑστῶτα). D05 reads ΚΑΙ ἸΝ ΤΟΝ ΚΝ ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΕΣΤΩΤΑ (where NA28 reads καὶ Ἰησοῦν ἑστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ); the fuller title serves to more closely define whom Stephen is seeing, namely, the Lord Jesus. Although this may be influence from Psalm 110:1 (LXX) on Acts 7:55, this is not a certainty.
### Matthew 22:44

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Latin Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΙΠΕΝ ΚΣΤΩ ΚΩΤ ΜΟΥ· ΚΑΘΟΥ ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>DIXIT DΝΣ DΜΟ MEΟ· SEDE A DEXTRIS MEIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΩC ΑΝ ΘΩ ΤΟΥC ΕΚΘΡΟΥC ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>PONEC PONAM INIMICOS TUOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΥΠΟΚΑΤΩ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>SUPTUS&lt;sup&gt;67&lt;/sup&gt; PEDES TUOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Luke 20:42-43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Latin Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚΣΤΩ ΚΩΤ ΜΟΥ· ΚΑΘΟΥ ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>DICT DΜS DΜO MESE A DEXTERAM MEAM&lt;sup&gt;68&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΩC ΤΙΘΩ ΤΟΥC ΕΚΘΡΟΥC ΣΟΥ ΥΠΟΚΑΤΩ</td>
<td>USQUE DUM PONAM INIMICOS TUOS SUB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ ΣΟΥ &lt;…&gt;</td>
<td>PEBIDUS TUIS &lt;…&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mark 12:36<sup>69</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Latin Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚΣΤΩ ΚΩΤ ΜΟΥ· ΚΑΘΟΥ ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>DIXIT DΜS DΜO MESE AD DEXTERAM MEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΩC ΘΩC ΤΟΥC ΕΚΧΘΡΟΥC ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>DONEC PONAM INIMICOS TUOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΥΠΟΚΑΤΩ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>SCAMILLUM PEDUM TUORUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Acts 2:34-35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Latin Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚΣΤΩ ΚΩΤ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>DIXIT DΝΣ DΝΟ MEΟ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΘΟΥ ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>SEDE AD DEXTERAM MEAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΩC ΘΩC ΤΟΥC ΕΚΘΡΟΥC ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>DONEC PONAM INIMICOS TUOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΥΠΟΠΟΔΙΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ ΣΟΥ</td>
<td>SCAMILLUM PEDUM TUORUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5.2.1.1. Psalm 109:1 (LXX) / Matthew 22:44

The text of Matthew 22:44 in D05 can be found on Folio 76b, and that of d05 on Folio 77a. The text is indented; the scribe consequently must have known that the text was a quotation from the OT. In both D05 and d05, a medial point (between MOY and KAΘOY) separates the two halves of the first line of the quotation. This medial point functions in D05 to indicate the line divisions of the manuscript’s Vorlage (Parker 1992:78-79). The Vorlage of Matthew 22:44’s text, then, was similarly arranged to the text of Acts 2:34-35 in D05, as will be demonstrated below.


<sup>68</sup> Stone (1946:45) notes that there is a slight possibility of _DEXTERAM MEAM_ being a mistake for the ablative case (of which the form was often confused with the accusative in late Latin) after _a / ab_ in Luke 20:42, a common way to express locality in d05. Stone further notes, however, that the _A_ in this line is more likely to be a mistake through haplography, or perhaps an error of hearing – for _ad_. The latter case seems more likely.

<sup>69</sup> According to Scrivener (1864:439), the correction of ΘΩCΩ to ΘΗCΩ (by simply drawing a small H above the Ω) was done by corrector A; an unidentifiable hand (or hands) corrected ΕΚΘΡΟΥC to ΕΧΘΡΟΥC by placing a dot above the K and striking it out with a diagonal line.
The quotation in Matthew 22:44 is attributed to David by its introductory formula in Matthew 22:43, making the link with the text of Acts 2:34-35 even easier to perceive, as the introductory formula in Acts 2:34 also attributes the quotation to David.


The quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Luke 20:42-43 is found in D05 on Folio 267b and in d05 on Folio 267b. The text is not indented, and the following text continues on the same line on which the text of the quotation ends. However, the text following the quotation only resumes after a “small space” (the terminology belongs to Parker 1992:31) of about the size of one letter. These small spaces most likely function in Luke as a marker of the end of the line in Vorlage of D05 (Parker 1992:79). A similar space appears between ΜΟΥ and ΚΑΘΟΥ – which would make the Vorlage of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Luke 20:42-43 in D05 look similar to Acts 2:34-35 in D05 (and similar to the Vorlage of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Matthew 22:44, as discussed above). However, the layout does not provide any decisive indication that the quotation of Psalm 109:1 in Luke 20:42-43 in D05 was perceived to be an OT quotation by the D05 tradition.

Similar to the parallel passages in Matthew 22:44 and Mark 12:36, the introductory formula of Luke 20:43-44 attributes the quotation to David, foregrounding a possible link with Acts 2:34-35.

70 The introductory formula reads ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΙϹ ΠΟϹ ΟΥΝ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΕΝ ΠΙΝΤΙ ΚΑΛΕΙ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΚΝ ΛΕΓΩΝ in D05 and AIT ILLIS QUOMODO ERGO DAUID IN SPÛ / UOCAT EUM DÎMÎ DICECS in d05.
71 For a full description of the punctuation of D05, see Parker (1992:31-34).
72 Compare the “large space” with a double point at the start of the paragraph in Luke 20:41 (ΕΙΠΕΝ ΔΕ ...) three lines before the quotation. These larges spaces functioned as paragraph or section markers (Parker 1992:79). The punctuation in d05, although not different from that of D05, is not as pronounced for this passage.
73 Although neither ΥΠΟΚΑΤΩ nor SUB has been marked as the start of a new line in the text’s Vorlage, it can be assumed that the preposition was originally on the same sense-line as the noun phrase it governs. Furthermore, ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ ΣΟΥ and PEDIBUS TUIS would have been exceptionally short lines had ΥΠΟΚΑΤΩ and SUB not originally stood on the same line.
74 The introductory formula, the first phrase of Luke 20:43, reads ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΒΙΒΛΑ ΤΩΝ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ in D05 and DAUID DICIT IN LIBRO PSALMORUM in d05.
5.2.1.3. Psalm 109:1 (LXX) / Mark 12:36

Mark 12:36 in D05 has an introductory formula75 of one line’s length starting at the top of Folios 331b with the equivalent of d05 starting at the top of Folio 332a. The first line of the quotation is divided by a medial point in both D05 and d05; this indicates that these two parts were on separate lines in the Vorlage (Parker 1992:79). As is the case with Matthew 22:44, the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Mark 12:36 was arranged in a similar way to the text in Acts 2:34-35 in the Vorlage of Mark.

As is the case with the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Matthew 22:44 and Luke 20:42-43, the context of the quotation attributes the quoted text to David, strengthening the possibility of the scribe perceiving a link with Acts 2:34-35.

5.2.1.4. Textual differences between the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05

The text of Acts 2:34-35 in D05 will be discussed in detail below, but a few remarks on the agreements and disagreements between this text and the other quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05 will be made here. At the outset, it is worth noting that none of the Greek versions of the quotation in D05 agree, even though all three of the passages had a similar layout in the Vorlage of D05 (as became apparent in the discussion above). The same goes for the Latin versions of the quotation in d05, except for Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35 – and then only if the nomina sacra (D̅ M̅ S̅  D̅ M̅ O̅ vs. D̅ N̅ S̅  D̅ N̅ O̅) are not taken into consideration.

The first set of agreements and disagreements concerns both the Greek and the Latin, namely, the use of the words λέγω and dico at the start of the quotation. The Latin tenses (dixit vs. dicit) might be easy to confuse either visually76 or by a slight lapse of concentration, but the difference between the Greek ΕΙΠΕΝ and ΛΕΓΕΙ is much harder to explain along these lines: The most likely explanation for ΛΕΓΕΙ (which differs from the Greek OT tradition’s ειπεν at the start of

---

75 The introductory formula in D05 reads ΚΑΙ ΌΥΤΟC ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΕΙΠΕΝ EN ΤΩ ΠΙΝΤ ΤΩ ΛΓΙΩ; while d05 reads ET IPSE DAUID IN S̅ P̅ O̅  SANCTO. There is thus no equivalent for ΕΙΠΕΝ in d05 at this point!
76 Although C and X are not the easiest letters to confuse visually, it is easier to propose a misreading of a single letter than what must have happened in the Greek to produce a shift in tense.
the quoted text) would be influence from a Latin version that read *dicit*. Interesting to note, then, is that the respective readings of Matthew 22:44 and Luke 20:42-43 agree in tense in D05 and d05, while Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35 disagree. This disagreement would imply that the Greek text of the D05 tradition (with regard to εἶπεν and λέγει) was changed based on different Latin *Vorlagen* than d05, or that the Greek text of Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35 might have been changed on account of the occurrence of ΛΕΓΕΙ in Luke 20:42-43, which was copied onto the manuscript of D05 prior to the other two.\(^{77}\) Unfortunately, it is not possible to decisively determine the motivation behind the ΛΕΓΕΙ of Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35.

Two further points of difference occur in the Greek text.\(^{78}\) The first of these, the reading found directly after ΕΩϹ, differs in each instance of the quotation: ΕΩϹ ΑΝ ΘΩ (Matthew 22:44), ΕΩϹ ΤΙΘΩ (Luke 20:43), ΕΩϹ ΘΩϹΩ (Mark 12:36) and ΕΩϹ ΘΩ (Acts 2:35). The “omission” or “addition” of ἄν in the overall text of D05 is not strange (cf. Yoder 1958:469-471),\(^{79}\) but the different forms of the verb τίθημι are noteworthy. Although the temporal use of ἔως is possible with or without ἄν,\(^{80}\) the usage without the particle was not common and could have seemed strange to some (Goodwin 1894:313, paragraph 1466; Smyth 1963:544, paragraph 2402).\(^{81}\) Perhaps these forms are different attempts to solve a previous “omission” of ἄν in the text of

---

77 The ΛΕΓΕΙ in Mark in D05 could also be due to the context of this quotation, as the uncontested reading is Δωπίο λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον in the very next verse (Mark 12:37) – that is to say, the commentary on Mark 12:37 resumes in the present tense, and this could have influenced a scribe to “correct” the reading in Mark 12:36. However, as both the introductory formula and the quotation itself reads εἶπεν in the majority of the Greek NT tradition, it is more likely that a scribe would adjust the reading in Mark 12:37 than the other way around.

78 The difference in spelling of the equivalents for ἐχθρός is a matter of orthography only. Yoder (1958:52-53) identifies, apart from Matthew 10:36, Luke 1:74, Acts 2:35, and Acts 13:10 as instances of ἐχθρός spelled with κ rather than χ. Yoder lists a further five instances where D05 has κ as an equivalent for words regularly spelled with χ. He fails to mention Matthew 22:44, and notes that Mark 12:36 contains the form “ἀκχθροῖ” – but Mark actually reads ΕΚΧΘΟΥϹ, without a ρ. Yoder (1958:71) notes that the extra κ in Mark 12:36 of D05 “has been added to strengthen the aspirate.”

79 Speaking of D05, Yoder (1958:470) erroneously remarks that ἄν “is added in this type of clause [i.e., temporal clauses] in Mark 12:36; Luke 2:26; 20:43; 21:32 and Acts 2:35.” Yoder is consistently wrong in all of these cases: D05 has no equivalent for ἄν in any of them. His next claim, namely that ἄν is omitted in Matthew 10:23 in D05, is also untrue: an ΑΝ is present in D05. Yoder’s consistency shows that he most likely made a simple mistake in reading the data he has collected. He nevertheless provides enough solid evidence to prove that there is not a definite rule with regard to the “omission” or “addition” of ἄν in D05.

80 However, this is only in the subjunctive (Smyth 1963:543, paragraph 2399). Presumably the ΘΩϹΩ found in Mark 12:36 is intended as a future indicative, and consequently not only speaks of a wrong form of the verb, but also incorrect usage of Greek grammar.

81 In fact, Smyth (1963:545, paragraph 2404) remarks that after Homer this usage “lends an archaic colouring to the style” of a work.
Luke 20:42-43, Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35 in D05. Whatever the case may be, there seems to have been some confusion regarding this part of the text of Psalm 109:1 (LXX), but the scribe of D05 did not pick up on it or seemed not to have consulted the other instances of the quotation during the copying process.

The final point of difference in the Greek text of D05 is between ὑποκάτω (Matthew 22:44, Luke 20:42-43 and Mark 12:36) and ὑποποδίον (Acts 2:35). In both Mark 12:36 and Matthew 26:64, ὑποκάτω is the reading most often preferred for the “initial” text (cf. Holtz 1968:51; Dupont 1984a:280). Scholars are generally agreed that the “initial” text of Luke 20:43 contained ὑποποδίον as equivalent for the ὑποκάτω of D05, and that Luke has corrected the text of Mark 12:36 on the grounds of his knowledge of the reading of the Greek OT tradition (e.g. Holtz 1968:51; Dautzenberg 1983:152; Steyn 1995:117, footnote 294). In the case of D05, this would imply a change back to the text of Mark 12:36, or perhaps Matthew 22:44, in Luke 20:43. Such a change is unlikely to have happened during the production of D05 due to the differences between these texts, especially if the Latin text is taken into consideration. Mark 12:36 contains a telling difference between the Greek and Latin equivalent of this reading in D05: where D05 has ὑποκάτω (“under”), d05 reads SCAMILLUM (“footstool”).

In the Latin text, two disagreements should be noted. The first disagreement is the reading of A DEXTRIS MEIS in Matthew 22:44 in d05 and A(D) DEXTERAM MEAM in the rest of the quotations in d05. The choice of the ablative case with dexter seems to be a distinctive feature of the Latin translation of Matthew in d05, and does not need to go back to the Latin OT tradition (all manuscripts of which have a dextris meis). Conversely, A(D) DEXTERAM MEAM is the translation of choice for the phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν for the rest of the Gospels and Acts.

82 Dupont (1984a:280) has suggested that this ὑποκάτω, which is not read in any Greek OT witness to Psalm 109:1 (LXX), stems from Psalm 8:7.
83 See the discussion of SCAMILLUM in the text below, as well as the discussion of SCAMILLUM in the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in this study’s chapter on Isaiah.
84 Stone (1946:100) notes, apart from Matthew 22:44, the following instances where the phrase A DEXTRIS is used as an equivalent for ἐκ δεξιῶν in Matthew: 20:21, 20:23, 25:33, 25:34, 26:64 and 27:38. A DEXTRIS is not used in Mark in d05 and Acts at all (except for the supplementary leaves of Mark), and twice in Luke (1:11 and 23:33).
85 That the quotation’s text as it is found in Matthew 22:44 was not taken directly from a Latin OT tradition is mitigated by the SUPTUS (to be read as subitus) found in d05 only; a dextris is the most common reading in Latin
Similar to this difference between the Latin texts of the quotation is the appearance of *USQUE DUM* in Luke 20:43 where the rest of the quotations in d05 have *DONEC*.⁸⁶ *USQUE DUM* as equivalent for ἕως seems to be a consistent translation choice for the translator of Luke in d05.⁸⁷ In both these cases of disagreement confined within the Latin text (*A DEXTRIS MEIS* in Matthew 22:44 and *USQUE DUM* in Luke 20:43) the difference is on account of translation choices in the Vorlage of d05, and not on the d05 scribe’s knowledge of the text in another form.

In light of the multiple differences discussed above, it is unlikely that the scribe of D05 paused to consult any of the previous instances of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) when writing the text of Acts 2:34-35. Consulting the manuscript might be the case with the ΛΕΓΕΙ of Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35, but the other differences between these texts (e.g., ΥΠΟΚΑΤΩ – Mark 12:36 vs. ΥΠΟΠΟΔΙΟΝ – Acts 2:35) speaks against it. The closest correspondence between the eight texts is between the Latin of Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35, but if any influence occurred in these two texts, it is influence from the text of Acts 2:34-35 on the text of Mark 12:36.⁸⁸

———

⁸⁶ The *PONEC* of d05 was corrected to *DONEC* by corrector G (Scrivener 1864:432), presumably shortly after the production of the manuscript and it was most likely the reading in the Vorlage of d05. Stone (1946:20) offers the *PONEC* for *donec* found in Matthew 22:44 in d05 as an example of orthographic shift from d > p, and notes that this shift is peculiar and singular. He (1946:65) concludes that this occurrence “may be palaeographical, since it is attested in no other place …”


⁸⁸ That the text of Acts 2:34-35 of d05 influenced the text of Mark 12:36 is unlikely. The agreements between these texts against the other quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in d05 can be explained without positing direct influence. *AD DEXTERAM MEAM* is most likely a translation choice by the translator of Mark (see the discussion above). The *SCAMILLUM* found in Mark 12:36 is unique in the Latin NT tradition of Mark, but unlike the Greek text of Mark with its variant of the preposition ὑποκάτω, the Latin NT tradition of Mark mainly knows forms of the noun scabellum (cf. Wordsworth & White 1898:249). The *SCAMILLUM* of d05, then, is most likely a variant of this type (i.e., the noun category) of a word that was well-known to the scribe of d05 or the community in which this scribe worked. Also see the discussion on *SCAMILLUM* below and the discussion of the *SCAMILLUM* found in the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in this study’s chapter on Isaiah.

The allusions to Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Matthew 26:64, Luke 22:69 and Mark 14:62 occur in parallel passages. In Matthew 26:64 and Luke 22:69, the words καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως (τοῦ θεοῦ, as it is added in Luke) calls Psalm 109:1 (LXX) to mind. The D05 text of Matthew 26:64 and Luke 22:69 reads the same as that of NA28 with regard to this phrase, and there is nothing in the context of these two versions (as it appears in D05) which could be seen as influence on the text of Acts 2:34-35 in D05. Mark 14:62 contains the same phrase as found in the other two parallel passages, albeit with a different word order (ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον τῆς δυνάμεως). Mark 14:62 reads different from NA28 in D05, but the phrase in question is essentially the same (ἘΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΚΑΘΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΩϹ). In all three parallel passages, similar phrases to their Greek counterparts are found in d05. It appears, then, that there was no influence between these passages that could explain textual variants in Acts 2:34-35 or shed light on the OT awareness in D05 with regard to this text.

5.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34 D05 differs from the general Greek NT tradition, all manuscripts of which read with NA28: οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς, λέγει δὲ αὐτός. D05 is in agreement with the first part of this introductory formula, but as an equivalent for the phrase λέγει δὲ αὐτός, D05 has ΕΙΡΗΚΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΑΥΤΟϹ. The change of tense and conjunction is best explained as contextual exegesis (cf. Cerfaux

89 In fact, the whole of Matthew 26:64 D05 corresponds to the text of NA28, except for differences in orthography and a OT1 as introduction following after ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΥΜΕΙΝ. Of course, the D05 texts contain nomina sacra.
90 The text of Mark 14:62 D05, found on Folio 341b, reads: Ο ΔΕ ΔΙΚΡΙΘΛΕΙ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΑΥΤΩ ΕΙΜΙ / ΚΑΙ ΟΨΕЩΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΥΙΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ / ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΚΑΘΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΕΩϹ / ΜΕΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΝΕΦΕΛΩΝ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ.
91 Corrector D has supplied THϹ before ΔΥΝΑΜΕΩϹ (Scrivener 1864:439).
92 Matthew 26:64 reads SEDENTEM A DEXTRIS UIRUTUTIS, Luke 22:69 reads SEDENS AD DEXTERAM UIRUTUTIS / DEI and Mark 14:62 reads AD DEXTERAM SEDENTEM UIRUTUTIS. In the case of Mark 14:62, the verse does not start, as the typography of Scrivener’s edition (1864:86) would suggest, with an ekthesis, but rather as normal text at the margin.
93 D05 contains a variant spelling of Δαυίδ (ΔΑΥΕΙΔ) and, differing from most manuscripts but in line with the oldest witnesses, reads OYPANOYC not as a nomen sacrum.
94 According to Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps (2004:175), the D05 reading’s use of the perfect tense tends “to introduce the quotation … to present David’s speech more as a scriptural record than his personal words.”
1950:44); that is to say, exegesis in the text and context of D05.\textsuperscript{96} Indeed, this change in the introductory formula in D05 cannot be fully understood without reference to the change of the same verb in the actual quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 in D05; this will be discussed below. The text found in d05, \textit{NON ENIM DAUID ASCENDIT IN CAELOS / DIXIT ENIM IPSE}, is in general agreement with D05 and has minimal support in the Latin NT tradition.\textsuperscript{97} The \textit{DIXIT} found in d05 is more likely to be a translation of D05 than the other way around, as the most natural translation of \textit{DIXIT} would be εἴπεν, which occurs most frequently in a NT context. The reference to David in the introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05 makes a sense of OT awareness likely.

\textsuperscript{95} The different conjunction in D05 (ΓΑΡ) “serves to confirm the contents of the first affirmation” in Acts 2:34 (Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2004:175), strengthening the idea that David did not ascend into the heavens. Read-Heimerdinger and Rius-Camps see this difference as resulting in a more “logical structure” of Peter’s argument.

\textsuperscript{96} Haenchen (1954:155), however, has a different explanation for the EIPHKEN of D05. According to him, the \textit{Vorlage} of D05 (sic; Haenchen might have implied the broader D05 tradition, i.e., the \textit{Vorlage} of the manuscript in the D05 tradition in which the change first occurred) must have read something similar to λέγει γάρ αὐτός· λέγει κύριος·. Haenchen envisions the copyist finding in the margin the reading εἴρηκεν, as a translation for the Latin side of the \textit{Vorlage’s dixit}. (The \textit{dixit} in question, according to Haenchen, is the second \textit{dixit} in the verse; i.e., the \textit{dixit} at the start of the quotation.) The copyist then falsely installed this εἴρηκεν in the place of the first λέγει. However, Haenchen’s explanation is not likely. Haenchen cautious that different rules apply to the D05 tradition because of its bilingual nature, but his explanation is simply too complicated, assuming a number of unnecessary steps. He does not make clear why the second \textit{dixit} is in view, nor is his explanation satisfactory with regard to the difference in the D05 text between ΛΕΓΕΙ and \textit{DIXIT}. Furthermore, although the Latin \textit{dixit} could be translated by a perfect tense, someone acquainted with the Greek and Latin NT tradition would probably default to the aorist (εἴπεν), as \textit{dixit} is most frequently a translation of the latter form.

\textsuperscript{97} Codex Gigas reads \textit{DIXIT} with d05; while \textit{enim} is also found in \textit{p}.
5.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

5.4.1. D05 ΛΕΓΕΙ / d05 DIXIT

The ΛΕΓΕΙ at the start of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 in D05 is unique among Greek NT manuscripts of Acts, which instead have εἰπεν. In the Latin NT tradition, d05 is not unique in reading DIXIT, the reading of most Latin NT manuscripts. The Greek OT tradition – with the exception of support by Irenaeus (noted by Tischendorf 1869:356) – knows only the past tense (εἰπεν), and the Latin OT tradition likewise only attests to dixit.

The Hebrew tradition could have been responsible for this change in D05, although this seems less likely than the other options. The difficulty in determining whether the ΛΕΓΕΙ of D05 could be influenced by the Hebrew OT tradition lies in assessing נאם. The later Hebrew tradition understood this word to be vocalised as נאם, which, as Brown, Driver and Briggs (1906:610) describe it, means “utterance, declaration, revelation, of prophet in ecstatic state.” נאם is, according to Holladay (1971:223), a “fixed tech[nical] term in prophetic speech [and] in comb[ination] w[ith] oth[er] formulas.” A frequent translation of נאם is the fixed phrase τάδε λέγει. However, translation in the present tense with just a form of λέγω without the

98 Among the documents from Qumran, Psalm 15:7-10 has only been preserved in 4QPsα. According to Ulrich, Flint & Skehan (2000:50), this manuscript as a whole does not have many differences from the MT. In fact, the “manuscript may be regarded as a representative of the edition of the Psalter that is also preserved in the Masoretic Text.” The fragmentary text of 4QPsα does not contain any differences from the text of BHS.

99 After collating D05 against WH, Yoder (1958:389; cf. Yoder 1959:245) concluded that the category where an aorist tense in WH is represented by a present tense in D05 contains “the largest number of variations in tense … 196 in all.” However, Acts contains the least of these differences (fourteen in total), and Yoder only notes two differences in the indicative mood. (The other difference noted by Yoder is at Acts 21:27). The present tense of λέγω cannot be explained in this case by way of this general tendency in the manuscript, as the tendency does not apply to Acts.

100 This difference in the D05 text is not without implication for understanding the Acts text. For instance, the partial basing of Moessner’s (1998:217) argument on the symmetry in the repetition of “David saying” (in the present tense) with regard to Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) and Psalm 109:1 (LXX), to substantiate that these two psalm quotations interpret each other, does not pertain to the D05 text.

101 Only the Latin NT manuscripts A and I1 have dicit.

102 Tischendorf (1869:356) notes in a discussion on Mark 12:36 that “Iustius fabulat λέγει pro ειπεν nostro loco reponere.” That is to say, at least in two quotations from the OT by Irenaeus (in Dialogus cum Tryphone 83.1 and 83.2 – text available in Goodspeed 1915:ad loci) there is evidence of λέγει being used instead of ειπεν in Psalm 109:1 (LXX), and that the dividing line between the two tenses might be narrower than supposed. On the other hand, the form of the quotation of the Greek OT quoted by Irenaeus could also have been influenced by the Greek NT manuscripts with λέγει in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts.
demonstrative pronoun is also common (cf. Muraoka 2010:74, 269). It is not inconceivable that the present tense of some witnesses to the NT tradition (both Greek and Latin) could be due to a later translation from Hebrew. However, this seems unlikely to have happened in only one NT manuscript, especially in the light of the rewritten introductory formula of D05 which includes the same verb (EIPHKEN) in a different form.

A number of scholars have pointed out that the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Luke 20:42 D05 begins in exactly the same way as the quotation in Acts 2:34 (ΛΕΓΕΙ) in D05 (e.g., Cerfaux 1950:44; Haenchen 1954:155; Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2004:175). This similarity should not be overstated, as if the text of Acts 2:34 is directly dependent on Luke 20:42. The quotation of Mark 12:36 in D05, for instance, also starts with ΛΕΓΕΙ rather than the rest of the Greek NT tradition’s εἶπεν. Moreover, as has been shown above, none of the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in the Gospels and Acts were harmonised to fit exactly with each other in the text of D05. Nevertheless, the agreement of the texts reading ΛΕΓΕΙ could perhaps show that the D05 reading of ΛΕΓΕΙ in Acts 2:34 is on account of familiarity with these readings in D05 or a larger tradition of reading a present tense in this quotation. As Yoder (1958:391) notes, the agreement of these texts in reading ΛΕΓΕΙ “may point to a Septuagint text other than that behind א and ב.” The fact that the rest of these texts disagree and have not been adjusted to fit with each other within the text of D05 enhances the likelihood of this possibility. However, although it is unlikely that the scribe of D05 paused to consult the other passages which quote Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05 when copying Acts 2:34-35 (as has been pointed out above), it is possible that he changed this reading to ΛΕΓΕΙ at the start of the quotation because he remembered the other readings in the manuscript. In support of such a theory, one can name the order of the occurrence of the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05 (all of which seemed to have had the same textual layout in their respective Vorlagen): Matthew 22:44 (ΕΙΠΕΝ),

103 E.g., Genesis 22:16, where the verb (יִשָּׂא / λέγει) also follows other verbs of saying. It should be noted that יִשָּׂא can also be translated in the aorist (e.g. εἶπεν) or with a form of φησί (e.g., φησίν). The latter word is the translation equivalent opted for in the only other appearance of יִשָּׂא in Psalms, Psalm 35:2 (LXX): φησίν (ὁ παράνομος).
104 The change in tense is slight, but has some implications for the interpretation of the quotation within its context. Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2004:175), for instance, notes that “[t]he use of the present tense in the opening verb of the speech has the effect of making David’s words relevant to the present situation.”
105 Haenchen (1954:155), with reference to the Latin NT tradition, also notes the possibility of a whole tradition of reading the first word of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in the present tense.
106 Yoder (1958:391), however, erroneously identifies the psalm as “Psalm 34:1”.
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Luke 20:42 (ΛΕΓΕΙ), Mark 12:36 (ΛΕΓΕΙ) and Acts 2:34 (ΛΕΓΕΙ). Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the quoted text of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) had the same layout in all three passages of the Synoptic Gospels as in Acts 2:34-35. This theory of a scribe simply remembering the previous texts is a viable one, and in light of the lack of substantial evidence for λέγει in the Greek OT tradition, this is the most likely option.107

5.4.2. D05 has no equivalence for the article (ὁ) before ΚϹ

D05 does not have an equivalent for the article (ὁ) before ΚϹ. There are only three manuscripts which have this reading in common with D05, namely א01, ב03 and 1241. In the Greek OT tradition, only the bilingual manuscript R does not contain an equivalent for the article – the rest of the tradition reads ὁ κύριος.108 That the article has been elided in D05 in Acts 2:34 on account of the Greek OT therefore seems unlikely.

As with the ΛΕΓΕΙ of D05 in Acts 2:34-35, a look at the other passages in D05 where Psalm 109:1 (LXX) is quoted in D05 is instructive. The lack of an article at the start of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in the text of D05 in all the quotations of this verse (ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚϹ in Luke 20:42, Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34; cf. ΕΙΠΕΝ ΚϹ in Matthew 22:44) is notable. Furthermore, the D05 tradition shows OT awareness in at least two of the four instances where Psalm 109:1 (LXX) is quoted, as well as peculiarities against the rest of the Greek and Latin NT tradition in more or less the same places in the rest of the quotation (especially the repetition of ΛΕΓΕΙ at the start of quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX), and the variants ΑΝ ΘΩ, ΤΙΘΩ, ΘΩϹΩ and ΘΩ). As noted above under the discussion of the ΛΕΓΕΙ of D05 in Acts 2:34, the D05 text of Acts 2:34 could possibly have been influenced by a scribe’s familiarity with the form in the other passages in D05 in which Psalm 109:1 (LXX) was quoted. That is to say, out of memory alone – and not by looking at the already written pages of D05 – the scribe altered this passage in Acts 2:34 to fit with the rest. However, in light of the editorial choices of some of the Greek NT

107 Yoder (1959:245) notes that, against WH, there is a preference in the whole of D05 for the present tense. Perhaps the preference for ΛΕΓΕΙ in three of the four quotations is merely part of this tendency.

108 As the Greek OT manuscript R and D05 are both bilingual manuscripts, the question should be asked whether the lack of an article could be on account of influence from the Latin tradition. However, this seems unlikely, based on the differences between the Greek and Latin texts of all the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05.
tradition’s editions, it is also possible that the “initial” text of Acts 2:34 had no article, and that D05 preserved this text without alteration. The following table lists manuscripts in the Greek NT tradition without an equivalent for ὁ in their respective quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX). NA28, WH and SBL have been added to show the eclectic nature of these texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Texts without an equivalent for ὁ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 22:44</td>
<td>א01 B03 D05 Z035 NA28 WH SBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:42</td>
<td>B03 D05 NA28 WH SBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 12:36</td>
<td>B03 D05 472 NA28 WH SBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:34</td>
<td>א01 B03 D05 1241 WH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The external evidence for the lack of the article remains almost constant, yet the article has been added to Acts 2:34 (albeit within square brackets, indicating its dubious nature, in NA28) and not to the other instances of this quotation. To this should be added the evidence of the Epistle of Barnabas 12:10, which independently quotes Psalm 109:1 (LXX) without the article (cf. Holtz 1968:51). If this is the case, which seems to be the more likely option, D05 has preserved the text faithfully amidst a large number of OT witnesses, which may point to a reluctance on the part of the D05 tradition to conform to the OT traditions.

---

109 In fact, the external evidence for the exclusion of ὁ is stronger in Matthew 22:44 and Acts 2:34, as א01 also adds its weight in these two passages.

110 Holtz (1968:51) is of the opinion that no instance of the quotation as found in Matthew 22:44, Luke 20:42-42, Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35 had the article in its initial text. Holtz proposes that the best explanation for the external evidence (including that of the Epistle of Barnabas 12:10) is that there was a Greek OT text that did not have an equivalent for the extant Greek OT manuscripts’ article. According to the latest critical text (and its text-critical apparatus) of the Epistle of Barnabas, that of Holmes (2007:420), there is no textual variation in the text of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) as it is found in 12:10. Apart from the article, the text of the quotation in Epistle of Barnabas 12:10 reads exactly the same as that of LXXGött. Cerfaux (1950:44), followed by Haenchen (1954:156), thinks that the article was added to the “initial” text in order to avoid confusion between “the Lord” and Christ.

111 The Hebrew tradition reads the proper noun הוהי, which could be translated with or without the article. Consequently, the Hebrew tradition does not help to determine whether the article was omitted or added in the text of the quotation.
5.4.3. **D05 ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ ΜΟΥ / d05 AD DEXTERAM MEAM**

The ΕΚ ΔΕΞΙΩΝ of D05 is in agreement with the rest of the Greek NT tradition. The d05 reading of *AD DEXTERAM MEAM* is unique, while the rest of the Latin NT tradition reads *a dextris meis*, a reading shared by the whole Latin OT tradition. As in the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28 in d05, the reading of d05 in Acts 2:34 is in the singular, while the Greek traditions (both NT and OT) and the rest of the Latin traditions (both NT and OT) have a plural form. In Psalm 109:1 (LXX), as in Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX), the Hebrew tradition also reads a singular. However, as discussed above in the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 in Acts 2:25-28, this singular number in d05 is most likely due to the preference of the translator of the Latin text of the d05 tradition.

5.4.4. **D05 ΕΩϹ ΘΩ / d05 DONEC PONAM**

Manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition read ἕως ἂν θῶ at the start of Acts 2:35 in the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35, but D05 has no equivalent for ἂν. The lack of ἂν in this context most probably signifies a desire to make a more definite – and not merely possible – statement (cf. Cerfaux 1950:44). The reading of d05, *DONEC PONAM*, is in agreement with both the Latin NT and OT traditions, and ἂν is present in all the witnesses to the Greek OT tradition. The Hebrew tradition reads עד־אשית, which could be understood as assertive and not only a possibility; thus, this appears to be closer to the D05 reading than the rest of the Greek NT tradition. However, the reading of both the Latin OT and NT (*donec ponam*), which could be understood as either a future indicative or a present subjunctive, could also have influenced D05 in this matter. In light of the repeated difference in the D05 text with regard to this exact point in the quotation in the passages which quote Psalm 109:1 (LXX) (AN ΘΩ – Matthew 22:44, ΤΙΘΩ – Luke 20:43, ΘΩϹΩ – Mark 12:36 and ΘΩ – Acts 2:35), however, the most likely reason

---

112 The Latin NT manuscripts e08 and t read *ad dextris meis*, and the Latin NT manuscript D reads *a dexteris meis*.
113 The difference between the ablative and accusative cases in the quotation of Psalm 15:8 (LXX) in Acts 2:25 and the quotation of Psalm 109:1 in Acts 2:34 have been discussed above.
114 According to Cerfau (1950:44), the D05 text here, by not reading ἂν, reinforces the affirmation present in the text.
115 Cf. Haenchen 1954:156, who also notes the possibility of influence from the Latin tradition.
would be – as was suggested with regard to the ΛΕΓΕΙ in Acts 2:34 in D05 – that the scribe of D05 was familiar with this quoted text and corrected the text in Acts 2:35 from (a faulty) memory of the preceding quotations.

5.4.5. *d05 SCAMILLUM*

While the Greek NT tradition agrees with the ΥΠΟΠΟΔΙΟΝ of D05, the *SCAMILLUM* of d05 in the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) is unique. The Latin NT tradition has a number of variants for this reading,\(^{116}\) as does the Latin OT tradition,\(^{117}\) but the Greek OT tradition and the Hebrew tradition show no variance with regard to their respective equivalents for the *SCAMILLUM* of d05.\(^{118}\)

5.5. **Conclusion**

The quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 in D05 shows OT awareness in its indentation. The quoted text is not indicated as a paragraph on its own, but the next paragraph does start immediately after the quotation. This paragraph division, however, is only found in D05; in d05, the next paragraph only starts a few lines later. The next paragraph in D05 starts with ekthesis, even though the previous text was indented. This affirms the conclusion drawn in the previous discussion on the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28 about the paragraphing system in D05: A new paragraph in D05 is always indicated by ekthesis, irrespective of whether the previous text was indented or not.\(^{119}\)

---

\(^{116}\) In Acts 2:35, the known equivalents for the *SCAMILLUM* of d05 are: *scabellum* ḪKMRSTUW and *scabillum* in ABCFGIOV.

\(^{117}\) The most common reading in the Latin OT tradition is *scabellum*, but *scabellum* (M\(^{+}\)) *scauellum* (a), *scabilum* (Q\(^{8}\)) and *scapillum* (R\(^{F}\)) are also known variants.

\(^{118}\) Also see the discussion of *SCAMILLUM* in the quotation of Isaiah 66:1 in Acts 7:49 in the chapter on Isaiah in the present study.

\(^{119}\) There is a possibility that the scribe made a mistake in the layout of D05. After copying the indented text of the quotation, the scribe could have been unsure of the margin, and have started too far to the left. However, one line of the introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 in D05 (EIPHKEN ΓΑΠ ΑΥΤΟC) had already been copied onto the page, which provided a clear indication of the margin, and the A of D05 was written slightly larger, which indicates that it was probably meant as a paragraph marker.
The discussion of the other quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) above was enlightening. Only one of these quotations (Matthew 22:44) shows OT awareness by way of indentation. All of their introductory formulae, however, describe the quotation as an utterance of David and could point a scribe to the Psalms or the other instances where the quotation is found in D05. Nevertheless, a closer investigation has shown that the text of each respective quotation is not directly dependent on any of the others. That is to say, the scribe did not consult previously copied text when copying the text of later quotations. The scribe also did not consult the respective Vorlagen of these quotations (in the respective texts of Matthew, Luke, Mark and Acts) when copying the text of other quotations. However, it was noted that the text had a similar layout in all of the Vorlagen of the quotations. Indeed, the text of the Vorlagen of all the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05 were arranged in exactly the same way as the text of Acts 2:34-35 as it is found in D05. Furthermore, a number of textual differences were identified that occur at the same point in the respective quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05 (e.g. ΑΝΘΩ – Matthew 22:44, ΤΙΘΩ – Luke 20:43, ΘΩϹΩ – Mark 12:36 and ΘΩ – Acts 2:35).

The introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 D05 has probably been changed on account of contextual exegesis of the text of the quotation as it is found in D05. The introductory formula shows no difference with regard to OT awareness against other manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition: The quotation is still attributed to David (and by implication, the Psalms).

The discussion above has highlighted a number of possibilities for the origin of the ΛΕΓΕΙ of Acts 2:34 in D05. Although the possibility exists that D05 follows a different tradition of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) than the tradition that has survived today (which unanimously reads εἶπεν), this is far from certain. The ΛΕΓΕΙ of D05 could also be based on the Latin tradition, where dixit and dicit is easy to exchange by mistake. If this is the case, the ΛΕΓΕΙ of D05 in Acts 2:34 may be the result of influence from a Latin tradition different from d05 (which reads DIXIT). Alternatively, there is a strong possibility that the scribe of D05 remembered the start of the two

---

120 Of course, it is also possible that the DIXIT of d05 in Acts 2:34 could be a copying error for dicit, but, since εἶπεν seems to be the “initial” text of Acts, this would imply that a mistake was made (when the reading changed to dixit) and yet another mistake again produced DIXIT.
previous quotations of this text (Luke 20:42 and Mark 12:36) and “corrected” the text of D05 in Acts 2:34 accordingly. The viability of this option is increased by the order of the Gospels in D05 as well as similarity of the layout of the Vorlagen of these two quotations with Acts 2:34-35 in D05 (as has been pointed out above). The same phenomenon of correction from memory – but in this case, faulty memory – could be the reason behind the ΕΩΣ ΘΩ of D05 in Acts 2:35. At every instance of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in D05, the equivalent for ΕΩΣ ΘΩ reads differently (ΑΝ ΘΩ – Matthew 22:44, ΤΙΘΩ – Luke 20:43, ΘΩϹΩ – Mark 12:36). A less likely alternative is that the ΕΩΣ ΘΩ of D05 in Acts 2:35 is a change that was made to produce a statement that is more definite and less of a possibility.

In light of the above, one can conclude that the evidence for influence on the text of Acts 2:34-35 from OT traditions is minimal. One additional difference in the text of D05 discussed above could bolster this statement. In Acts 2:34, D05 does not have an equivalent for the article (ὁ) before Κύριος. Although this lack of an article could also be based on a case of correction through memory as in the two examples mentioned in the previous paragraph, there is a very likely possibility that the “initial” text of Acts did not contain an article before κύριος in Acts 2:34 either. If this is the case, the text of D05 has resisted being changed in the face of an overwhelming majority of Greek OT manuscripts which do have an article before κύριος.121

121 Most of these manuscripts of the Greek OT tradition were produced at a much later stage than D05, but their univocal witness to the inclusion of the article in the Greek OT tradition proves that the reading with the article must have been well established at this early stage.

6.1. The physical text of D05

| ΟĆ ΔΙΑ Π殓ΝĈ ΑΠΙΌΥ ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΣΤΟΜΑΤΟΣ ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ | QUI PER SPM SANCTUM PER OS LOCUTUS EST |
| ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΠΑΙΔΟϹ COΥ | DAVID PUERO TUO |
| ΙΝΑΤΙ ΕΦΡΥΞΑΝ | QUARE FREMUERUNT GENTES |
| ΚΑΙ ΑΑΟΙ ΕΜΕΛΕΤΗϹΑΝ ΚΑΙΝΑ | ET POPULI MEDITATI SUNT INANIA |
| ΠΑΡΕ΢ΗϹΑΝ ΟΙ ΒΑϹΙΑΕΙϹ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ | ADSISTERUNT REGES TERRAE |
| ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΕϹ ΣΥΝΗΧΘΗϹΑΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ | ET PRINCIPES CONGREGATI SUNT IN UNU’ |
| ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΥ’ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΧΡ’ ΑΥΤΟΥ | ADUERSUS DΝΜ ET ADUERSUS ΧΡΜ ΕΙUS |

6.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26 D05 is on Folio 429b. The quotation is indicated by indentation of about four and a half letters, which caused the second to last line of the quotation (ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΕϹ ΣΥΝΗΧΘΗϹΑΝ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ) to come very close to the right-hand edge of the page; the scribe anticipated the end of the line by writing smaller letters for ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ, and the line curves downward to the right. Neither the quotation nor its introductory formula starts a new paragraph; rather, the paragraph begins at the beginning of the direct speech in Acts 4:24 at the bottom of Folio 428b (ΔΕϹΠΟΤΑ ΣΥ’ ΘϹ Ο ΠΟΙΗϹΑϹ ΤΟΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΓΗΝ). The next paragraph begins directly after the quotation (𝐶ΥΝΗΧΘΗϹΑΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΠΙ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑϹ EN TH ΠΟΛΕΙ ΤΑΥΤΗ).

6.1.2. Corrections in D05

ΚΑΙΝΑ has been corrected to ΚΕΝΑ by way of an E written on top of and between the original ΚΑΙΝΑ’s A and I.123

122 There are nine cases identified by Yoder (1958:51) where the scribe of D05 misspells words through the loss of a vowel. He notes that these could either be on account of errors of hearing or simple scribal error.

123 The corrector responsible for this change is identified by Scrivener (1864:441) as corrector C. Although the correction of ΚΑΙΝΑ “new” to ΚΕΝΑ “empty” technically changes a discrepancy between the Greek and Latin texts (cf. Parker 1992:135), the original intention of D05 was probably κενά, an orthographical variant of καινά. See the discussion of the text of Acts 4:25-26 in D05 below.
6.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of this quotation may be found on Folio 430a. The quotation is indented by the space of about three and a half letters, and the paragraph markers agree with that of D05. That is to say, the paragraph starts at Acts 4:25 / Ꭺ الصحيح N̅ E̅ ̅Qui FeCīStI caelum et terram and ends directly after this paragraph, the next paragraph starting with Collecti sunt enim reuera in ciuitate hac.

6.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26 d05.

6.2. Other quotations or allusions to Psalm 2:1-2 in the text of D05

There is only one place where Psalm 2:2 is alluded to, according to NA 28's list of loci citati vel allegati, which pertains to the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26 in D05. This allusion occurs in Acts 4:27 – directly after the quotation of Psalm 1:1-2.\textsuperscript{124}

6.2.1. Psalm 2:1-2 / Acts 4:27\textsuperscript{125}

Acts 4:27, set within the prayer uttered by the community to which Peter and John has safely returned, takes up and comments on the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 directly before, in Acts 4:25-26. The D05 text reads, in essence, the same as NA 28 (excluding orthography and the word order of COY ΠΑΙΔΑ).\textsuperscript{126} The text of Acts 4:25-26 is interpreted in the community’s prayer as a

\textsuperscript{124} Psalm 2:2 is listed as alluded to in Revelation 11:15, 17:18 and 19:19 in NA 28's list of loci citati vel allegati, but D05 does not contain Revelation. John 1:41 is also listed as a possible reference to Psalm 2:2, but the text of John 1:16b-3:26a in D05 and John 1:1-3:16a in d05 has unfortunately been lost.

\textsuperscript{125} As will become clear in the argument below, Acts 4:27 picks up on both Psalm 2:1 and Psalm 2:2, and not only Psalm 2:2 as listed in the NA 28's list of loci citati vel allegati.

\textsuperscript{126} The text of Acts 4:27 in D05 reads СУНХΘΘΗϹΑΝ ΓΑΡ ΕΠΙ ΛΑΗΘΕΙΑϹ ΕΝ ΤΗ ΠΟΛΕΙ ΤΑΥΤΗ / ΕΠΙ ΤΟΝ ΑΓΙΟΝ ΠΑΙΔΑ ΙΗΝ ΟΝ ΧΡΕΙϹΑϹ / ΗΡΩΘΗϹ ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΟΝΤΙΟϹ ΠΙΛΑΤΟϹ / СУΝ ΕΘΝΕϹΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΟΙϹ ΙϹΡΑΗΛ. The verse in d05 reads Collecti sunt enim reuera in ciuitate hac / SUPER
prophecy pointing to contemporary circumstances: Herod and Pilate are identified with the kings and rulers (οἱ βασιλεῖς … οἱ ἀρχοντες – Acts 4:26) who have, together with the nations and “peoples” (ἔθνη … λαοί – Acts 4:25),127 gathered (συνήχθησαν – Acts 4:26 / Acts 4:27)128 against the Lord’s Christ – who is identified with Jesus129 (cf. Roloff 1981:86; Bellinger 1990:139; Boismard & Lamouille 1990b:45; Von Wahlde 1995:525).130 This explicit link, created by the repetition of the συνήχθησαν found in Acts 4:26 and Acts 4:27, is not as discernible in d05, where Acts 4:27 has COLLECTI SUNT as an equivalent for Acts 4:26’s CONGREGATI SUNT. Thus, although part of the immediate context of the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26, the text of Acts 4:27 D05 did not influence the text of the quotation.

6.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26 presents one of the more puzzling cases in the textual tradition of Acts. The text in D05 (ΟϹ ΔΙΑ Π̅Ν̅Ϲ̅ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ϹΤΟΜΑΤΟϹ ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ / ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΠΑΙΔΟϹ ΨΟΥ) is unique in the Greek NT tradition; this is also true for the Latin NT tradition with regard to the text as found in d05 (QUI PER S̅ P̅ M̅ SANCTUM PER OS LOCUTUS EST / DAVID PUERO TUO). The Greek NT tradition varies so

SANCTUM PUEPERUM TUUM ΙΗΜΙ QUEM UNXISTI / HERODES UERO ET PONTIUS PILATUS. This can be found on Folios 429b and 430a, respectively. There appears to be no reason for the word order of COY ΠΑΙΔΑ in D05 (Read-Heimerdinger 2002:109).

127 Epp (1966:76) notes that the λαοι of the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26, as taken up by Acts 4:27, refers to the Jews. Brawley (1995:6) points out that Acts 4:27 disturbs the parallelism of the quotation of Psalm 2:1, as ἔθνη and λαοί refer to the same entity in the context of Psalm 2. Nevertheless, this discontinuity from the original context does not negate the fact that Acts 4:27 is a commentary on the quotation in the context of Acts. See Brawley (1995:100-104) for a discussion on the effect of this discontinuation as well as a discussion on the use of the quotation as a persuasive device within the context of Acts.

128 Evans (1993:221) also points out the possible connection of these terms with Acts 4:5, where “the rulers” (τοὺς ἀρχοντας), elders and scribes were “gathered” (συναχθηκανιν), which Peter addresses (Acts 4:8) as “rulers of the people (ἀρχοντες τοῦ λαοου) and elders.” The possibility of making a link between these verses is even greater in D05 than in the text preferred by Evans, as in D05 the “rulers” are not named in an oblique sentence, but the verb is cast in the nominative with an indicative verb (CYNHXΘΗCAN ΟΙ ΑΡΧΟΝΤΕΚ etc).

129 For the view that Jesus is here linked with a messianic view on David, see Jipp (2010:272-273).

130 That Acts 4:27 is commentary on the preceding two verses is shown, for one thing, in the peculiar use of λαος in the plural, which is reminiscent of the language of the Old Greek tradition. Although the term frequently occurs in the plural in the Old Greek tradition, the NT (i.e., in this case, NA26) knows the term only in OT quotations (Acts 4:25; Romans 15:11), Luke 2:31, part of Simeon’s eulogy (which is heavily influenced by LXX usage), and Revelation (Revelation 7:9; 11:9; 10:11; 17:15; 21:3). At Acts 4:27, a few manuscripts read the singular ((ο) λαος), but the attestation is weak and the reading is negligible. Barrett (1994:246) suspects the author of Acts’s conservative and respectful attitude towards the “LXX” as reason behind his retaining the plural. See Wilckens (1974:132-133) for a discussion of the interpretation of Acts 4:25-26 offered by Acts 4:27.
greatly (with regard to word order, lexical choice and shorter and longer readings), that Holtz (1968:54) views the situation as beyond repair.\footnote{A similar stance is taken by Haenchen (1954:156), who thinks that one should rather take the whole phrase – in any version – as corrupt. Metzger (1994:279-281) devotes the length of two pages to a discussion of the problem in his textual commentary, starting his discussion with “[t]he text of this verse is in a very confused state.” Metzger ends his discussion by admitting the inadequate nature of the UBS text, stating that “[r]ecognizing that the reading of P74 א01 א B א E al is unsatisfactory, the Committee nevertheless considered it to be closer to what the author wrote originally than any of the other extant forms of text.”}

Eine Einzeldiskussion der damit gegebenen textlichen Probleme dürfte sich erübrigen; sie würde, wie die Dinge nun einmal liegen, schwerlich zu wirklich überzeugenden Ergebnissen gelangen. Letztlich führt jeder Versuch, den Text zu heilen, zu mehr oder weniger begründetem Raten.

The text in D05, however, is not far removed from the text found in the earliest Greek NT majuscule manuscripts, also represented by NA\textsuperscript{28} (ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών).\footnote{This is the reading of P74 א01 א02 ב03 א08 פ044 and a number of miniscule manuscripts.} This is especially true when measured against the majority of Greek manuscripts, classified as “Byzantine” (Pierpoint & Robinson 2005:257, for instance, adopted ὁ διὰ στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών for their eclectic edition).\footnote{Schille (1983:140) errs in grouping D05 with the “Byzantine” texts which elide διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου.} Textual differences within this “Byzantine” group are negligible, concerning mostly scribal blunders or a τοῦ before either στόματος or παιδός. Dibelius (1968:81-82; cf. Roloff 1981:86) has argued for an original form more closely aligned to this group, suggesting that the reading(s) containing an equivalent for πνεύματος ἁγίου as found in the earlier majuscules (including א01 and D05) have been influenced by a theology that wishes to emphasise the role of the Holy Spirit. However, as Metzger (1994:281; similarly Ropes 1926:40) points out, it is hard to explain how this was done, because “no adequate reason can be assigned why it should have been glossed so ineptly.” Rather, the “Byzantine” text shows a reaction to the grammatical and theological difficulties involved with reading τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ – as it is possible to understand “Holy Spirit” as equal to “David” in this sentence. The reading in D05 should probably also be understood as a later development of a א01-like text; but whereas the “Byzantine” text has simplified the difficulty by removing the objectionable πνεύματος ἁγίου,
the D05 tradition has made it clear that two entities are involved (ΔΙΑ ΠΝÇ ΑΓΙΟΥ and ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΤΟΜΑΤΟϹ … ΔΑΥΕΙΔ) (cf. Ropes 1926:41). In doing so, the D05 tradition had recourse to the very similar statement in Acts 1:16, ΗΝ ΠΡΟΕΙΠΕΝ ΤΟ ΠΝΑ ΑΓΙΟ/ ΔΙΑ ΚΤΟΜΑΤΟϹ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ (which is, apart from orthography, the reading of the rest of the Greek NT tradition). In this phrase, the Holy Spirit and the “mouth of David” are clearly distinguished. Both the “Byzantine” text and D05 have also chosen to elide the clumsy τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.

A noteworthy feature of D05 is the occurrence of ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ in the introductory formula, unique in the Greek NT tradition. At first glance, ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ appears problematic, as the clause is introduced in D05 by the relative pronoun ΟϹ. This has led some to believe that ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ is a scribal error for an intended ἐλάλησας (cf. Barrett 1994:244). However, ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ in D05 was probably intended as an aorist participle rather than a second person indicative aorist. Although an isolated participle following a relative clause is not the best of grammar, Yoder (1958:523) gives multiple examples in D05 similar to Acts 4:25 where the phenomenon occurs.

Important to note nonetheless, is that the D05 tradition, although a later development of a text such as א01, has kept the main themes of the introductory formula intact. The ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ which

---

134 Yoder (1958:238) takes the ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΤΟΜΑΤΟϹ in D05 as evidence of influence from a Hebraic tradition (cf. Blass & Debrunner 1984:176, paragraph 217) on D05, basing his argument partially on the number of occurrences of this phrase, according to him, in D05 when measured against WH. Yoder’s argument thus assumes that the D05 tradition was influenced by the Hebrew tradition since a Hebraistic idiom keeps recurring in D05 alone. However, of the four occurrences Yoder names, only Acts 1:4 (ΦΗϹΙΝ ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΤΟΜΑΤΟϹ ΜΟΥ) and Acts 4:25 actually contain the phrase. The other two passages read ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟϹ (Acts 6:8 in D05 contains ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟϹ ΚΥΗΜΩΝ ΠΗΥΧΡΥ and 18:8 contains ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΟΝΟΜΑΤΟϹ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΗΜΩΝ ΠΗΥΧΡΥ). Yoder’s error is clearly due to a misreading. Moreover, as the D05 tradition had Acts 1:16 at its disposal as a model, in which the expression “ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΤΟΜΑΤΟϹ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ occurs, Yoder’s proposal of a Hebraic influence is completely unfounded.

135 Zahn (1922:175, footnote 2) suggests that ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ (as in D05) be accepted instead of εἰ πών, and τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν be striked out. Zahn’s suggestion, however, does not solve all the difficulties involved and remains a conjecture as it is not based on manuscript evidence.

136 This is, for instance, the assumption made by Stone (1946:62-63), who takes the phrase LOCUTUS EST in the introductory formula as one of the few instances where a verb that ought to be in the second person in δ05 has been rendered in the third person, stating about his examples that “[t]he Greek is second person in all these instances.” However, the δ05 reading is most likely in accord with the D05 reading, as will be argued below.

137 A further, even less likely possibility is that ΛΑΛΗϹΑϹ is simply an unaugmented second person aorist.
has most likely been added in D05 merely serves as a clarification:\textsuperscript{138} The reference to David as the instrument through which is spoken is still present in the text. Therefore, the introductory formula as found in D05 does not affect the degree in which awareness of the text’s OT origin can be inferred from the text.\textsuperscript{139}

6.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation\textsuperscript{140}

6.4.1. D05 KAINA / d05 INANIA

The KAINA (“new”, or perhaps to be understood in the sense of “anew”) of D05 is not unique, as a number of manuscripts (including א01 and A02) have this reading, all of them without correction.\textsuperscript{141} The OT traditions (i.e. Greek, Latin and Hebrew) do not contribute anything to the question of the intention of this KAINA.\textsuperscript{142} Most likely, KAINA in D05 is an orthographical variant for κενά (which could be translated “in vain” in this context), which is read by most Greek NT manuscripts, and would make more sense in the context of the text, whether NT or OT (so too Ropes 1926:42: “the meaning was vana, as in all versions”; Ropes is followed by Holtz 1968:53; similarly Barrett 1994:246). Moreover, Scrivener (1864:xlvi; followed and quoted by Parker 1992:108; also cf. Haenchen 1977:67), notes the E > AI (and AI > E) sound to be interchanged frequently in D05, which strengthens the likelihood of the KAINA of D05 having the meaning of “in vain”.

\textsuperscript{138} Compare the ΘΣ found in D05 (and the majority of other manuscripts) in Acts 4:24 with the lack of this word in the earliest majuscules, possibly to make explicit whom the present prayer addresses.

\textsuperscript{139} For a more detailed discussion of proposed solutions for the “initial” text, see Metzger (1994:279-281).

\textsuperscript{140} The text for this quotation is relatively stable. To prove this point, Holtz (1968:53, footnote 2), has only two remarks: that “D schreibt, offenbar versehentlich, Zeile 1 οριμασάν” and a note about the variants for κενά, as will be discussed below. The d05 reading ADSISTERUNT is unique in the Latin NT for Acts 4:26 – it is probably a form of assisto or adsisto (“to stand somewhere, to stand at or by” cf. Lewis & Short 1879:181). Nevertheless, it is an acceptable translation of the Greek, and direct translation from the Greek could be a sufficient explanation for its provenance.

Among the manuscripts discovered at Qumran, a fragmentary manuscript (11QPs) containing one letter of the end of Psalm 2:1 and two letters of the start of Psalm 2:2 ([... יְהֹוָּ֣אַה יִצֵּ֣בֹו...]) was found. In 4QFlor, a non-Biblical manuscript, the extant text is slightly longer but still fragmentary. The editor of this text, Allegro (1968:54), points out only two variants, מַצֵּא וּמַצֵּא וּמַצֵּא. Both these variants are probably orthographical variants, written in scriptio plena. See Bellinger (1990:136-139) for a discussion of the use of the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26 against the psalm’s OT context.

\textsuperscript{141} Apart from D05, א01 and A02, the Greek NT manuscripts 049 181 665 1241 2147 2243 2344 all read καινα.

\textsuperscript{142} It should be noted that orthographical variants are not noted in the LXXGött’s apparatus, and that some witnesses to the Greek OT tradition might actually have καινά in their text.
6.5. Conclusion

The quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26 in D05 is indented, and consequently shows OT awareness. The paragraphing system used in D05, however, did not indicate this quotation as a separate paragraph. This conforms to the general pattern of the Psalms, as has become clear from the discussion thus far.

It has also become clear in the discussion above that the only passage in the text of D05 which alludes to Psalm 2:1-2, the text immediately following the quotation in Acts 4:25-26, has not had an influence on the text of Acts 4:25-26. This statement is even more applicable with regard to d05, as the link made between Acts 4:25-26 and Acts 4:27 through the repetition of the keyword συνήχθησαν has not been kept intact (CONGREGATI SUNT – Acts 4:26; COLLECTI SUNT – Acts 4:27).

The introductory formula of this quotation in D05, although most likely altered, still provides a good indication that the quoted text stems from the OT. In fact, the level of OT awareness evoked by the introductory formula in D05 is on par with that of other majuscule manuscripts of the period and what can be seen as the “initial” text, even though the texts of these manuscripts differ. Changes within the introductory formula in D05 can be ascribed to theological and grammatical reasons, and a desire to avoid ambiguity.

Lastly, the text of the quotation of Psalm 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-26 in D05 does not show any real changes from the Greek NT tradition, which is in agreement with the Greek OT tradition. As the introductory formula has clearly been revised (not only in D05, but probably in most manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition), this agreement between the Greek NT and Greek OT traditions is worthy of note. This agreement also speaks of a possible familiarity with the text of this psalm.
7. Acts 13:33 / Psalm 2:7-8

7.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΡΩΤΩ ΨΑΛΜΩ ΓΕΓΡΑΙΤΑΙ</th>
<th>SICUT ENIM IN PRIMO PSALMO SCRIPTUM EST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΥΙΟϹ ΜΟΥ ΕΙ CY</td>
<td>FILIUS MEUS ES TU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΓΩ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΣΕ</td>
<td>EGO HODIE GENUIT TE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΙΤΗϹΑΙ ΠΑΡ ΑΙΜΟΥ</td>
<td>POSTULA A ME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΔΩϹΩ ΕΟΙ ΕΘΝΗ</td>
<td>ET DABO TIBI GENTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΤΗΝ ΚΑΗΡΟΝΟΜΙΑΝ ΕΟΥ</td>
<td>HEREDITATEM TUAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΚΑΤΑϹΧΕϹΙΝ ΕΟΥ</td>
<td>ET POSSESSIONEM TUAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΤΑ ΠΕΡΑΤΑ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ</td>
<td>TERMINOS TERRAE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The quotation of Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 in D05 occurs on Folio 469b, the same page as the quotations of Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34 and Psalm 15:10 in Acts 13:35. All of these texts are indented by the space of about four and a half letters. The paragraph in which these quotations occurs starts on the previous Greek folio (468b) with ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΓΕΝΟΥϹ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ (Acts 13:26). The next paragraph begins on the following Greek folio (470b) with ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΕϹΤΩ ΥΙΟΙ ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ (Acts 13:38).

7.1.2. Corrections in D05

There are no corrections in the text of the quotation of Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 in D05.

---


144 The indentation follows the line of prick marks that was created in the production of the manuscript.

145 Schulz (1827:20) suggests that the short lines as presented in both D05 and d05 stem from Eastern practice. However, Schulz does not provide any evidence to back up this claim.
7.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin of the quotation can be found on Folio 470a; it is indented by the space of about five letters. The paragraph markers are in agreement with that of D05: The paragraph starts at *UIRI FRATRES FILI GENERIS ABRAHAM* (Acts 13:26) and the next paragraph starts at Acts 13:38’s *NOTUM ERGO SIT UOBIS UIRI FRATRES*.

7.1.4. Corrections in d05

No corrections were made to the text of the quotation of Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 in d05.

7.2. Other quotations or allusions to Psalm 2:7-8 in the text of D05

According to the NA²⁸’s list of *loci citati vel allegati*, there are three allusions to Psalm 2:7 that occur in the text of D05, namely Matthew 3:17, Luke 3:22 and Mark 1:11.¹⁴⁶ These texts occur within parallel passages in the synoptic Gospels,¹⁴⁷ and will be discussed under one heading below. There are no allusions to or quotations of Psalm 2:8, which is part of the D05 text in Acts 13:33, in passages occurring in D05.¹⁴⁸


As will become apparent in the discussion below, Matthew 3:17, Luke 3:22 and Mark 1:11 blur the lines between quotation and allusion, as they are partly quoted *verbatim* and are introduced by what an introductory formula.¹⁴⁹ As with the quotations of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in the

¹⁴⁶ Also listed as a possible reference to Psalm 2:7 is John 1:34, but the text of John 1:16b-3:26a in D05 and the text of John 1:1-3:16a in d05 has regrettably been lost.
¹⁴⁷ Matthew 3:13-17, Mark 1:9-11 and Luke 3:21-22, the episode of the baptism of Jesus, are marked in the NA²⁸’s margins as parallel passages.
¹⁴⁸ Psalm 2:7 is listed as a quotation in Hebrews 1:5 and Hebrews 5:5 in NA²⁸’s list of *loci citati vel allegati*. Psalm 2:8 is listed as a quotation in Revelation 2:27 and an allusion in Hebrews 1:2, but neither Hebrews nor Revelation is contained in D05.
¹⁴⁹ Cf. the diplēs at Acts 7:31 in B03, which reads ΕΤΕΝΕΤΟ ΦΩΝΗ ΚΥ, a similar expression to the respective introductory formulæ for the “allusions” to Psalm 2:7 in D05. Matthew 3:17, Mark 1:11 and Luke 3:22 have not
Synoptic Gospels in D05 discussed above, it will be best to present these three texts in the order of their appearance in the text of D05 in a single table, together with the text of Psalm 2:7 as it appears in D05 (excluding Psalm 2:8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... CY EI ΥΙΟC ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟC</td>
<td>... ΥΙΟC ΜΟΥ ΕΙ CY ΕΓΩ ΧΜΕΡΟΝ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΑΕ ...</td>
<td>CY EI O ΥΙΟC ΜΟΥ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟC EN COI ΕΥΔΟΚΗCΑ 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN Ο ΕΥΔΟΚΗCΑ</td>
<td>ΕΓΩ ΧΜΕΡΟΝ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΑΕ</td>
<td>TU ES FILIUS MEUS DILECTUS IN QUO BENE PLACUI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acts 13:33**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΥΙΟC ΜΟΥ ΕΙ CY</td>
<td>FILIUS MEUS ES TU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΓΩ ΧΜΕΡΟΝ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΑΕ</td>
<td>EGO HODIE GENUIT E ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.1.1. Psalm 2:7 / Matthew 3:17

The D05 text of Matthew 3:17 is found on Folio 8b and Folio 9a. The text of this quotation is one of the relatively few places where the sense-lines of D05 and d05 do not match up: In D05, the line containing the text similar to Psalm 2:7 starts with ΠΙΟC ΑΥΤΟΝ, which is part of what can be seen as the introductory formula to this saying (ΚΑΙ ΙΔΟΥ ΦΩΝΗ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩΝ ΛΕΓΟΥϹΑ / ΠΙΟC ΑΥΤΟΝ), while its equivalent *AD EUM* is found at the end of the line preceding this similar text in d05; this line reads *ET ECCE UOX DE CAELIS DICENS AD EUM*.

D05 is the only manuscript of the Greek NT tradition which reads CY EI as equivalent for οὗτος ἐστιν at the beginning of the phrase in question. This reading has some support in the Latin NT

---

150 The ΕΥΔΟΚΗCΑ of D05 has been corrected to read ΗΥΔΟΚΗCΑ by corrector A, as identified by Scrivener (1864:436).
tradition (including d05) and writers of the early church. Because of this strong external evidence against the text of D05 at this point, one may reasonably suspect influence from the parallel passage in Mark 1:11. Matthew and Mark were likely placed next to each other in an earlier codex of the D05 tradition from which the text of D05 was copied (Parker 1992:118-119), but neither the Greek nor the Latin of Matthew 3:17 and Mark 1:11 completely agree with each other in D05 and d05. In D05, the readings differ between EN Ω (Matthew 3:17) and EN COI (Mark 1:11). In d05, the readings differ between IN QUO BENE PLACUI (Matthew 3:17) and IN QUEM CONPLACUI (Mark 1:11). Consequently, the influence on D05 in Matthew 3:17 from Mark 1:11 probably did not occur directly between these two specific passages in the D05 tradition. In any case, the D05 text of Matthew 3:17 has much more likely been influenced by Mark 1:11 than the Greek OT tradition, which invariably reads these words in the order νιός μου εί σύ.

Finally, the introductory formula of this quotation in D05, agrees with the Greek NT tradition apart from the ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ of D05 (which has no equivalent in the Greek NT tradition), does not betray any specific connection with the OT. This, in agreement with the fact that the text does not occupy its own lines in the layout of the manuscript, makes OT awareness and a link with the text of Acts 13:33 a less likely possibility in D05.

7.3.1.2. Psalm 2:7 / Luke 3:22

Luke 3:22 can be found on Folio 195b in D05 and Folio 196a in d05. This text is in exact agreement with the Greek OT tradition and with Acts 13:33. Similarly, the text of d05 also agrees with the Latin OT in these two passages. The layout provides no visual clues to a possible OT provenance of the quoted text in Luke 3:22; in fact, the quoted text is nestled between text at the start of the first line of the quotation (ΓΕΝΕϹΘΑΙ) and at the end of the second and last line of the quotation (ΗΝ ΔΕ ΙΗϹ ΩϹ ΕΤΩΝ Λ). D05 is the only manuscript of the Greek NT tradition that has the text of Psalm 2:7 in Luke 3:22, but the evidence for the text of Psalm 2:7 in

---

151 Apart from d05, only the Latin manuscripts a, b, g, and h support this reading, together with the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac manuscripts. Irenaeus (Adversus Haereses 3.9; text available in Brox 1995:78) lends further support to the D05 text. For a discussion of the text of Irenaeus and the text itself, see Grenfell & Hunt (1903:10; 1904:264).

152 Compare also the Hebrew tradition’s נַפְשׁ-יִצְוָא, the order of which the Greek OT tradition emulates.
Luke 3:22 by the Latin NT tradition and the early church writers is extensive. Ehrman (1993:62-67) has made a compelling argument for the authenticity of the D05 text in Luke 3:22. The key phrase here is ΕΓΩ ΨΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΠΕΤΕΝΝΗΚΑ ΚΕ; Ehrman argues that this phrase opens up the possibility of an adoptionistic reading of the text and that “orthodox” scribes, in shying away from adoptionism, altered the text to fit with the text of Mark in manuscripts other than D05. If Ehrman is correct, there would be no influence from Acts 13:33 on Luke 3:22, or vice versa. However, that the D05 reading of Luke 3:22 is attested primarily in the Latin NT tradition still makes the text suspect. Moreover, the text of Luke 3:22 appears at a suspicious juncture in D05. The text directly after the quotation of Psalm 2:7 consists of the introduction to the genealogy of Jesus, which appears to be revised in D05 (the only Greek NT manuscript to read ΗΝ ΔΕ ΠΗϹ ΩϹ ΕΤΩΝ ·ΑΡΧΟΜΕΝΟϹ ΩϹ ΕΝΟΜΕΙΖΕΤΟ ΕΙΝΑΙ). What follows appears to be a genealogy based on Matthew 1:6-16, presented in a reversed order from Matthew 1:6-16. Clearly, there was redactional activity in the D05 tradition at exactly this point. The same person responsible for the different genealogy could have recognised the passage as a reference to Psalm 2:7 and updated the text to stress the true nature of the “birth” of Jesus – He was begotten (cf. ΠΕΤΕΝΝΗΚΑ) by God. If this is the case, Acts 13:33, with its introductory formula assigning the quotation to the Psalms (even as it is found in D05 and possibly the Vorlage of D05), could have played a role in this change; but equally likely is that

153 A number of manuscripts of the Latin NT tradition has the exact text of d05 and Psalm 2:7 in the Latin OT tradition. These manuscripts are: a b c d ff l r (Wordsworth & White 1898:326). Writers of the early church from a wide geographic area attest to this reading, too: Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Methodius, Lactantius, Juvenecus, Hilary of Poitiers, Tyconius and Augustine all bear evidence to this reading (cf. Ehrman 1993:62-63, 106-107 for the exact passages and further examples).

154 This is indicated, for instance, in the critical apparatus of NA28. Cf. also Tischendorf (1869:449).


156 Even if the text of D05 in Luke 3:22 is secondary, Ehrman’s (1993:62-67, 106-107) discussion should make textual critics attentive to the complexity of this passage. It should also be noted that, even though the scribe responsible for changing Luke 3:23-31 to a genealogy based on Matthew 1:6-16 clearly showed a preference for the text of Matthew, he did not alter the text of Luke 3:22 to fit with Matthew 3:17. That the text of Luke 3:22 in D05 (even if it was original) played a role in a subsequent decision to exchange the normal text of Luke 3:23-31 with that of a genealogy based on Matthew 3:17 is not likely, or at the very least a moot question, as the text of Luke 3:23-31 contains a genealogy in any case – and the reference to being born (cf. ΠΕΤΕΝΝΗΚΑ) would not provide any additional impetus to alter the text of Luke 3:23-31.
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the phrase was recognised apart from influence from Acts 13:33, i.e., the quotation was recognised directly as a quotation from the OT.\textsuperscript{158}

The introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 2:7 in Luke 3:22 in D05 reads KAI ΦΩΝΗ EK TOY OYPANOY / ΓΕΝΕϹΘΑΙ and in d05 ET UOCEM DE CAELO / FACTAM. A link made on the grounds of this introductory formula with Acts 13:33 does not seem to be likely, especially keeping in mind the context of Luke 3:22 (namely, the baptism of Jesus).

7.2.1.3. Psalm 2:7 / Mark 1:11

The text of Mark 1:11 is on Folio 285b in D05 and Folio 286a in d05. These folios also contain the quotation in Mark 1:2-3, which has been indented.\textsuperscript{159} Mark 1:11, however, has not been treated in any special way apart from being written on its own line, starting from the margin. The unlikelihood of a relation between Mark 1:11 and Matthew 3:17 in D05 has been discussed above. However, the text of Mark 1:11 differs in D05 and d05.\textsuperscript{160} EN COI in D05 has IN QUEM as an equivalent in d05. IN QUEM most likely follows the text of Matthew 3:17 (but not Matthew 3:17 as found in d05, which reads IN QUO) and could be a direct translation of Matthew 3:17 (as it is found in D05). However, it is more likely that IN QUEM was based on a Greek NT text of Mark 1:11 that was adjusted to Matthew 3:17.\textsuperscript{161} The rest of this quotation, in

\textsuperscript{158} This would imply that the other allusion to which the text of this phrase in Luke 3:22 as it is found in the rest of the Greek NT tradition (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα) refers, Isaiah 42:1, was not recognised by the scribe. (On the composition of the phrase in Luke 3:22 as it is found in the rest of the Greek NT tradition, see Jones 1984:151).

\textsuperscript{159} The text of the quotation in Mark 1:2-3 is attributed to Isaiah in the text of D05 by the introductory formula (ΟÇ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ EN ΗϹΑΙΑ ΤΩ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗ (in d05 the equivalent text reads SICUT SCRIPTUM EST IN ESAIAM PROPHETAM). (The introductory formula reads somewhat different, but similar in its attribution to the prophet in NA\textsuperscript{28}. This text has been indented in spite of the fact that the first part of the quotation, Mark 1:2b, does not stem from Isaiah but rather from Exodus 20:23 or Malachi 3:1. There is a small gap between these two verses (i.e., between THN ΩΔΩΝ COY and ΦΩΝΗ in D05 and between UIAM TUAM and UOX in d05), which could indicate knowledge of this fact. The D05 text of Mark 1:3 has evidently been corrected to read the same as the Greek OT tradition (at the end of the verse, D05 has TOY ΘΥ ΥΜΩ where NA\textsuperscript{28} has αὐτοῦ; the D05 reading is the uncontested reading of the Greek OT tradition in Isaiah 40:3), but the indentation seems to take its cue from the wording of the introductory formula rather than exact knowledge of the OT’s reading.

\textsuperscript{160} This difference is also indicated by Parker (1992:216).

\textsuperscript{161} The oldest and usually considered to be weightier witnesses to the text of Mark in the Greek NT tradition (including D05) read ἐν σοι, although the majority of manuscripts read ἐν ὑμῖν (cf. Pierpoint & Robinson 2005:69). The reading in d05, IN QUEM, could therefore have been translated from a Greek NT text reading ἐν ὑμῖν. The situation is slightly different in the Latin NT tradition, where equivalents for ἐν ὑμῖν are scarce. The greatest part of the
any case, does not seem to be influenced by or to have influenced the text of Acts 13:33 in D05. The introductory formula, whether in D05 (ΚΑΙ ΦΩΝΗ ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩΝ) or d05 (ET UOX DE CAELIS), was also not likely to direct a scribe to either Acts 13:33 or the OT.


In summary of the discussion of Matthew 3:17, Luke 3:22 and Mark 1:11 in D05 above, it can be stated that the likelihood of influence between these texts among themselves and between them and Acts 13:33 in D05 is minimal. Not only do the texts that allude to Psalm 2:7 (Matthew 3:17 and Mark 1:11) or that quote Psalm 2:7 (Luke 3:22) differ (even, in the case of Mark 1:11, between D05 and d05), but so do the text of their introductory formulae. In the case of Luke 3:22, there is a possibility that the D05 text was the “initial” text; however, this possibility is somewhat diminished by the clear case of redactional activity in D05 in the following verses in D05. Whatever the case may be, the text of Psalm 2:7 as quoted in Acts 13:33 and Luke 3:22 agree exactly in D05, and if there was any influence, it did not extend to the contexts of these passages. All three passages in the synoptic Gospels are set within the context of the baptism of Jesus, and a link with Acts 13:33 based on context is unlikely in every case.

7.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of Psalm 2:7(-8) in Acts 13:33 (ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΡΩΤΩ ΨΑΛΜΩ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ) presents two textual difficulties in D05. The first of these readings, ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ, is unique to D05 in the Greek NT tradition. The rest of the manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition read ως καί (as does NA). The equivalent text in d05 is similar to D05: SICUT ENIM. SICUT is in agreement with the Latin NT tradition, and although a more natural

---

Latin NT tradition reads in te in Mark 1:11. The IN QUEM of d05 is unique in the Latin NT tradition in this passage, with only one manuscript (the Latin NT manuscript G) that reads in quo (cf. Wordsworth & White 1898:191). In Matthew 3:17, the reading in quo is secure in the Latin NT tradition (cf. Wordsworth & White 1898:50; Jülicher 1972:14).

There are some negligible disagreements with ως και. The ως of 1838 is undoubtedly a misspelling of ως, and an equivalent for και is not found in 180 and the supplementary leaves of 1831.
translation of ὁὕτως would be sic, it is conceivable that sicut would have been left intact as a translation equivalent for ὁὕτως. ENIM, on the other hand, is not a natural translation of καί; rather, the ENIM of d05 is in agreement with the ΓΑΡ of D05. With regard to ENIM, d05 is unique in the Latin NT tradition.

A more perplexing case is presented by the readings ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΡΩΤΩ ΨΑΛΜΩ (in D05) and IN PRIMO PSALMO (in d05). In reading the numeral ΠΡΩΤΩ ("first"), D05 is unique in the Greek NT tradition. In the Latin NT tradition, d05 is not unique, but has minimal support. The external evidence, then, weighs heavily against D05. However, other factors are in play in this specific reading, and the external evidence should not necessarily be followed blindly. Writers of the early church provide the most compelling case for an original πρώτῳ. Foremost of these is Origen, who notes that the practice of joining the first two psalms into one was a Hebrew custom, and that he had a Hebrew manuscript that did exactly this. About a century later

---

163 The normal translation equivalent of ὁὕτως is sic, as the entries in Hederich’s Greek-Latin / Latin-Greek dictionary (1832a:591 for ὁὕτως; 1832a:885 for ὡς; 1832b:156 for sic and sicut) show: Not once is sicut listed as equivalent for ὁὕτως.

164 A considerable number of witnesses to the Latin NT tradition have no equivalent for et, the only other known equivalent for the ENIM of d05. These witnesses (G, R, T, Codex Gigas, p, t, w, Ambrose of Milan (De fide Gratianum 5.1.25)) probably consider the et after sicut too awkward a construction. The text of Ambrose’s De fide Gratianum 5.1.25 can be found in Faller (1962:225).

165 Only Codex Gigas contains this reading.

166 An interesting case of too much trust in the external evidence can be found in the apparatus of UBS3 when compared with that of UBS4. Although the text of these two editions remained the same, the reading printed in the text of the edition (ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ) is rated a “D” (i.e., a very uncertain reading) in UBS3, but a “B” (i.e., relatively certain) in UBS4. The arguments for the choice of the reading printed in the text, as set out by Metzger (1975:412-414 for UBS3; 1994:363-365 for UBS4), have remained exactly the same; in fact, the explanation is repeated verbatim. As the main argument for the reading’s preference remains that the UBS Committee was “impressed by the weight of four of the great uncials”, one can deduce that these four manuscripts were valued more highly in UBS4.

167 Williams (1964:164) notes that “third-century Hebrew and Latin psalters put Pss. i and ii together as Ps. i,” but furnishes no proof for this statement. Williams’s statement should be treated with caution; Origen, at least, only provides evidence with regard to Hebrew practice. The suggestion by Zahn (1927:443), explicitly noted by Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2007:77), that Luke at first wrote πρώτῳ because this was in accord with the practice of the synagogues, but that Luke himself later supplied a number, cannot be proven. Cf. Metzger (1994:365), who points out the lack of evidence for the reading of the Psalms synagogue gatherings. Metzger (1994:365) also debunks the evidence from the Talmud, where the second psalm is sometimes grouped together with the first (to place Psalm 20:1 immediately after the “eighteenth” psalm), because this practice should be dated in accordance with the Eighteen Benedictions (of which originally there were less than eighteen), and is consequently late.

168 The Greek text of Origen’s statement on this matter in Selecta in psalmos is printed in Ropes (1926:263), but can also be found in PG 12:1100. For further attestation and a discussion of these sources, see Ropes (1926:364; followed by Metzger 1994:363).
than Origen, Hilary of Poitiers made a similar comment about this textual variant. Furthermore, as Elliott (2003:27-28) notes, πρῶτῳ is without doubt the lectio difficilior. Scribes familiar with the much better attested division of the psalms in the Greek OT tradition (whether numbered or not) were more likely to correct this reading to δευτέρῳ (cf. Clark 1933:356; Kilpatrick 1963:67). All of this has led a line of scholars from Ropes (1926:265) to Pervo (2009:329) to opt for πρῶτῳ as the older reading.

Another possibility is furnished by the reading found in P45, ΤΟΙϹ ΨΑΛΜ. This reading has both Cerfaux (1950:44-45) and Haenchen (1954:157) on its side; both noting that Luke is not in the habit of citing psalms by number. However, this same argument of a unique practice in the text of Acts can count against the primacy of τοὶς ψαλμοῖς, especially because there might have been some dispute about the two other readings (πρῶτῳ and δευτέρῳ). To put it in the words of Metzger (1994:365),

if the shorter reading is regarded as original, one has the difficulty of explaining why, in this passage alone in the New Testament, almost all scribes thought it necessary to identify the quotation by using a numeral with ψαλμοῖς. Does not this tradition suggest that the author had used one or the other numeral?

---

169 Hilary’s text, as quoted in his Tractatus in psalmorum 2, can be found in Ropes (1926:263-264). Hilary is primarily concerned with whether Paul made a mistake in citing the Psalm as Hilary’s text said he did. A number of early Christian writers who wrote in Latin, e.g. Tertullian (Adversus Marcionem 4.22.8; text available in Braun 2000:284) and Cyprian (Ad Quirinum 1.13 – but only in some codices; text available in Bévenot & Weber 1972:ad locum) also cite Psalm 2:7 (LXX) as in primo psalmo (Ropes 1926:264; followed by Metzger 1994:364).

170 In their three-tiered theory of the development of the text of Acts, Boismard & Lamouille (1990a:45) use this same reasoning to plea for “second” to be in the final stages of the text’s development.

171 Even though the text of P45 breaks off before the end of the word, the article (TOIC) supplies sufficient evidence to read the word as a dative plural.

172 In fact, the designation of a psalm by number is not only unique to Acts, but is rather “is an individual case and unique in the whole NT” (Steyn 1995:170, footnote 68).

173 Pervo (2009:329) compares the circumstances of the τοὶς ψαλμοῖς in the P45 tradition with the textual problem in Mark 1:2, where a possibly original ἐν τῷ Ἱερουτώ προφήτη was felt to be erroneous (the quotation is not from Isaiah alone, but is a conflation of OT texts) and was seemingly replaced by the largest part of the Greek NT tradition with ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.
In addition, the introductory formula for the two psalms in Acts 1:20 (γέγραπται γὰρ ἐν βιβλῳ ψαλμοῖν)\textsuperscript{174} shows that βιβλος ψαλμοι is the preferred collective name for psalms in Acts.\textsuperscript{175} Apart from a possible case of harmonisation and the normal practice of introductory formulae in Acts, the external evidence weighs just as heavily against P\textsuperscript{45} as against D05 – but P\textsuperscript{45} lacks the support of the early church. Accordingly, the TOIC ΨΑΛΜ[OIC] of P\textsuperscript{45} is most likely a later development.

The πρώτῳ and δευτέρῳ readings are still balanced on the evidence presented in the discussion above, but two factors tip the favour slightly in the direction of δευτέρῳ as the original reading. The first factor concerns word order: EN ΤΩ ΠΡΩΤΩ ΨΑΛΜΩ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ presents an easier text to read than ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ, as the ordinal (ΠΡΩΤΩ) stands next to the noun (ΨΑΛΜΩ) it qualifies (Holtz 1968:54). Moreover, the reworked character of the first part of the introductory formula in D05 (ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ) and the fact that D05 is the only manuscript in the Greek NT tradition to contain Psalm 2:8 at the end of the quotation of Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33 casts doubt on πρώτῳ as the original reading (so too Holtz 1968:54; Hemer 1989:195). Taken with this addition of Psalm 2:8 (as will be argued below), the difference in numbering in D05 (ΠΡΩΤΩ) betrays a clear sense of OT awareness.\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{174} Cf. the discussion above under the quotation of Psalm 68:26 (LXX) in Acts 1:20.

\textsuperscript{175} This is also the preference in Luke 20:42 (ἐν βιβλῳ ψαλμοι; but EN ΤΩ BYΒΛΩ ΤΩΝ ΨΑΛΜΩΝ in D05); but cf. Luke 24:44 (πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς; ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΓΕΓΡΑΜΜΕΝΑ / EN ΤΩ ΝΟΜΩ ΜΩΥϹΕΩϹ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙϹ / ΚΑΙ ΨΑΛΜΟΙϹ), although this text is not an introductory formula. Elsewhere in introductory formulae, both Luke and Acts either do not include a reference to the Psalms or use (the mouth of) David to indicate the origin of the quotation.

\textsuperscript{176} It is worth mentioning that Yoder (1958:380) notes four places where the D05 text contains a different numeral than in WH: Acts 2:14; Acts 10:30 and Matthew 25:28. He remarks that “[i]n the only explanation, it seems, is that of a different tradition.” All three these cases, however, can be explained on the grounds of contextual reasons. In the case of Acts 2:14, the context could certainly have been the reason: there were only eleven original “apostles” (as is explicitly stated in D05) left after the death of Judas, ten of which were standing with (CYN) Peter, the eleventh. With regard to Acts 10:30, Metzger (1994:330) suggests that “the reading in D ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας may have arisen when the scribe counted the three instances of ἐπαύριον in verses 9, 23 and 24” – i.e., a contextual solution. In Matthew 25:28, the slave who receives the one talent is identified in D05 as “the one who has five talents” (ΤΩ ΕΧΟΝΤΙ ΤΑ ΠΕΝΤΕ ΤΑΛΑΝΤΑ – WH reads τῷ ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα). This is not entirely wrong, as the slave in question did start out with five talents (cf. Matthew 25:15-16), and Matthew 25:15-16 is surely the reason why he is described in this way in D05.
D05 is the only manuscript with the text of Psalm 2:8 after the quotation of Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33. This is true for both the Greek and Latin NT traditions. The text corresponding to Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33 in D05 reads the same as that of the whole of the Greek NT tradition, as does the text of d05 with respect to the Latin NT tradition. In D05, the text of Psalm 2:8 is the same as that in the Greek OT tradition; even more interesting, the text of d05 reads the same as that of the Latin OT tradition. This agreement in both the Greek and the Latin OT traditions lessens the likelihood of one of the two columns of D05 / d05 being a mere translation of the other: Rather, the psalm was known in both Greek and Latin forms when they were added to the texts, whether at the time of the creation of the first bilingual manuscript in the D05 tradition or when the Greek and Latin traditions were still separate. The agreement between the Greek and Latin NT and OT traditions also lessens the likelihood of influence from the Hebrew tradition in the text of D05.

The external evidence weighs heavily against D05. There appears to be no reason why the text of Psalm 2:8 would have dropped out of the NT tradition, whether intentionally or unintentionally. In fact, Smits (1955:195; cf. Kenyon 1938:28) goes so far as to state that the text of Psalm 2:8 “voegt geen nieuwe gedachte aan de vorige toe. Zij doet alleen sterker het universalisme van het heil uitkomen.”

---

177 Snippets of Psalm 2:7-8 have been preserved among the manuscripts found at Qumran. 11QPsî has preserved [...] of Psalm 2:6-7 and [...] of Psalm 2:8. Both these lines read the same as BHS. The extant text of Psalm 2:7 in 3QPs reads [...] also in agreement with BHS.
178 The only note in the text critical apparatus of Wordsworth & White is a variant in the Latin manuscript C, which has *hodieae* as equivalent to the rest of the tradition’s *hodie*. The text of Psalm 2:8, however, is also added as a note in the margin of the Harclean Syriac version.
179 The AIMOY of D05 is an orthographic variant of LXXGött’s ἐμοῦ.
180 The only variant in the Latin OT reading is the manuscript Q, which reads *esto* for the rest of the tradition’s *es tu*.
181 The presumption here is that the Greek and Latin columns of D05 / d05 stem from different traditions that were combined and in this process of combination adapted to each other in at least a general fashion (with the result that the sense lines are mostly equal to each other).
182 Kenyon (1938:28) even labels the addition of Psalm 2:8 “pointless.”
183 Cerfaux (1950:45) opines that the addition of Psalm 2:8 is on account of a “théologie primitive”, according to which the resurrection confirms Jesus as Lord and Christ. He notes that in Acts 13:33, just before the introductory formula of the quotation, the (ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν) reads *TON ΚΝ ἦν* in D05 (cf. Ropes 1926:124; Epp 1966:61-63). According to Cerfaux, this reading is based on thoughts on resurrection gleaned from Acts 2:36. At the same time, the promise to Christ is then representative of...
Haenchen (1954:158) argues along the same line as Smits in perceiving in this passage a desire to emphasise universal salvation as the key reason why the text was expanded. However, he describes the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 D05 as a shift in the main emphasis of the passage, which in D05 has the “weltumspannende Heidenmission” as its main focus. He notes two reasons why the text should be seen as a later addition: The gentile mission has as its main announcement in Acts the passage which occurs later on, in Acts 13:46-47, and in the immediate context, Psalm 2:8 severs the bridge between Acts 13:33 and Acts 13:34, which concerns the incorruptibility of the body of Jesus. However, Haenchen’s criticisms may be too severe. The gentile mission has been hinted at before in the narrative of Acts (both in D05 and a B03-like text), although these references are vague and the gentiles involved could be interpreted as those already showing an interest in Judaism (so, for instance, Acts 11:1). Moreover, “I will give you nations as inheritance and as your possession the ends of the earth” (δώσω σοι ἐθνή τῆν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τῆν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς) is not a clear statement about the gentile mission unless it is viewed from the perspective of Acts 13:46-47. From the reader’s

the promise made to the patriarchs in Acts 13:32. However, according to Cerfaux, this does not sit well with the theology of the book of Acts, in which the “promise” is the Holy Spirit. Cerfaux’s position has been criticised by Haenchen (1954:158). According to Haenchen, the difference in the context of Acts 2 and Acts 13 plays a key role. On first sight, it seems that the B03 text (and those reading with it) takes the resurrection of Christ as the way in which the fulfilment of the promise is accomplished, but on closer inspection, the B03 text is similar to Pauline theology, in which Christ’s resurrection is the way in which it is established that He is the Son of God – the manner through which this is accomplished is through the power of the Spirit. For Haenchen (1954:158) then, there is no difference with regard to the “promise” in the theology of Acts in B03 and D05 at this point. Haenchen is probably in the right, and the possible addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 in D05 does not contribute to a theology about the resurrection as such.

184 The case for universalism as key to the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 in D05 has also been made by Epp (1966:80-81).

185 A difference in focus between D05 and B03 is also seen by Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2007:99). According to them, the quotation in B03 of Psalm 2:7 serves “to endorse the son-ship of Jesus”, while in D05, the longer quotation justifies “Paul’s proclamation that the promise has been fulfilled to both Jews and God-fearers.”

186 E.g., Acts 1:8, 2:5-11 (although the precise referent of Acts 2:5 is difficult to determine; this is perhaps the cause of the textual difficulties in this verse); 2:39; 8:26-40; 10:1-11:18; 11:19-24. Cf. also Acts 13:16, at the beginning of Paul’s speech, where he addresses the ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται (Ἰ ΣΤΡΑΗΛΙΤΑΙ in D05) καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τῶν θεῶν – implying that there were gentiles in the audience, although these gentiles appear to have had an interest in the Jewish religion.

187 Acts 11:1 is still within the context of the so-called “God-fearers”, as Cornelius is described as φοβοῦμενος τῶν θεῶν (“one who fears God” – Acts 10:2; Acts 10:22; Acts 10:35). Unfortunately, the text of Acts 10:2 is not extant in D05, but the other two verses supply enough evidence to this effect.

188 See, for instance, the summary of this debate by De Boer (1995:50-71). De Boer concludes that the “God-fearers” do constitute their own group, at least in the text of Acts.
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perspective, the phrase only hints at the gentile mission in its present position in Acts 13:33.\textsuperscript{189} In answer to Haenchen’s second criticism, one may question whether the link between Acts 13:33 and Acts 13:34 with respect to incorruptibility is really that strong. Certainly the speech presents the resurrection (and the incorruptibility of the body of Jesus) as a key factor in salvation (cf. Acts 13:38-39),\textsuperscript{190} but the keyword διαφθορά is only introduced in Acts 13:34 and then repeatedly used as a motif from there on (cf. Acts 13:35; 13:36; 13:37). Acts 13:33 is more concerned with the relationship between God and Jesus, and the promise in Psalm 2:8 does not necessarily disturb the argument about the resurrection.

The point of the objections to Haenchen’s criticism raised above is not to prove that Psalm 2:8 was part of the “initial” text of Acts, but rather to illustrate the care that a scribe in the D05 tradition took in editing the text. Indeed, the addition of Psalm 2:8 takes up ideas and phrases that can be found elsewhere in the text of Acts, and not only in the immediate context. The keyword ἔθνος – in the plural, of course – (as noted by Barrett 1994:646-647)\textsuperscript{191} should be considered such a theme (cf. in the immediate context Acts 13:46-48), but also the words δίδωμι, κληρονομία and κατάσχεσις. Δίδωμι repeats in Acts 13:34\textsuperscript{192} and Acts 13:35, both times part of the phrase of the quotation in the respective verse. The addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 brings this first quotation in the series of three in line by making δίδωμι part of the quoted text.

\textsuperscript{189} Epp (1966:83-84) notes that D05 “has an evangelization of the Gentiles already in v. 43,” as D05 reads ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΚΑΘ ΟΛΗϹ ΤΗϹ ΠΟΛΕΩϹ / ΔΙΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ Θ̅Υ between the B03 text of Acts 13:43 and Acts 13:44. This sentence in D05, however, does not necessarily imply a turn to the Gentiles, but – as Epp also notes – serves to explain why “almost the whole city” (ΣΧΕΔΟΝ ΟΛΗϹ Η ΠΟΛΙϹ, as it reads in D05) has gathered on the next Sabbath. Similar to D05 is E08 (followed by 1884) in reading ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ / ΚΑΤΑ ΠΑϹΑΝ / ΠΟΛΙΝ (πολην – 1884) / ΦΗΜΙ ΨΘΗΝΑΙ / ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ and a number of witnesses to the Latin NT tradition.

\textsuperscript{190} Thor Strandenaes (2011:341-354) has recently provided a summary of the main tenets in the so-called missionary speeches in Acts. Strandenaes (2011:346-347) lists the elements of the story of Jesus that are incorporated in these speeches; foremost among these is the resurrection, which occurs in all eight speeches identified by Strandenaes except one (Acts 14:15-17). For other distinctive characteristics in these speeches, also see Gendy (2011:247-265).

\textsuperscript{191} Barrett (1994:646-647) states that the “point of the addition (which cannot be regarded as original) lies in the word ἔθνη; the editor saw the opportunity of bringing in a reference to the mission to the Gentiles.” The discussion below, however, will show that Psalm 2:8 contributes more than just a mere reference to the ἔθνη.

\textsuperscript{192} This use of δίδωμι could be on account of the use of the word in Isaiah 55:4, the verse following immediately after the verse which the rest of the quotation is from. See the discussion of the quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4 in the chapter on Isaiah in the present study.
Κληρονομία and κατάσχεσις are used, both together with δίδωμι, in Acts 7:5 within the Abraham story as related by Stephen. Although these terms do not refer to the “nations” as possession that Abraham will inherit, they are linked with a promise (cf. ἐπηγγείλατο in Acts 7:5) to the fathers – similar to Acts 13:32 (ΤΗΝ ΠΡΟϹ ΤΟΥϹ ΠΑΤΕΡΑϹ ΗΜΩΝ D05 ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΗΝ ΕΠΑΙΓΓΕΛΙΑΝ). D05 places even more emphasis on this promise by making it apply to “our” (ΗΜΩΝ) fathers and including ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΗΝ by moving ΕΠΑΙΓΓΕΛΙΑΝ to the end of the phrase. In a similar fashion, the term κατάσχεσις occurs in the fulfilment of the promise in Acts 7:5 in Acts 7:45, when the Ark of the Covenant is received by “our fathers with Joshua in taking (the land) as possession from the nations” (ΟΙ ΠΑΤΕΡΕϹ ΗΜΩΝ ΜΕΤΑ ΗϹΟΥΝ (Ἰησοῦ – NA28) ΕΝ ΤΗ ΚΑΤΑϹΧΕϹΕΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΘΝΩΝ). The addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 evokes the promise made to “our fathers” as previously described in the text of Acts, especially when these words are set within a speech delivered in a synagogue (cf. Acts 13:14) while relating the history of Israel.

At the same time, “the ends of the earth” (ΤΑ ΠΕΡΑΤΑ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ) recalls the ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς of Acts 1:8 (cf. Delebecque 1986:364; Barrett 1994:646) and points forward to the ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς of Acts 13:47 (cf. Read-Heimerdinger 2002:242-243; Pervo 2009:339). Yet, the link

193 Κληρονομία occurs once more in Acts (Acts 20:32), in the speech given by Paul to the Ephesian elders. The words are used in Acts 20:32 as a promise to the Ephesian elders of the “inheritance” they will share with all the saints – hence, slightly different from the quotation of Psalm 2:8 in D05, which applies to Jesus. The term κατάσχεσις makes another appearance in D05 in Acts 20:16, but here in the sense “holding back” or “restraining” Paul on his way to Jerusalem. The term does not occur elsewhere in the Greek NT (as noted with regard to the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 in D05 by Delebecque (1986:295).
194 This link between Acts 13:32 and the quotation of Psalm 2:8 has also been noted by Cerfaux (1950:45), but not with regard to Acts 7:5. See also the discussion above on Cerfaux’s ideas about what this entails for a theology of the resurrection in the D05 tradition against the B03-tradition in Acts.
195 The overwhelming majority of witnesses read τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελιῶν γενομένην. D05 is unique in word order with regard to ἐπαγγελιῶν γενομένην, which very probably makes it secondary. In the Greek NT tradition, only E08 have ΗΜΩΝ after πατέρας with D05 – but the Latin tradition securely reads nostros. It is therefore probable that D05 and E08, both bilingual manuscripts, are under influence of the Latin NT tradition. Nevertheless, whatever the origin of ΗΜΩΝ, the emphasis on the fathers by adding “our” is still present in the D05 text.
196 EN TH ΚΑΤΑϹΧΕϹΕΙ ΤΩΝ ΕΘΝΩΝ is a slippery phrase, and could also be interpreted as “in taking possession of the nations”.
197 According to Delebecque (1986:364), the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 is also meant to apply to Paul and the apostles – a position he justifies by reference to Acts 1:8. However, as with the rest of the addition, this only becomes clear in the narrative in Acts 13:46-47.
198 Pervo (2009:339) states that the addition of Psalm 2:8 “lamey anticipates v. 47.” However, as will be argued below, the addition of Psalm 2:8 instead heightens the narrative tension which is dissolved by Acts 13:46-47.
with the latter is not entirely clear from the start. The concept “ends of the earth” is, of course, important for the Acts narrative with its ever-widening geographical scope, but the connotations of this phrase are ambivalent when set within the present speech by Paul (Acts 13:16-41). Although the reader may suspect that TA ΠΕΡΑΤΑ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ refers to the gentile mission, this has not been stated outright.

It is also possible that a political motif underlies the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 – the audience could understand from the addition that Jesus might “rule” the nations, similar to the original intent of the remainder of Psalm 2. This ambiguity with regard to the Psalm 2:8 text in Acts 13:33 heightens the tension at a strategic point in the narrative, at least from the perspective of the gentiles: What is the implication of the “nations” being the “possession” of Jesus? Does Paul’s preaching still fall within the broad lines drawn up by the history of Israel, a history where the nations can be “dispossessed” of their land and their autonomy (cf. Acts 7:45 as discussed above; cf. also the description in Acts 13:19 of how the land was taken from seven nations

is correct, however, when he states that the opinion of Clark (1933:357) that Psalm 2:8 “is necessary to the sense” is not correct.

Another interesting point of contact of the phrase τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς can perhaps be found in another quotation from the OT in the text of Acts. In Acts 3:25, “the covenant which God made with our fathers” (ΘΗΣ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗΣ ΌΘΗΣ ΔΙΕΘΕΤΟ/ΠΡΟϹ ΤΟΥϹ ΠΑΤΕΡΑϹ ΗΜΩΝ (ύμων – NA28)) is described as ΕΝ ΤΩ ΣΠΕΡΜΑΤΙ ΣΟΥ ΕΝΕΥΛΟΓΗΘΗϹΟΝΤΑΙ/ΠΑϹΑΙ ΑΙ ΠΑΤΡΙΑΙ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ. This phrase is given as a direct quotation from Genesis 22:18 or Genesis 26:4 in the margin of NA28, but in fact does not read verbatim like any of these two passages. Different forms of this covenant formula occur further in Genesis 12:3; Genesis 18:18 and Genesis 28:14 (cf. Meeks 2008:114), but none of these contain the phrase αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς ἐθνῶν, preferring αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς (Genesis 12:3; Genesis 28:14) or τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς (Genesis 18:18; Genesis 22:18; Genesis 26:4). Αἱ πατριαὶ is doubtlessly the “initial” text of Acts 3:25 (as only two miniscule manuscripts, 94 and 1678, read φυλαι, and no other variants are known). That the author of Acts changed the reading from ἔθνη to πατριαὶ himself is quite possible (cf. Fitzmyer 1998:291; Meeks 2008:114). Among the possible influences proposed for this change by the author of Acts, Psalm 21:28 (LXX), proposed already by Clarke (1922:95; also noted by Haenchen 1954:165; Conzelmann 1972:40; but cf. Bock 1987:358-359, footnote 129), is a very likely option. The relevant part of Psalm 21:28 reads: καὶ ἐπιστραφήσονται πρὸς κύριον πάντα τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς καὶ προσκυνήσουσιν ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἔθνων. Other parallels between the context of this verse in Psalm 21 (LXX) and the Acts narrative can be drawn (e.g. Psalm 21:26b (LXX): τὰς εὐχὰς μου ἀποδώσω ἐνώπιον τῶν σοφούμενων αὐτῶν, cf. the “God-fearers” in Acts; as well as Psalm 21:27b (LXX): καὶ αἰνέσουσιν κύριον οἱ ἀκεχερώτες αὐτῶν, cf. Acts 15:17 and Acts 17:27 in the majority of Greek NT manuscripts, but not in D05), but it will suffice here to say that the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 is in concord with these parallels, and there is the distant possibility that the scribe in the D05 tradition responsible for the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 also noticed them.

Illustrative is Psalm 2:9 (ποιμανεῖς αὐτῶν ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, ὡς σκεῦος κεραμέως συντρίψεις αὐτῶν), a trend which the following text of the psalm (Psalm 2:10-11) continues.

This is seen in a different light by (Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2007:99), who note the negative view of the gentiles in the original context within Psalm 2, but judges that the “idea of destruction is apparently absent from the application of the promise Paul makes to Jesus, but it is nonetheless clearly implied that the time has come for the nations and Israel to be ruled over as one by the Lord Jesus as the Messiah.” This may be implicit in the context of Acts 13:33, but as noted below, only becomes clear at Acts 13:46-47.
(ΕΘΝΗ) and how God gave it to Israel as inheritance (ΚΑΤΕΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΗϹΕΝ))202 On exiting, only Jews and “religious proselytes” (ϹΕΒΟΜΕΝΩΝ ΠΡΟϹΗΛΥΤΩΝ – Acts 13:43) follow Paul and Barnabas. In D05, a note is added at the end of Acts 13:43 explaining how the word spread: ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΚΑΘ ΟΛΗϹ ΤΗϹ ΠΟΛΕΩϹ / ΔΙΕΛΘΕΙϹ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ,203 probably to explain the result that the “whole city” (ΟΛΗ Η ΠΟΛΙϹ – Acts 13:44)204 gathered on the next (cf. Acts 13:42, ΕΞΗϹ in D05) Sabbath (cf. Metzger 1994:368-369). The gathering now seems to consist of not only Jews and “God-fearers” or proselytes, but also those not attracted to the Jewish religion. This sets up the scene for the resolution of the narrative tension in Acts 13:46-47, with Paul’s declaration that they will from now on turn towards the gentiles. Acts 13:47 proves to be a turning point within the narrative of Acts,205 and even more so in D05: the gentiles (cf. ΟΛΗ Η ΠΟΛΙϹ in Acts 13:44 in D05) rejoice and “receive the word of God” (ΕΔΕΞΑΝΤΟ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ – Acts 13:48 in D05). The majority of the Greek NT tradition reads “they glorified the word of the Lord” (ἐδόξαζον τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου) in Acts 13:48. It is most likely that the phrase in D05 is based on the wording in the similar scene in Acts 11:1 (ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΕΘΝΗ ΕΔΕΞΑΤΟ206 ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ) or perhaps Acts 8:14 (ΔΕΕΚΤΑΙ / Η ΚΑΜΑΡΙΑ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ). Nevertheless, it should not be overlooked that both these events occur at key realisations in the text of Acts – Acts 8:14 in the realisation that Samaritans can become believers and Acts 11:1 in the realisation that God-fearing gentiles can become believers. The reading of Acts 13:48 in D05 is sensitive to these key points in the narrative.207

202 Acts 13:19 in D05 reads: ΚΑΙ ΚΑΘΕΛΩΝ ΕΘΝΗ ΕΠΙΤΑ ΕΝ ΓΗ ΧΑΝΑΑΝ / ΚΑΤΕΚΛΗΡΟΝΟΜΗϹ ΕΝ ΤΗΝ ΓΗΝ ΤΩΝ ΑΛΛΟΦΥΛΩ." The ΑΛΛΟΦΥΛΩ of D05 is unique in the Greek NT tradition, but found in the Harclean Syriac version and middle Egyptian Coptic tradition. Although frequently used for “Philistines” in the Greek OT tradition, the word could also simply mean gentile (cf. Eynikel, Hauspie & Lust 2003: s.v.). If the former is meant here, the variant could be based on a desire for historical accuracy. In any case, the D05 text seems to exacerbate any potential tension between the Jews and the gentiles in this speech.

203 In E08 (and 1884), the similar ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ / ΚΑΤΑ ΠΑϹΑΝ / ΠΟΛΙΝ / ΦΗΜΙϹΘΗΝΑΙ / ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ. A similar text to D05 is also read in the margin of the Harclean Syriac version and in the Coptic Glazier Codex (G67).

204 ΟΛΗ is a singular reading in D05. All other manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition have πᾶσα.

205 For an assessment of the treatment of the text of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in D05, see the chapter on Isaiah in the present study.

206 ΕΔΕΞΑΤΟ (singular) could be a scribal error for ἔδεξαντο (plural) as the rest of the Greek NT tradition, since D05 reads EXCEPTIONEUNT, but the reading is grammatically possible (as a neuter plural with a singular noun) and is also seemingly read by P74 (ΕΔΕΞΑΤ[Ο]).

207 A similar expression is used in Acts 17:11, where the people of Berea are said to be more receptive towards the word – but here the phrase is only ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ, not ΤΟΝ ΛΟΓΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ. © University of Pretoria
In all likelihood, Psalm 2:8 is a later addition in the D05 tradition, and Cerfaux (1950:45) was correct in describing the addition of Psalm 2:8 in D05 as an addition “qui suppose un nouveau contact avec LXX.” The addition of Psalm 2:8 was a thoughtful action, sensitive to the main tenets of the Acts narrative as it is found in D05, and not merely an attempt to show off erudition on the part of a scribe.

7.5. Conclusion

The following conclusions can be drawn from the discussion of the quotation of Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 in D05 above. First, the quotation was indented – as the other quotations from the Psalms – in the text of D05, which speaks of OT awareness. The text was not indicated as its own paragraph, similar to most other quotations that have been discussed so far.

The allusions to Psalm 2:7 in the extant text of D05, which should perhaps be labelled quotations (especially in the case of Luke 3:22), do not show OT awareness, except for Luke 3:22. Indeed, Luke 3:22 D05 contains the exact text of Psalm 2:7 as found in the Greek OT tradition and in Acts 13:33 D05 (albeit without Psalm 2:8). This could imply that Luke 3:22 was changed based on Acts 13:33, but the reverse – that Acts 13:33 was changed to be in accord with Luke 3:22 in

---

208 This is also the opinion of Holtz (1968:137). However, Holtz may be overly critical when judging the possible addition of Psalm 2:8 as “einer der häufigeren Fehler des ‘westlichen’ Textes.” At the very least, one has to admit that the text of Psalm 2:8 shows a number of similarities with the narrative of Acts as a whole (as will be pointed out below), and it was not someone unfamiliar with the theology of Acts who was responsible for the addition. Holtz speculates elsewhere (1968:56) that the author of Acts may have found the text of Psalm 2:7 in a different form in a Testimoniumvorlage, but then checked the quotation or maybe even recast Ps 2:7 into the role of the original quotation in the Testimonium (on which Acts 13’s speech is purportedly based, according to Holtz). According to Holtz, that would explain the exact agreement between the Greek OT and Greek NT in Psalm 2:7 and Acts 13:33 and the precise Stellenangabe. This would imply that the author of Acts did violence to the original Testimoniumvorlage and that the author of Acts was familiar with the text of Psalm 2 as a whole (and not just Psalm 2:7). However, perhaps Psalm 2:8 is the reason why the author of Acts stumbled upon Psalm 2:7 – as Psalm 2:8 uses much the same language and contains the same general idea as in the rest of the Acts narrative, but was not used because it did not fit the context that well.

209 It should be noted that Cerfaux (1950:45) comes to this conclusion based on his view of the theology of Acts – see the discussion above for a critique on his position by Haenchen. Nevertheless, both Haenchen and Cerfaux agree in seeing OT awareness in the work of a scribe in the D05 tradition in Acts 13:33.

210 An additional point worthy of note is the fact that Psalm 2:9 was not added in this process. Anyone familiar with this verse (σομαμενος αυτους εν ρωδο δεσπορη ως σκοπος κεραμως συντρ אוς αυτο ς) and the text following it (Psalm 2:10-11) will notice how calculated the addition of Psalm 2:8 is – bringing the possibility of a political motif stronger to the foreground in the Acts narrative while avoiding speaking of Jesus as an oppressive ruler.

211 Cf. Haenchen (1977:395, footnote 5), who, perhaps approaching sarcasm, notes that the scribe “nennt den Psalm, von dem er noch V. 8 zitiert, den ersten und beweist damit sein gelehrtes Wissen …”
D05 – cannot be true. In any case, the text of Luke 3:22 was more likely changed on account of awareness of the text’s connection with the OT and the quotation’s context in Luke (immediately before the genealogy of Jesus). Furthermore, there is a slight possibility that the text of Luke 3:22 in D05 could be the “initial” text, which will make the present question irrelevant. The remaining two passages which allude to Psalm 2:7 in D05 do not show influence or dependence on Acts 13:33, and do not seem to have influenced each other (at the time of the production of D05) either.

Determining the “initial” text of the introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 2:7(-8) in Acts 13:33 is no easy matter. However, the discussion above has shown that the evidence tips the scales in favour of the D05 reading being a secondary development. The most likely “initial” text (ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δεύτερῳ), with its precise indication of the origin of the quotation, shows OT awareness in itself. If the D05 reading is secondary, the implication would be that a scribe followed up on the hint of the quotation’s location (“second Psalm”) and recognised the text as stemming from “Psalm 1” in his OT. The change in the introductory formula implies clear OT awareness and influence by the way an OT tradition was understood in the relevant stage of the D05 tradition.

The text of D05 similarly shows clear signs of OT awareness. In all likelihood, Psalm 2:8 was added to the quotation of Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33 D05. The text of this quotation agrees exactly with both the Greek OT tradition and the Latin OT tradition, which implies that the text was known in both these traditions.²¹² Whether the text was added before or after the texts became part of the bilingual tradition of D05 cannot be determined unequivocally, but it is more likely that the two traditions were already one when the text was added.²¹³

The discussion has also made clear that the text of Psalm 2:8 was not added to Acts 13:33 in D05 in a haphazard manner. Rather, when a number of other changes in the D05 tradition are kept in mind, the addition of Psalm 2:8 shows an acute knowledge of the Acts narrative. The addition of

²¹² Of course, there is a chance that an independent translation of the Greek text could read exactly the same as the Latin OT tradition, but this seems very unlikely.
²¹³ If the text was added at two different points in time in the two traditions, the same rationale for adding the text was at play in both traditions.
Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 creates a narrative tension (especially from the perspective of the gentiles) that is only resolved at a key text in the Acts narrative (Acts 13:46-47).

8. Acts 13:35 / Psalm 15:10 (LXX)\textsuperscript{214}

8.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΚΑΙ ΕΤΕΡΩϹ ΛΕΓΕΙ</th>
<th>IDEOQUE ET ALIA DICIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΟΥ ΔΩϹΕΙϹ ΤΟΝ ΟϹΙΟΝ ΙΩΔΕΙΝ ΔΙΑΦΘΟΡΑΝ</td>
<td>NON DABIS SANCTUM TUUM UIDERE CORRUPTIONEM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quotation of Psalm 15:10 in Acts 13:35 D05 occurs on Folio 469b and d05 on Folio 470a, the same folios as the quotations of Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 and Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34 D05. The quotation is not indicated as its own paragraph in either Greek or Latin.\textsuperscript{215} There were no corrections made to the text of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 in Acts 13:35 in D05, whether in Greek or Latin.

8.2. Other quotations or allusions to Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in the text of D05

There are no other allusions or quotations to Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in NA\textsuperscript{28} list of loci citati vel allegati, except for the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28 (which has been discussed above under the section dealing with Acts 2:25-28).

8.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) (ΚΑΙ ΕΤΕΡΩϹ ΛΕΓΕΙ) takes up its own line of text in D05 between the two indented quotations of Isaiah 55:3 and Psalm 15:10 (LXX).\textsuperscript{216} The text of this introductory formula in d05 reads slightly different from

\textsuperscript{214} See Bock (1987:254-256) and Steyn (1995:182-185) for an investigation into the initial text of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35 and a discussion of its context.

\textsuperscript{215} For the paragraph markers, see the discussion of Acts 13:33 / Psalm 2:7-8 above.

\textsuperscript{216} See also the discussion of Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34 in the chapter on Isaiah in the present study.
the Greek NT tradition (*IDEOQUE ET ALIA DICIT*), mostly in agreement with the Latin NT tradition.\textsuperscript{217}

Based on the introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35 as found in the majority of Greek NT manuscripts (διὸ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει),\textsuperscript{218} Holtz (1968:138-139) postulated that the author of Acts considered the preceding quotation from Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34 as stemming from the Psalms. According to Holtz (similarly Barrett 1994:648), the ἑτέρῳ found in the introductory formula can only be complemented by ψαλμῷ (cf. Delebecque 1986:295) or τόπῳ, since a feminine form would be needed for γραφῆ or περιοχῇ. As the quotation preceding the quotation from Isaiah 55:3 was from the Psalms (Psalm 2:7(-8) in Acts 13:33) and explicitly identified as stemming from this book,\textsuperscript{219} the implicit “place” (τόπῳ) refers to a place in the Psalms (of course, the same applies if ψαλμῷ is the implicit referent of ἑτέρῳ).\textsuperscript{220} In other words, an incongruity could have been perceived in the Acts text because Acts 13:35 refers to another “psalm” while the previous quotation, in Acts 13:34, is not a psalm but a quotation from a prophetic book.\textsuperscript{221} Perhaps this perceived incongruity compelled a scribe or corrector in the D05 tradition to change the ἐν ἑτέρῳ of the Greek NT tradition (apart from 61*, which reads δευτερω) to the ΕΤΕΡΩϹ of D05 (but cf. Delebecque (1986:295), who thinks that the ΕΤΕΡΩϹ of D05 is “probablement dû une distraction de copiste.”). Barrett (1994:648) points out that the lack of an equivalent for NA\textsuperscript{28}’s διότι (which in most manuscripts read διο) at the start of Acts 13:35 should probably be taken in conjunction with this change to ΕΤΕΡΩϹ.\textsuperscript{222} Barrett offers a translation of the complete D05 introductory formula as “[h]e puts it differently”.

\textsuperscript{217} The rest of the Latin NT tradition reads *alias* where d05 reads *ALLA*. See the discussion below.

\textsuperscript{218} This is the reading as found in Pierpoint & Robinson (2005:282). The NA\textsuperscript{28} reading has opted for the evidence by the earlier manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition, which mostly read διότι rather than διό.

\textsuperscript{219} Cf. the discussion on the introductory formula of Psalm 2:7(-8) in Acts 13:33 above.

\textsuperscript{220} Buss (1980:108) rightly critiques Holtz’s point of view by noting that one could also “nach lukanischem Sprachgebrauch” expect βιβλίῳ or βίβλῳ (cf. Luke 3:4; 4:17; 4:20; 20:42). Possibly other masculine or neuter nouns could also be the implied noun; for the argumentation of the present study, however, it is only important that ψαλμῷ could have been perceived to be the noun referred to by ἑτέρῳ.

\textsuperscript{221} Cf. Pervo (2009:329), who offers additional support for ἑτέρῳ referring to a psalm: “Note also the singular in v. 35, which probably refers to a psalm.”

\textsuperscript{222} Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2007:78) also seem to group the two readings together in their assessment of the B03 and D05 text. According to them, “B03 links the two quotations with a conjunction of consequence and ties the second one to another psalm. D05 is less specific, spelling out neither the connection between the two quotations nor the source of the second.”
The Latin NT tradition mostly reads *alias*, an equivalent for the ΕΤΕΡΩϹ of D05 (aliis (O) and alibi (W) are similar; probably under influence of the Greek text of E08; e08 reads *in alio*). D05 could therefore be under influence of the Latin text. The widespread reading of the Latin NT probably also originated through an attempt to do away with this perceived incongruity between Isaiah quotation and Psalm quotation. Notably, the difficulty was solved in another way in d05, which reads *ALIA*, possibly with *alia scriptura* in mind. Whether D05 was influenced by a Latin NT tradition or not, these two different solutions in the introductory formula in Acts 13:35 comport well with the idea that d05 is not simply a translation of D05, or vice versa. Moreover, whether the origin of the D05 reading lies in the Latin NT tradition or not, there is a degree of OT awareness involved. A scribe (in either the D05 tradition or the Latin NT tradition) identified the quotation of Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34 as not stemming from the Psalms. This, of course, says more about the OT awareness in the D05 tradition of Isaiah 55:3 than Psalm 15:10 (LXX) (and only that the quotation is known not to be from the Psalms, not necessarily that it was known as a quotation from Isaiah).

8.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

The text of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) is exactly the same as the rest of the Greek NT tradition. In fact, in the whole Greek NT tradition, there are no noteworthy text critical variants with regard to this text. The same is true for the Latin NT tradition, in which d05 is in exact agreement with the rest of the Latin NT manuscripts.

There is only a slight difference with the Greek OT tradition; a difference reflected in the text of Acts 2:27 D05 (where Psalm 15:10 (LXX) is also quoted) in reading ΟΥΔΕ and the text of Acts 13:35 D05 in reading ΟΥ. This difference, however, does not stem from the Greek OT tradition, but rather on account of the new context in Acts 13:35 where Psalm 15:10 (LXX) is now applied. This change on the ground of context also explains the divergent readings in d05

223 The reading *alia scriptura* can indeed be found in the Latin manuscript Θ.
224 The same is true for the rest of the Greek NT tradition’s text of Acts 2:27 and Acts 13:35. Holtz (1968:56), pointing out that this is the only difference between the texts, calls the divergence a “syntaktisch bedingte Änderung”; cf. also Holtz (1968:137); Bock (1987:255) and Steyn (1995:183) argue along similar lines.
(NEQUAE in Acts 2:27 vs. NON in Acts 13:35). Consequently, no conclusions can be drawn about OT awareness in the D05 tradition with regard to the text of this quotation.

8.5. Conclusion

The quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35 in D05 is indented, but not indicated as its own paragraph. The indentation, of course, shows that the text was recognised as an OT quotation.

The introductory formula of this quotation has been altered in D05. This alteration is most likely on account of a difference perceived between the text quoted in Acts 13:34, which stems from Isaiah 55:3-4, and the text quoted in Acts 13:35, which is from Psalm 15:10 (LXX). The “initial” text created the impression that these two quotations were from the same book. The D05 tradition has removed this difficulty in the text by changing ἐν ἑτέρῳ to ΕΤΕΡΩϹ. The change could be based on the Latin NT tradition (but not the text as found in d05), in which the same mechanics of removal of ambiguity would be at work. Whether the reading stems from the Greek or the Latin tradition, the change in D05 (and its Vorlage) shows a degree of OT awareness.

The text of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in D05 is in agreement with the NT traditions as well as the OT traditions. The only difference between the text of this psalm in Psalm 15:10 (LXX) (and Acts 2:27) and the text found in Acts 13:35 is based on the new context in which the text finds itself, and this change was undoubtedly introduced by the author of Acts.

9. Conclusion

This chapter has made a thorough investigation of the text of the explicit quotations of the Psalms in the Acts of D05. The investigation has been fruitful on many accounts. First, all the explicit quotations from the Psalms have been completely indented in D05. In other words, all of the explicit quotations from the Psalms were known to be from the OT, and have been indicated as such on the manuscripts. The paragraphing system in D05, however, did not single out quotations from the OT in the text of D05. Paragraphs in D05 were always indicated by ekthesis,
even after following indented quotations (cf. the discussion of Acts 2:25-28 and Acts 2:34-35 above). This implies, for instance, that the cluster of quotations in Acts 13:33-35 (Psalm 2:7-8, Isaiah 55:3-4 and Psalm 15:10 (LXX)) forms part of the same paragraph in D05. Of course, these conclusions will need to be tested against the results of the two following chapters of this study on the Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05.

There is not a clearly discernable influence on the explicit quotations of the Psalms in D05 from other allusions to or quotations of Psalms in D05. In fact, in many cases, these allusions and quotations have drifted further apart from each other and from the Greek OT tradition. In one case, that of the quotation of Psalm 2:7 in Luke 3:22, the text seems to have been changed to fit with the OT text, while the “initial” text of Luke 3:22 only alluded to the OT. However, there is also a slight possibility that the D05 text was the “initial” text in this case. In the case of quotations from Psalm 109:1 (LXX) (Matthew 22:44, Luke 20:42, Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35), it has been shown that the scribe of D05 did not consult the previously copied text of this psalm when copying Acts 2:34-35 onto D05. Nevertheless, influence from these quotations on the text of Acts 2:34-35 could be indirect, through the scribe’s recollection of these previously copied texts or perhaps their Vorlagen. Such an explanation for the textual variants in Acts 2:34-35 is viable, since the other quotations show variation at the same point in the quotation (e.g., the ΕΙΠΕΝ – Matthew 22:44 vs. ΛΕΓΕΙ – Luke 20:42, Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35; ΑΝ ΘΩ – Matthew 22:44, ΤΙΘΩ – Luke 20:43, ΘΩϹΩ – Mark 12:36, ΘΩ – Acts 2:35). The order in which the books were copied onto D05 (Matthew, Luke, Mark, Acts) supports this theory. Nevertheless, the large number of alternative explanations for these variant readings in Acts 2:34-35 – including the possibility of a now lost part of the Greek OT tradition – should caution against being overly confident of the origin of the D05 variant readings.

Although some introductory formulae in D05 (e.g. Acts 4:25) have been altered to read differently from the “initial” text, all the introductory formulae of the explicit quotations of the Psalms in Acts in D05, with the exception of Acts 13:35, provided enough clues for scribes to be aware of the quotation as stemming from the Psalms. These introductory formulae include either “Psalms” or “David”. The introductory formula of Acts 13:35 also shows OT awareness, as it was probably altered to show that the quotation from Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34 and the
quotation from Psalm 15:10 (LXX) did not come from the same OT book. In this instance, then, Acts 13:35 was known to contain a quotation from the Psalms. However, this change in D05 could also be based on influence from the Latin NT tradition, and the text of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) is also found in Acts 2:25-28, where it is ascribed to David. It was not necessary for a scribe to be familiar with the text of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) on a manuscript of the Greek OT tradition to identify it as a quotation from the OT.

The introductory formulae of the explicit quotations of the Psalms in D05 show clear awareness of the quotations stemming from the OT. Did this affect the text of these quotations in D05? This could perhaps be the case. For the most part, D05 is in agreement with the text of the Greek NT tradition in the explicit quotations from the Psalms. This, in turn, is mostly in agreement with the text of the Greek OT tradition of these respective Psalms. Whereas secondary changes appear to be rife in the rest of D05, the text of these quotations has to a great degree not been altered, apart from a few changes that appear to be contextual (e.g. Κ̅Ν̅ΜΟΥ in Acts 2:25 in D05). This reluctance to change the text could be on account of OT awareness and a desire by the D05 tradition not to deviate from the OT tradition. However, there are a small number of places where the D05 tradition seems to have preferred the Greek NT tradition over the Greek OT tradition (e.g. ΛΑΒΕΤΩ in Acts 1:20 and Κ̅Ϲ̅ without an equivalent for the article (ὁ) appearing before it). This could imply that scribes in the D05 tradition were more reserved in altering text that was known to be a quotation from the OT, but did not consult the Greek OT tradition to ascertain the text of these quotations.

In one case in D05, in Acts 13:33, there is clear evidence of OT awareness and a certainty that the text of the relevant psalm was known in the D05 tradition. The text of the addition of Psalm 2:8 to the text of Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33 matches exactly the text of the Greek OT tradition (and this is true with respect to d05 and the Latin OT tradition as well). This presupposes a familiarity with the text of the Greek OT tradition. Additionally, it has been shown above that the addition of Psalm 2:8 was not made at random, but had a specific purpose within the narrative of Acts as it is found in D05.
These conclusions are valid for the quotations of the explicit Psalms quotations in D05. The investigation of the explicit quotations of the Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05 will have to test whether these conclusions hold true for other explicit quotations in the Acts text of D05. This will be done in the following two chapters of the present study.
Chapter 3:  
Explicit quotations from the Twelve Minor Prophets in D05

1. Introduction

1.1. General introduction

The present chapter deals with explicit quotations from the Twelve Minor Prophets in the Acts of D05. These quotations are, in order of their appearance in the D05 text: Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21; Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43; Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41; and Amos 9:1-12 in Acts 15:16-17. The latter quotation is frequently seen as being conflated with Isaiah 45:21 in Acts 15:18; however, as will become clear from the discussion of the text’s layout below, this was not the case in D05. Apart from the quotation of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41, these quotations are some of the longest explicit quotations in Acts (and the NT), and consequently of some importance. The quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21, furthermore, is the first quotation in a missionary speech in Acts and could be seen as programmatic for the rest of the Acts text. The conclusion to this chapter will reflect upon the OT awareness in the explicit quotations of the Twelve Minor Prophets in D05 and possible changes that have been made to the D05 text on account of the OT traditions. The pattern of each investigation will be the same as that offered in the previous chapter of this study.

1.2. Text-critical sources used for this chapter

The collations made for the Editio Critica Maior of Acts were consulted for the Greek NT tradition, as was the case in the previous chapter. The Greek text will accordingly be the guide to which the discussion enfolds. For the Greek OT tradition, the apparatus and text of the Göttingen edition (Ziegler 1984) were used; for the Hebrew OT tradition, the newly prepared edition of the Twelve Minor Prophets for the Biblia Hebraica Quinta (Gelston 2010) was the main source. Since the Beuron Vetus Latina edition of Acts and the Twelve Minor Prophets have not yet been published, the edition of Acts by Wordsworth and White (1905)

---

1 The Biblia Hebraica Quinta edition includes in its array of witnesses the evidence from the Judaean desert, and it was consequently not necessary to consult the volumes of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert for this chapter. See, however, the addendum at the end of this study for a list of extant material from the Judaean desert with text of the Twelve Minor Prophets as quoted in Acts.
and the edition of the Twelve Minor Prophets prepared by the Benedictine Abbey of St. Jerome in Rome (Libreria Editrice Vaticana 1987) were the main sources for the Latin NT and OT traditions. For the Latin OT tradition, the dated but still useful edition of Sabatier (1743) was also consulted.


The text of Acts 2:17-21 in D05 has been the subject of a number of studies or comments by scholars. The status quaestionis has not developed much since the days of Klijn (1966:104), who, in a survey of research up to his time, notes that “unanimity seems to be impossible.” It is important to stress here, then, that the goal of this investigation is not to solve all the problems the text offers, but to investigate the text with regard to OT awareness and possible influence from the OT traditions. Along the way, of course, some suggestions will be offered as solutions to some of the various puzzles that the text contains.

2 Although both these Latin editions are editions of the Vulgate, the present interest lies with their critical apparatus.

2.1. The physical text of D05

| ΑΛΛΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ | ΣΕΔ ΗΟΚ ΕΣΤ ΝΟΠΟΙΟ ΔΙΚΤΟΜ ΕΣΤ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ</td>
<td>ΠΕΡ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΜ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΚΣΕΩ ΑΙΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΙΝΤΗ ΜΟΥ ΕΙΠΙ ΠΙΑΣΑΝ ΕΑΡΚΑΣ</td>
<td>ΕΡΤ ΗΝ ΝΟΙΣΜΙΝΙ ΑΙΜΕΝ ΜΟΤ ΝΟΜΕΝ ΕΑΡΝΕ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥΟΥΣ ΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΑΥΤΩΝ</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΜ ΑΙΜΟΡΑ ΣΕ ΒΟΛΟΜ ΕΤΑΙ ΠΑΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΘΥΓΑΤΕΡΕΣ ΑΥΤΩΝ</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΥΙΙΗΝΕΣ ΥΙΙΙΕΝΕΣ ΥΙΙΙΙΕΝΕΣ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΝΕΑΝΙΚΟΙ ΟΡΑΣΕΙ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ ΕΠΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΔΟΥΛΟΥΣ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙ ΤΑΣ ΔΟΥΛΕΙΣ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΚΧΕΩ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΝΕΜΟΥ ΕΠΙ ΠΑΣΑ ΣΑΡΚΑΣ</td>
<td>ΕΤ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΝΕΑΝΙΚΟΙ ΟΡΑΣΕΙ ΣΕ ΕΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΝΕΑΝΙΚΟΙ ΟΡΑΣΕΙ ΣΕ ΕΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΩΗΥΕΩ ΑΙΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΙΝΤΗ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΩΗΥΕΩ ΑΙΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΙΝΤΗ ΜΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΔΟΣΩ ΑΝ ΕΠΙ ΟΥΡΑΝΟ ΑΝΩ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΔΟΣΩ ΑΝ ΕΠΙ ΟΥΡΑΝΟ ΑΝΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΚΗΜΕΙΑ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΤΩ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΚΗΜΕΙΑ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΤΩ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ο ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
<td>Ο ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΑΝ ΑΝ ΑΝ ΑΝ ΑΝ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΑΝ ΑΝ ΑΝ ΑΝ ΑΝ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΔΟΥΛΟΥΣ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΔΟΥΛΟΥΣ ΜΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΔΟΥΛΕΙΣ ΜΟΥ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΔΟΥΛΕΙΣ ΜΟΥ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ ΣΕ ΣΟΡΟ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ ΣΕΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΟΙ ΕΝ ΥΠΝΙΑΣ ΟΨΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΗΛΙΟΝ ΜΕΤΑΣТΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 can be found on Folio 420b. The quotation is not indented, but starts with the initial E extended into the left margin and written slightly larger than the normal text. The text beginning directly after the quotation is treated in the same way – that is to say, the alpha of ANΔΡΕϹ at the start of Acts 2:22 is indicated as the start of a new paragraph by way of ekthesis. The quotation is therefore clearly indicated as its own passage in the textual layout of the manuscript.

4 The reading ΕΙΣΚΟΤΟϹ in D05 is not unique in the Greek NT tradition, but is almost certainly a mistake for an intended εἰς σκότος. The problem lies in deciding to which side the solitary C belongs – the words could be divided ΕΙ ΚΟΤΟϹ or ΕΙϹ ΚΟΤΟϹ. In the case of the ΕΙ ΚΟΤΟϹ, however, the grammatical case of κότος (“grudge”) would be wrong. Furthermore, the d05 reading of IN TENEBRIS supports an original εἰς σκότος. The same problem of only one ς instead of two occurs in 049 81 181 621 1735* 1874 160 and the supplementary leaves of 1156. As is the case with D05, these manuscripts most likely contain a copying error.
2.1.2. Corrections in D05

This text was subject to a number of corrections.

Scrivener (1864:440) has tentatively proposed that, in the line ΕΚΧΕΩ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΝϹ ΜΟΥ, the first hand originally wrote Α for Ψ, which was then erased by the scribe himself and immediately replaced by the Ψ. The Cambridge Library pictures show this not to be the case:

![Image of page with corrections]

Figure 2: Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, Fol 420b, line 10 (Source: Cambridge University Library MS Nn.2.41).

Rather, the purported Α has been caused by bleed-through from the Α of FRYGLAM on the other side of the page (Folio 419b).

The original ΠΑϹΑϹ ΨΑΡΚΑϹ has been changed to ΠΑϹΑΝ ΨΑΡΚΑ by erasure of the two Ψ’s in question and drawing a Ν over the final Ψ in ΠΑϹΑϹ. OPACEI has been corrected to OPACEIC by drawing a small Ψ after the word’s final letter (Ι) on top of the line. ENΥΠΙΝΙΟΙϹ has been added on top of the line, commencing slightly before the start of ENΥΠΙΝΙΑϹΟΗϹΟΗϹΟΗϹΟΗϹΟΗϹ. Although Scrivener (1864:440) gives this correction as “ενυπνιοις”, a diaeresis above the Υ was probably intended rather than a single horizontal

---

5 As Scrivener (1864:440) describes it, “α elot. sub σ in πν̅σ p. m., ut videtur.”
6 This image is reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.
7 According to Scrivener (1864:440), both these corrections have been made by corrector Α.
8 Scrivener (1864:440) attributes this correction to corrector Α.
stroke. Indeed, on closer inspection, it seems that the diaeresis was formed by two horizontal strokes that were made too close to each other, as is visible in the picture below:

![Figure 3: Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, Fol 420b, line 7 (Source: Cambridge University Library MS Nn.2.41).](image)

An original ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ has been changed into ΚΑΙ ΓΕ (cf. Parker 1992:152). The printed text in Scrivener’s (1864:331) edition of the manuscript, και εγ, mirrors his opinion on the fate of the Ω, “of which not even a trace remains,” as expressed in his editor’s notes (1864:440). The recent pictures by the Cambridge Library, however, appear to indicate the opposite:

![Figure 4: Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, Fol 420b, line 8 (Source: Cambridge University Library MS Nn.2.41).](image)

---

9 The correction was made by corrector B, according to Scrivener. For the discussion below, it is worthy to note that, although corrector B could be as early as the fifth century, this corrector does not appear to have had a copy of the Vorlage of D05; in fact, there are many instances where corrector B witnesses to a different type of text than D05 (Parker 1992:140-141).

10 This image is reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.

11 This correction has been made by corrector D (Scrivener 1864:440).

12 In Scrivener’s (1864:440) exact words: “cuius ne vestigium quidem superest.”

13 This image is reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.
In the picture above, both the original Ε (although almost completely erased, with the outline still visible) and the right semicircle of the Ω are visible. There can be no doubt that the original read ΕΓΩ instead of ΓΕ.

A part of the quotation has been retraced by a second hand. This redrawn text covered the original word МЕТАСΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ. A corrector different from and earlier than the one responsible for the retracing of the letters drew an Α over the first Ε of the original word, and drew ΗϹ after Φ on top of the line, resulting in the reading МЕТАСΤΡΑΦΗϹΕΤΑΙ.14 This reading, in turn, was corrected to read МЕТАСΤΡΑΦΙϹΤΑΙ by the same late hand that was responsible for the retracing of the letters.15 Finally, in the second to last line of the quotation, the ΤΟΥ before ΚΥ has been indicated as an error through placing a dot above each letter.16

2.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) is on Folio 421a. The Е of ERIT at the start of the quotation is extended into the margin and written slightly larger. Similar to the Greek, the quotation is marked off as a paragraph, as the text directly following the quotation starts in the margin, the У of UIRI written slightly larger than the normal text.

2.1.4. Corrections in d05

The condition of the text of this quotation is much easier to read in d05 than its counterpart in D05, as the only correction occurring within the text of the quotation is that of FILIAS to FILIAE. This has been done by corrector G (Scrivener 1864:440) by drawing an oblique stroke through the S and writing an Е on top of it. Similar to the Greek, a part of the text of this quotation has been retraced by a later hand.17

---

14 According to Scrivener (1864:440), this was done by corrector B.
15 Scrivener (1864:440) assigns the retracing and this correction to the late group of corrections grouped under his “corrector K”. This group is late, but consists of different correctors (cf. Scrivener 1864:xxvi; Parker 1992:41).
16 Scrivener (1864:440) did not assign this correction to a corrector, but simply indicated that it stems from a later hand.
17 Scrivener (1864:440) assigns this retracing to an unknown corrector K; the ink and style of writing is similar to the hand that has retraced the text in D05.
2.2. Other quotations or allusions to Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in the text of D05

Passages in D05 which contain allusions to Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) other than Acts 2:17-21 are, according to the NA\(^\text{28}\)'s list of \textit{loci citati vel allegati} and in the order they appear in the text of D05, Matthew 24:29 (Joel 3:4 LXX), Luke 21:25 (Joel 3:3-4 LXX), Mark 13:24 (Joel 3:4 LXX), and Acts 2:39 (Joel 3:5 LXX).\(^\text{18}\)


The allusions to Joel 3:(3-)4 (LXX) in the Synoptic Gospels occur in parallel passages. However, as the discussion below will show, the contexts of these parallel passages differ between Matthew 24:29 and Mark 13:24 on the one hand, and Luke 21:25 on the other. The text of Matthew 24:29 and Mark 13:24 are similar as they both contain an additional allusion to Isaiah 13:10.\(^\text{19}\) It is therefore advisable to first discuss these two more closely related passages, and Luke 21:25 afterwards.

2.2.1.1. Joel 3:4 (LXX) / Matthew 24:29

Apart from orthography\(^\text{20}\) and the interchange of a single preposition,\(^\text{21}\) the text of Matthew 24:29 in D05 reads the same as that of NA\(^\text{28}\). Both the context of Matthew 24:29

\(^{18}\) Matthew 3:11, which contains an allusion to Joel 3:1-5, is not present in the text of D05. The folio on which this text occurs has regrettably been lost, and has been replaced with a supplementary leaf. The text of Matthew 3:11 in this supplementary leaf, found on Folio 7b, reads: EΓΩ MEN ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩ ΥΜΑϹ ΕΝ ΥΔΑΤΙ / ΕΙϹ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΝ · Ο ΠΕΡΙ ΜΟΥ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟϹ / ΕΙϹ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΝ ΣΑΜΑϹΑΙΝΑϹ. The NA 28 further lists the following allusions to Joel 3:1-5 which are not present in the text of D05: 1 Corinthians 1:2 (Joel 3:5 (LXX)), Titus 3:6 (Joel 3:1 (LXX)), Revelation 8:7 (Joel 3:3 (LXX)), Revelation 6:12,17 (Joel 3:4 (LXX)) and Revelation 14:1 (Joel 3:5 (LXX)). Romans 10:13 quotes Joel 3:5 (LXX).

\(^{19}\) Both Matthew 24:29 and Mark 13:24 show verbal parallels with Isaiah 13:10 to the extent that one may call the reference to Isaiah 13:10 an allusion. However, the form of both texts is unknown to manuscripts of the Greek OT tradition. The text reads, in LXXGött: οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ Ὠρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι, καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος, καὶ η σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς. The second φῶς in this sentence is sometimes read as φέγγος in some manuscripts; see the text-critical apparatus of LXXGött.

\(^{20}\) D05 has ΘΑΕΙΨΕΙΝ for θλίψειν.

\(^{21}\) D05 reads ΕΚ where most NT manuscripts read ἀπό, which is followed by NA\(^\text{28}\). The D05 reading is also read by θ01 (see Tischendorf 1872:161 for more support for ΕΚ), and the NA\(^\text{28}\) points out that this could be on account of a synoptic parallel. However, the interchange of ίμαϲ and ἐκ, measured against WH, is frequent in D05 (cf. Yoder 1958:232-233; 1959:245), and this variant does not necessarily imply harmonisation.
and Acts 2:17-21 are concerned with eschatology, although the allusion to Joel 3:4 (LXX) in Matthew 24:29 looks to the future, while the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 is used to explain a contemporaneous phenomenon. A link could easily have been made between these two texts.\(^{22}\)

Joel 3:4 (LXX) reads as follows in LXXGött: ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα πρὶν ἔλθειν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.\(^{23}\) The underlined text in this verse shows parallels with the underlined text of Matthew 24:29 in D05 as it is found in the table below.\(^{24}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 24:29 (D05)</th>
<th>Acts 2:20 (D05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΥΘΕΩϹ ΔΕ ΜΕΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΘΛΕΙΨΕΙΝ ΤΩΝ ΗΜΕΡΩΝ ΕΚΕΙΝΩΝ - Ο ΗΛΙΟϹ ΣΚΟΤΙϹΗϹΕΙΑΙ ΚΑΙ Η ΣΕΛΗΝΗ ΟΥ ΔΩϹΕΙ ΤΟ ΦΕΓΓΟϹ ΑΥΤΗϹ ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΑϹΤΕΡΕϹ ΠΕϹΟΥΝΤΑΙ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΑΙ ΔΥΝΑΜΙϹ ΤΩΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩΝ ΚΑΛΕΥΘΗϹΟΝΤΑΙ</td>
<td>Ο ΗΛΙΟϹ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙϹΚΟΤΟϹ ΚΑΙ Η ΣΕΛΗΝΗ ΕΙϹ ΑΙΜΑ ΠΡΙΝ ΕΛΘΕΙΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ ΚΥΡΙΑΤΗΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΗΝ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The texts in D05 do not seem to have influenced each other in either direction. In fact, the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 in D05 is further removed from Matthew 24:29 than most Greek NT manuscripts: whereas most Greek NT manuscripts show a similarity between their reading of ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις in Acts 2:18 and the phrase (μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν) τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων in Matthew 24:29, D05 does not contain this phrase in Acts 2:18.\(^{25}\)

### 2.2.1.2. Joel 3:4 (LXX) / Mark 13:24

The text of Mark 13:24 D05 reads similar to Matthew 24:29 D05, although it differs enough to exclude direct dependence in the copying process.\(^{26}\) However, the same conclusions apply

---

\(^{22}\) Within the same context in Matthew 24, there are more verbal parallels to be found which could have drawn the attention to a similarity between theses texts. Compare, for instance, the phrase ΔΟϹΟΥϹΙΝ ΣΗΜΕΙΑ / ΜΕΓΑΛΑ / ΚΑΙ ΔΩϹΩ ΤΕΡΑΤΑ as found in Matthew 24:24 in D05 with Acts 2:19 (Joel 3:3 (LXX)) in D05, which reads ΚΑΙ ΔΟϹΩ ΤΕΡΑΤΑ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΟΥΡΑΝΩ ΑΝΩ / ΚΑΙ ΣΗΜΕΙΑ ΕΠΙ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ ΚΑΤΩ. In Matthew, however, these signs are given by the false prophets.

\(^{23}\) There are no noteworthy text-critical difficulties with this verse noted in the apparatus of LXXGött.

\(^{24}\) For the ΕΙϹΚΟΤΟϹ of D05, where εἰς σκότος is intended, see the discussion in the footnote under the section entitled “The physical text of D05” above.

\(^{25}\) See the discussion of this variant below.

\(^{26}\) The text of Mark 13:24 in D05, found on Folio 334b, reads: ἈΛΛΑ ΕΝ ΕΚΕΙΝΑΙ ΤΑΙϹ ΗΜΕΡΑΙϹ / ΜΕΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΘΛΕΙΨΕΙΝ EΚΕΙΗΝ / Ο ΗΛΙΟϹ ΣΚΟΤΙϹΗϹΕΙΑΙ / ΚΑΙ Η ΣΕΛΗΝΗ ΟΥ ΔΩϹΕΙ ΤΟ ΦΕΓΓΟϹ ΑΥΤΗϹ / ΚΑΙ ΟΙ ΑϹΤΕΡΕΑΙΟΙΕΚ ΤΟ ΟΥΡΑΝΟΥ / ΕΟΝΤΑΙ ΠΕΙΠΙΤΟΝΤΕϹ / ΚΑΙ ΑΙ ΔΥΝΑΜΙϹ / ΤΩΝ ΟΥΡΑΝΩΝ ΚΑΛΕΥΘΗϹΟΝΤΑΙ.
to this text with regard to Acts 2:20 D05: there is no influence either way. In fact, the lack of the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις in Acts 2:18 D05 (while it occurs in most other Greek NT manuscripts) and the phrase EN EKEINAIC TAIC HMEPAIC in Mark 13:24 D05 is even more prominent than the equivalent of the phrase (ΤΩΝ ΗΜΕΡΩΝ ΕΚΕΙΝΩΝ) in Matthew 24:29 D05.

2.2.1.3. Joel 3:3-4 (LXX) / Luke 21:25

Similar to Matthew 24:29 and Mark 13:24, Luke 21:25 is set within the context of a discussion of the last days. This text, however, does not allude to Isaiah 13:10, and the allusion to Joel 3:3-4 (LXX) is more difficult to perceive. The connecting points between Joel 3:3-4 (LXX) and Luke 21:25 D0527 are the “signs” (CHMEIA) and the “sun and moon” (HAIΩ KAI CHEAHNH). Although these could have reminded a scribe or copyist in the D05 tradition of Luke 21:25, there is nothing in the text as it appears in D05 to show influence between Luke 21:25 D05 and Acts 2:18 D05.

2.2.2. Joel 3:5 (LXX) / Acts 2:39

Acts 2:39 ends the advice that Peter has given to those “pierced in the heart” (KATENYTHCAN TH KAPΔIA, as it reads in Acts 2:37 D05) in reaction to his missionary speech (Acts 2:14b-36). In this speech, Peter has offered as explanation for the behaviour of him and his companions the quotation from Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:16: what is taking place has been foretold by the prophet (TOYTO ECTIN TO EIHMENON / ΔΙΑ TOY ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ).28 The allusion to the final line of the first quotation in his speech, Acts 2:21 / Joel 3:5 (LXX), and especially the following phrase in Joel 3:5 (LXX) which has not been quoted in Acts 2:21, provides a most fitting conclusion to this advice. These texts in D05,

27 The full text of Luke 21:25 as found in D05 runs: KAI ECONTAI CHMEIA / EN ΗΑΙΩ KAI CHEAHNH KAI AΣΤΡΟΙΣ / KAI ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ ΚΥΝΟΧΗ ΕΘΩΝ / ΚΑΙ ΑΠΟΡΙΑ ΧΟΥΧΗΣΕ ΘΑΛΑΣΣΑΣ / ΚΑΙ ΣΑΛΟΥ. In reading ΧΟΥΧΗΣΕ where most Greek NT manuscripts have ηχους, another possible link between Luke 21:25 the context of Acts 2:17-21 D05 is broken: In Acts 2:2, the start of the event of which Acts 2:17-21 is proffered as an explanation, the ΧΟΥΧ ("sound") of the wind that is heard at the start of Pentecost could remind a reader of the ηχους of Luke 21:25 (although their function in the text differs).

28 The designation "Ἰωήλ" does not have an equivalent in the introductory formula in the D05 text.
with the rest of the Joel text added from LXXGött,29 read as follows (underlined words highlight verbal parallels):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts 2:39 (D05)</th>
<th>Acts 2:21 (D05) / Joel 3:5a (LXX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΗΜΕΙΝ ΓΑΡ ΕϹΤΙΝ Η ΕΠΑΓΓΕΛΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΙϹ ΤΕΚΝΟΙϹ ΗΜΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΑϹΙ ΕΙϹ ΜΑΚΡΑΝ ΟϹΟΥϹ ΑΝ ΠΡΟϹΚΑΛΕϹΗΤΕ ΚΚ ΟϹ ΥΗΜΩΝ</td>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΕϹΤΑΙ ΠΑϹ ΟϹ ΑΝ ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕϹΗΤΑΙ ΤΟ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟϹ ΟϹΘΗϹΕΤΑΙ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joel 3:5b (LXXGötter)

| ὅτι ἐν τῷ άῳ Σιὼν καὶ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμων ἔσται ἀνασῳζόμενος, καθότι ἐπεί κύριος, καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, οὓς κύριος προσκέκληται |

The connection between Acts 2:21 and Acts 2:39 is clear, even if Joel 3:5b (LXX) is left out of consideration. Nevertheless, there does not appear to be any changes wrought to Acts 2:21 D05 by this connection. The text of Acts 2:21 D05 is agrees with the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition. However, at least one difference between D05 and the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition could be due to allusion to Joel 3:5b (LXX). A scribe or copyist might have noted the allusion to Joel 3:5b (LXX) in Acts 2:39 and have connected this to the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21. The link between Acts 2:17-21 and Acts 2:39 is presupposed by the Joel text itself. Note, for instance, the inclusio in Joel 3:5 (LXX) between ἐπικαλέσηται and προσκέκληται. These two terms have been used effectively in the Joel text to indicate a reciprocal action of “calling” – people call on the Lord (κύριος), while the Lord calls people.31 This inclusio is reflected in Acts, where Acts 2:21 is at the start of a speech while Acts 2:39 concludes Peter’s address to the crowd that has gathered. With Joel 3:5 (LXX) as a bridge between these two texts (Acts 2:21 and Acts 2:39), a scribe could have taken the Lord (κύριος) as the primary referent. This could have resulted in a scribe or copyist changing the speaker of Acts 2:17 to κύριος instead of θεός.32

---

29 There are no relevant variants in the text of Joel 3:5 (LXX), according to the LXXXGötter apparatus.
30 The TOI before EIC MAKPAN has been corrected to TOIC by corrector C (Scrivener 1864:439).
31 In the Greek OT tradition, προσκαλέω is never used with κύριος or θεός (or an equivalent term, e.g. ὄνομα τ. θ.), whereas ἐπικαλέω could have a divine referent as its object. The distinction between these two terms in Joel 3:5 – and Acts 2:21 / Acts 2:39 – is appropriate.
32 See, however, the discussion of this variant in D05 below.
2.3. Introductory formula

In D05, the introductory formula (ἈΛΛΑ ΤΟΥ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΟ ΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΝ / ΔΙΑ ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ) of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) reads exactly the same as in the rest of the Greek NT tradition, except that D05 has no equivalent for Ἰωήλ after ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ, the direct indication of the quotation’s source. The Latin NT tradition has a number of witnesses, chiefly early Christian writers, which agree with the SED HOC EST QUOD DICTUM EST of D05 / PER PROPHETAM of d05) in not having an equivalent for Iohel.33

The most convincing argument for the “initial” text’s lack of Ἰωήλ, and the name being an addition, has been made by Kilpatrick (1979:95; followed by Pervo 2009:72; cautiously followed by Elliott 2003:26). According to Kilpatrick, the normal order of “prophet” and “name” in the Greek NT tradition is, for example, “Joel, the prophet”.34 In the Greek NT tradition (apart from D05, of course), the order in Acts 2:16 is the reverse: τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ.35 Kilpatrick regards this difference in order from the normal pattern in the Greek NT tradition as a whole to support the shorter reading in D05 as the original text.36 Although Kilpatrick’s recourse to the NT – as if all authors of the NT wrote in the same style – could be questioned,37 his proof from Acts (and Luke) deserves attention.38 The reading as found in the Greek NT tradition (προφήτου Ἰωήλ), apart from D05, does appear to conform to a (possibly later) well-polished Greek usage. Moreover, in an earlier study, Kilpatrick (1963:65) noted that, as the following quotation does indeed come from Joel, “there was no occasion for

---

33 These witnesses are Irenaeus Adversus haereses 3.12.1 (text available in Brox 1995:120), De Rebaptismate 15 (text available in Hartel 1871:88) and Hilary of Poitiers De Trinitate 8.25 (text available in Doignon et al. 2000:416).

34 Kilpatrick (1979:95) identifies this order (“Joel, the prophet”) as the Hebrew order; normally Greek usage asks for the reverse. Kilpatrick gives a list of NT passages, including Acts, “where the text is certain” to substantiate his claim. He notes that, wherever the order differs, there is a problem of textual variation. In the Latin NT tradition, only Codex Gigas (with its Iohel propheta) reads the text in a reverse order from the Greek NT tradition.

35 Bock (1987:158; 342, footnote 5) asks whether Kilpatrick’s suggestion that the order of the prophet-name / name-prophet in the introduction does not make the “addition” the harder reading, implying that a scribe would delete the name based on this pattern (which seems to be clearly established). However, this seems very unlikely. Certainly a scribe would simply transpose the two words if they were deemed to be in the wrong order.

36 Bock (1987:158; 342, footnote 5) asks whether Kilpatrick’s suggestion that the order of the prophet-name / name-prophet in the introduction does not make the “addition” the harder reading, implying that a scribe would delete the name based on this pattern (which seems to be clearly established). However, this seems very unlikely. Certainly a scribe would simply transpose the two words if they were deemed to be in the wrong order.

37 At the very least, of course, Kilpatrick’s extensive examples from the NT prove that the placing of the name-prophet in this particular order was a common practice of the earliest Christian writers.

38 Cf. Luke 3:14; 4:27; Acts 8:30; 13:20; 28:25, all of which are textually certain; further see Acts 8:28; Luke 4:17 for textual variation with regard to the prophet-name / name-prophet order.
omitting it, if it was in the original text. On the other hand, if it were not in the original text, its addition would be understandable.” 39

Bock (1987:158; 342, footnote 5) objects to Kilpatrick’s suggestion by noting that the lack of Ἱωήλ in Acts 2:16 does not match with the internal evidence provided by the book of Acts, namely, that the author of Acts is more likely to supply the name together with an explicit citation. Although Pervo (2009:72 – independent of Bock) points out that the quotations from the other Minor Prophets in Acts 40 do not contain the name of a prophet, the balance is slightly in favour of Bock’s position. This is because the other introductory formulae introducing quotations from Minor Prophets in Acts utilise a plural form (without textual variation), while this quotation (in D05 and the rest of the Greek NT tradition) make use of a singular form.41

Another factor could contribute to deciding the most likely reading in this case, but this solution runs the risk of circular reasoning. In the discussion of the text of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) below, it will become clear that D05 differs significantly from the majority of the manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition. It is possible that a scribe, noticing these differences between the NT before him and the OT text, removed the discrepancy by deleting the reference to Joel in the introductory formula (also noted by Kilpatrick 1979:95). 42 Conversely, it is equally possible that a scribe (or, a “redactor”) realised that the text – even a text such as D05, which differs from the Greek OT tradition – was a quotation from Joel and supplied the name of the prophet in the introductory formula. Once the name entered the

39 Zahn (1922:108) proposed a similar solution to Kilpatrick, but, although he noted the word order (1922:108, footnote 59), he did not strongly base his argument on it. Cerfaux (1950:47) has also argued for Ἱωήλ being an addition, basing his argument on the introductory formula to the quotation of Psalm 2:7(-8) in Acts 13:33 (this is clearly the text he is referring to, although his text mistakenly refers to “14:33”). According to Cerfaux, it is a characteristic of the B03-type text (which, in the case of both these quotations and their introductory formulae, is the same as the rest of the Greek NT tradition against D05) to precisely define the source of quotations. However, the introductory formula of Psalm 2:7(-8) in Acts 13:33 in D05 is most likely secondary; see the discussion of this passage in the chapter on the Psalms in the present study. A different argument for Ἱωήλ being an addition has been made in passing by Williams (1964:67), who takes the quotation from Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 to be from a testimony source; Williams notes that “if testimonies were used in the primitive Church, they would be likely to be anonymous.” However, a number of objections can be levelled against Williams’s suggestion: e.g., it is uncertain whether the text stems from a testimony source and as there are no undeniable testimony sources extant, it is impossible to tell whether they would be anonymous or not.

40 Acts 7:42-43; 13:40; 15:15 – see the respective discussions of these introductory formulae below.


42 This is the stance taken by Metzger (2003:250-251) in stating: “Durch die Auslassung des Namens wird der konkrete Bezug zur Septuaginta verdeckt.”
Greek NT tradition, plainly indicating the correct source, there was no reason to elide it. \(^{43}\) In fact, in a later step, if the text of the D05 tradition was the “initial” text, the newly introduced name could have prompted a scribe to adjust the text of a tradition like D05 to be in line with the Greek OT tradition. \(^{44}\) Both scenarios seem to be equally valid.

In summary, the possible omission or addition of the name of the prophet has implications for evaluating the OT awareness of D05, but whether the text was added or omitted is not easily determined. Kilpatrick’s compelling arguments versus Bock’s objection of authorial custom puts the internal evidence at an impasse. The only way to address this problem, it seems, is to rely on the external evidence, which is in favour of the secondary nature of the D05 reading (i.e., the lack of an equivalent for Ιωήλ). \(^{45}\) However, recourse to the external evidence is, with regard to this reading, merely a tentative solution.

The inability to determine the “initial” reading in the case of the introductory formula in Acts 2:16, however, is not completely without value. With regard to D05, one can at least determine that, in the final stages of the D05 tradition, the OT awareness of the quotation in D05 was probably less than most other Greek NT manuscripts at this time. Most likely, more manuscripts would have preserved the D05 reading, had there still been a large number of manuscripts without an equivalent for Ιωήλ in circulation at the time of the production of D05. Indeed, in these final stages of the D05 tradition, it must have been harder to pinpoint the quotation as stemming from Joel than in the rest of the NT tradition.

\(^{43}\) Pace Schille (1983:107; similarly Stählin 1975:236), who argues that the best explanation for Ιωήλ not having an equivalent in Acts 2:17 in D05 is “Angleichung an die übliche namenlose Zitationsweise.”

\(^{44}\) Cf., for instance, the text as it is found in B03.

\(^{45}\) This appears to be the reasoning behind the UBS\(^3\) and UBS\(^4\) (and through this connection also the NA\(^2\)) texts. As substantiation, Metzger (1994:255) simply remarks that “[a] majority of the Committee judged that the name Ιωήλ had fallen out accidentally from the Western text …” No explanation for how this “accident” could have happened is offered. In light of the numerous differences between the following quotation from Joel in D05 against the rest of the Greek NT tradition, this silence is unsatisfactory. Also noteworthy is that the UBS text was first rated with a “D” (i.e., very uncertain) in the UBS\(^3\) apparatus, but with a “B” (i.e., relatively certain) in the UBS\(^4\) apparatus, without providing additional evidence. One can only assume that the estimation of the external evidence were higher in this revision of the UBS text.
2.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

2.4.1. D05 EN TAIC ECXATAIC HMEPAIC / d05 IN NOUISSIMIS DIEBUS

The inclusion of the variant unit discussed below is by virtue of a variant reading in two other manuscripts (B03 and 076). The reading of these two manuscripts has generated a lot of scholarly debate: B03 and 076 read META TAYTA where D05 and the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition read EN TAIC ECXATAIC HMEPAIC. A number of Greek NT manuscripts conflate these two readings, but the conflation is clearly secondary. The Latin NT tradition unanimously agrees with d05. The Greek OT tradition knows no variation at this point (reading μετὰ ταῦτα), as does the Latin OT tradition (post haec). There are no variants in the Hebrew tradition, either. The Greek and Latin OT traditions are in line with the Hebrew tradition, which reads אחריו כל הנשיא. In light of the consensus of the OT traditions, it is hard to imagine a reading deviating from these traditions becoming so widespread as the reading in D05 and almost all other Greek NT manuscripts have done if EN TAIC ECXATAIC HMEPAIC was not original.

Perhaps the most ardent argument for an original μετὰ ταῦτα was made by Haenchen (1954:162; 1977:181). In his view, the reading ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις does not tally with Luke’s theology, as Luke is “keineswegs der Meinung, das mit Pfingsten und der Kirche die Endzeit angebrochen ist.” However, as Mußner (1961:263-265; followed by Weiser 1981:91; cf. Smits 1955:180; Schille 1983:107) has explicitly argued against Haenchen, whether μετὰ ταῦτα or ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is accepted as the original reading would not make a substantial difference to the theology of Acts. Both these readings signify a change in time

---

46 See Porter (2006:119-125) for a discussion of the quotations from Joel 3:1-5 (LXX), Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) and Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:14-36. Porter touches upon the important text-critical problems of these texts. For the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21, Porter discusses the variant in a few manuscripts (including B03 and C04) in verse 17 – where D05 (and NA28) reads EN TAIC ECXATAIC HMEPAIC, this group has μετὰ ταῦτα, which agrees with the text of the Greek OT tradition. He concludes that the reading as found in D05 is more likely to be original. For a text-critical investigation of the NT and its source text, see Bock (1987:156-164).

47 This fifth to sixth century manuscript only contains portions of Acts 2:11-22, and the text in question has not been preserved in its entirety. However, TA TAYTA is visible, and there is not enough space before the text resumes to expect an equivalent for the EN TAIC ECXATAIC HMEPAIC found in D05 to have stood next to this reading.

48 Namely, C04 365 467 621 1842, which all read μετὰ ταῦτα ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις.

49 The only manuscript with a different reading is the original hand of the Latin codex V, which reads the patently erroneous NOMUISSIMIS.
period, and ἐσχάταις does not need to imply immediacy – only that the last stage of (a) time period has started, regardless of how long this stage will last.

Haenchen’s proposition has nevertheless been influential, his most recent ally being Richard Pervo (2009:77-79). Connecting the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις with the question of the similar phrase in the text in Acts 2:18 (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις – of which D05 has no equivalent – see the discussion below), Pervo (2009:79) notes that “[o]n both textual and theological grounds it is reasonable to posit ‘in the last days’ as part of a D-Text revision of Acts 2:17-21.” Pervo suggests that μετὰ ταῦτα should be accepted because of its awkwardness in the context – it is unclear to what “after these things” should refer to in Peter’s speech. This would make μετὰ ταῦτα the lectio difficilior. However, it is not the usual pattern for the author of Acts to start quotations without fitting these quotations into their new context. Pervo’s claim with regard to the “textual … grounds” is also not persuasive. According to him, the D05 text moved the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις from its position in Acts 15:18, slightly revised the phrase, and substituted it for μετὰ ταῦτα in Acts 15:17. The Greek NT tradition then took up the D05 reading in Acts 15:17, but not the “omission” in Acts 15:18. This, however, is unlikely, as D05 is the only manuscript in the Greek NT tradition not to have an equivalent for ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις in Acts 15:18. Pervo’s suggestion involves two cases where the external evidence speaks strongly against its possibility. To this should be added the secure evidence of Greek OT tradition, which would rather point to a harmonisation with the text of the Greek OT tradition in B03 than in D05 (cf. Fitzmyer 1998:252).

---

50 Haenchen’s influence in this matter has somewhat waned over the years. This can be illustrated by, e.g., Wilckens (1974:33, footnote 2), who, by his own confession, first accepted Haenchen’s position but rejected it in the third edition of his work.

51 In Acts 15:16, μετὰ ταῦτα occurs at the beginning of what seems to be a conflated quotation. However, in this context, μετὰ ταῦτα is not awkward, as the quotation’s referent is indeed to a time “after these things.” One should, however, take note of at least one quotation which is awkward within its new context in Acts, namely that of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47. See the discussion of this quotation in the chapter on Isaiah in this study.

52 This possibility has previously been noted by Epp (1966:67).

53 Bock (1987), choosing against an original μετὰ ταῦτα in Acts 15:17, further notes that, if μετὰ ταῦτα were original, it is strange to think that not more manuscripts of the Greek NT would have kept this reading in the light of the secure Greek OT tradition. That is to say, would every scribe knowingly change a text toward a known reading in the Greek NT which disagrees with the Greek OT, or would they rather change a reading to the Greek OT if they knew the text was a quote? The latter instance is more likely.
2.4.2. D05 (ΛΕΓΕΙ) KC/ d05 (DICIT) DNS

In reading ΚϹ in Acts 2:17, D05 stands further away from most manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition, which prefer ὁ θεός, but closer to most witnesses of the Latin NT tradition. The reading in D05, ΚϹ, is generally assumed to be secondary (Porter 2006:122; but cf. Elliott 2003:26). While the Greek NT has only a few manuscripts which read κύριος, the Latin NT tradition attests to dominus invariably. To be sure, the whole phrase, λέγει ὁ θεός / ὁ κύριος, has been added to the quotation by the author of Acts (probably on account of emphasis – see Steyn 1995:78-79; Rusam 2003:293), as it occurs nowhere in the OT traditions. The change from θεός to κύριος could be based on a reading in the context of the quotation in the Greek OT such as Joel 2:12 (λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός – cf. Steyn 1995:78-79, with regard to both θεός and κύριος) or the much closer Joel 2:27 (ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός), since there the Greek OT reads both terms. In Joel 2:12 the Hebrew and Latin OT simply read יהוה / dominus, with almost no equivalent for θεός. If assimilation to a Hebrew or Latin OT context is the case, the reading in D05 is probably due to influence from d05 and the Latin NT tradition rather than direct influence by the OT traditions. Nevertheless, an even closer explanation is apparent: the reading could be due to harmonisation to the term κύριος (dominus) in Acts 2:20 and 2:21, or even, as Rius-Camps (1999:253) points out, with reference to the pouring out (ἐξέχεεν – cf. the ἐκχεῶ of Acts 2:17) of the Holy Spirit by Christ.

54 Zehnle (1971:32), for instance, notes that θεός is more characteristic of “Lukan” style than κύριος. Elliott (2003:26), however, notes that “scribes often avoid the ambiguity” of the term κύριος, and prefers this reading based on the principles of thoroughgoing eclecticism. Kilpatrick’s (1979:96) assertion that “κύριος without the article is a little odd in Greek” and this may have resulted in a change to ὁ θεός is not entirely convincing; as Kilpatrick himself admits, the easiest (and precedent in other instances) way to fix would be to simply add the article, rather than change the term and add the article in addition.

55 Except D05, κύριος (not always a nomen sacrum) is read by E08 254 467 617 629 – note the absence of an article in both these manuscripts and D05, whereas 886 and 1884 reads ὁ θεός. The lectionary manuscript Λ1825 conflates the two readings into κυριος ὁ θεος.

56 Porter (2006:122; cf. Pervo 2009:77) explains the addition of the phrase by the author of Acts as an “ascription of the [quoted] passage not only to the prophet … but to God himself (or the Lord, who is God) as the speaker of it.” Barrett (1994:136) refers to the context of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX), where the phrase ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός ὑμῶν occurs in Joel 2:27, and states that “[a]n ascription is no doubt desirable in Acts”, since the quotation does not quote Joel 2:27 with the rest of the quotation. Barrett’s remark implies that the OT context of the quotation is honoured in the text of Acts, as the quotation is not without ascription (but is ascribed to a prophet (D05) or the prophet Joel (the rest of the Greek NT tradition).

57 In light of these readings of the Greek OT tradition, Porter’s (2006:122) explanation for the “Western” reading as “probably changed … to conform to Old Testament reference to God” is not satisfactory.

58 Cf. Sabatier 1743:913 for at least one manuscript with dominus deus.

59 Moessner (1998:220) points out the inclusio in the Joel citation between the Acts 2:17a’s θεός (as Moessner takes the reading to be), and Acts 2:21’s κύριος. “The use of ‘Lord’ is artfully ambiguous. Does ‘Lord’ refer primarily to the ‘Lord God’ (2:20 …) or to the ‘Lord Jesus …’? In D05, the inclusion is stronger and there is less ambiguity. The clearing up of a perceived ambiguity could have been the motivation behind changing the D05 reading to ΚϹ in Acts 2:17a.
in Acts 2:33. Likewise, Bock (1987:158, 342-343, footnote 6) has proposed that the reading in D05 is harmonisation with the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34, in which the term κύριος is used twice. Another possibility for the origin of Κ̅Ϲ̅ has already been pointed out above in the discussion of the allusion to Joel 3:5b (LXX) in Acts 2:39.

In summary, there could be some degree of OT awareness evident in the D05 reading, but the context of the reading in the Acts of D05 provides a satisfactory if not better explanation for the origin of this specific variant reading. Although Klijn (1966:107) is correct in reminding the reader, with regard to Acts 2:17, that “[m]anuscripts show very little consistency” with regard to κύριος and θεός, the Κ̅Ϲ̅ of D05 should perhaps not be dismissed so lightly – as there might indeed be some amount of consistency in D05, as will become clear in the discussion of the readings KAI ΕΓΩ and TOY (KY) below.

2.4.3. D05 ΕΚΧΕΩ ΑΙΩ ΤΟΥ Π̅Ν̅Ϲ̅ ΜΟΥ / d05 EFFUNDAM ŚΡΜ (SPIRITUM – Acts 2:18) MEUM

An example of possible adaptation to the OT drawn mainly from the Latin side of this quotation is the EFFUNDAM SP̅Μ MEUM in Acts 2:17 in d05 and EFFUNDAM SPIRITUM MEUM in 2:18. The Greek NT tradition, apart from orthography and the occasional neglect of the use of the nomen sacrum for πνεύματος, is in line with D05 (ΕΚΧΕΩ ΑΙΩ ΤΟΥ Π̅Ν̅Ϲ̅

60 Kilpatrick (1963:65-66; similarly Cerfaux 1950:47) is of the opinion that an original κύριος might have been seen as a too ambiguous term. The change to θεός would be in order to clear up this ambiguity. Kilpatrick’s argument is not as convincing on account of the overwhelming external evidence for θεός. Read-Heimerdinger (2002:279) agrees with Rius-Camps and connects the use of ΛΕΓΕΙ Κ̅Ϲ̅ in D05 with the presence of the article before the final reference to κύριος (i.e., in D05, TOY KY): “The presence of the article before κύριος at 2.21 D05 is an indication that the name of Jesus is intended since, by undoing the stereotypical nature of the expression ‘the name of the Lord’, attention is drawn to κύριος.” She also notes, with reference to Rius-Camps (1999:258), that in reading the article before KY, D05 differs from the “LXX wording”. Read-Heimerdinger (2002:289) also notes that the effect of the ΛΕΓΕΙ Κ̅Ϲ̅ of D05 for understanding the context in Acts is that “the Lord known to Joel (Yahweh)” can now be understood by Peter as “one and the same as the Lord acting in the present times (Jesus).”

61 The manifold occurrences of κύριος in the context of this passage are in accordance with the solution offered by Pervo (2009:77), although Pervo’s suggestion is subject to a wider scope: in Acts, the Κ̅Ϲ̅ of D05 is “more conventional”; θεός presents the lectio difficilior; hence, the latter reading is to be preferred.

62 Such a contextual solution (i.e., within the NT text itself) is to be preferred if the fact that D05 does not have an equivalent for the reading ὠν τὰς ἡμέρας ὄξσινας in Acts 2:18 is taken into account, as discussed below. See also the discussion of the TOY (KY) in Acts 2:21 in D05 below.

63 The D05 text regularly shows variation against WH – and consequently a text such as B03 – with regard to the divine name. See Yoder (1958:227) for a list.
MOY). The reading in d05 is singular in the NT tradition, while the better attested reading, *effundam de spiritu meo*, is closer to the Greek NT tradition.⁶⁴

The difference between D05 and d05 is one of quality: the reading in D05 could be seen to imply a partial outpouring of the Spirit (*ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου* – “(a part) of my Spirit”), whereas d05, making the Spirit the direct object, implies an outpouring of the Spirit in *toto* (“I will pour out my Spirit”).⁶⁵ The d05 reading most likely has its roots in the Hebrew tradition, which reads, without variation, אָשֶׁר אֲלִבִּי.⁶⁶ The difference must have been felt in the other OT traditions, as the greatest part of the Greek OT tradition has ἐκχέω ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου (i.e., the D05 reading),⁶⁷ but some witnesses read τὸ πνεύμα (akin to the d05 reading).⁶⁸ The Latin OT tradition is also familiar with both these readings.⁶⁹ There is, then, a slight probability that d05 was influenced in this reading by either the Latin OT or the Hebrew OT tradition.

### 2.4.4. D05 ΠΑϹΑϹ ΨΑΡϹΑϹ / d05 OMNEM CARNEM

D05 is the only Greek NT manuscript to have the plural in reading ΠΑϹΑϹ ΨΑΡϹΑϹ where the rest of the Greek NT tradition reads πᾶσαν σάρκα. The *OMNEM CARNEM* of d05, however, agrees with the rest of the Latin NT tradition (and consequently the Greek NT tradition too). None of the OT traditions have a plural as an equivalent: While the Greek OT

---

⁶⁴ Although Parker (1992:231) lists the reading in Acts 2:18 as a difference between the Greek and Latin columns of D05, his reference to the “carelessness in d” is to *SPIRITUM*, which should have been a *nomen sacrum*, the normal use in d05.

⁶⁵ This difference between the Greek OT tradition and Greek NT tradition on the one hand and the Hebrew tradition on the other has also been noted by Steyn (1999:365-371; cf. Keener 2012:916). Steyn adds a third possibility with regard to the Greek OT and Greek NT traditions, namely that “something else is being poured out from the Spirit.” Steyn suggests that this “something else” is the “gift” of the “power” of “prophecy” (cf. Luke 1:35; 24:49; Acts 1:8; 2:38; 8:20; 10:45; 11:17) or perhaps baptism (cf. Acts 1:4-5; 10:44; 11:16). Keener (2012:916, footnote 602) remarks on Steyn’s third suggestion, however, that “this thoughtful interpretation (while otherwise feasible) does not seem to fit the widespread OT background or the analogous passages in Acts.

⁶⁶ The Hebrew text knows no variants; Targum-Jonathan reads יִתְרָח קָדָשׁ (literally, “the Spirit of my Holiness”), which also has “spirit” as direct object.

⁶⁷ Gelston (2010:34) posits assimilation to Numbers 11:17, 25 as the reason for the ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου reading in the Greek OT tradition of Joel 3:1, 2 (LXX). These two passages in Numbers prove that a partitive understanding is possible; in Hebrew, this has been construed with the preposition ְּ. Whether a different Hebrew tradition shaped the Greek reading is difficult to say.

⁶⁸ Not surprisingly, Aquila and Symmachus have the accusative. Justin, the Achmimic version, and a part of the Ethiopic version have the accusative in Joel 3:1 (LXX), with only a part of the Ethiopic version in Joel 3:2 (LXX).

⁶⁹ See, for instance, Sabatier (1743:915).
tradition reads the same as the rest of the Greek NT tradition (πᾶσαν σάρκα), the Latin OT tradition knows only omnem carnem, and the Hebrew tradition reads כל־בשׂר without fail.

The agreement of the adjective with its referent shows that the variant reading in D05 is likely not a simple scribal blunder. Of course, a slip of the mind could have produced the plural reading in both words simultaneously, but the question would still remain why a change to the plural occurred – i.e., if any specific theological idea should be ascribed to it. The usual explanation for this plural reading is as an attempt by the D05 tradition to express a more universal salvation, “a tendency to consider the Holy Spirit as something for the world as a whole” (Klijn 1966:107, with reference to Ropes 1926:ccxxiii; Haenchen 1954:162; cf. Epp 1966:69; Conzelmann 1972:34; Haenchen 1977:181, footnote 2; Bock 1987:158). Barrett (1994:136; cf. Conzelmann 1972:34) suggests that the idea of universality is also echoed by the variation of pronouns shown by D05 (and d05) against the rest of the Greek NT tradition in this quotation (for which, see the discussion below).

Within this argument for a theological change in the D05 tradition to accommodate universality, there is room for influence from the OT. Meek (2008:102), for instance, notes that the idea of “all flesh” could have been obtained from the text of Joel in the Greek OT tradition. However, the plural form of the word σάρξ itself could hardly have been inspired

70 Less likely is that one of the two terms were inadvertently changed to a plural, with a subsequent “correction” at a later stage of the copying process of the other to agree with this changed term. Holmes (2003:189) seems to imply that, in an original ΠΑϹΑϹΑΡΚΑϹ, the ΑϹ of the first word was accidentally copied twice, resulting in ΠΑϹΑϹΑΡΚΑϹ. This, in turn, could have led to the change in ΠΑϹΑϹΑΡΚΑϹ.

71 The opinion expressed by Haenchen (1954:162) was made in explicit contrast to Cerfaux (1950:47), who does not believe the difference in D05 against the rest of the Greek NT tradition to be of any importance.

72 Barrett (1994:136) makes this suggestion with due caution, as he notes that ΠΑϹΑϹΑΡΚΑϹ could also be an “accidental error”. Conzelmann (1972:34) has also been careful to make a too hasty claim, using the term “scheint” to express the possibility of universality in D05. He further follows Ropes (1926:ccxxiii), who cautiously points to Acts 2:47, where D05 have EXONTEC ΧΑΡΠΟΤΟΝ ΚΟϹΜΟΝ (d05 reads MUNDΟΥ), against both the Greek NT and Latin NT traditions. The greatest part of the Greek NT tradition reads ἐξοντες χάριν πρὸς ἅλων τῶν λαῶν. However, in the context of this phrase in both D05 and the rest of the Greek NT tradition, the phrase expresses the stance of the people towards the believers, and this need not imply a sense of universalism.

73 Keener (2012:881) notes that the idea of universality may be present in the Acts narrative: “Although Peter would not so understand it at this point in the story, Luke undoubtedly interprets ‘all flesh’ as referring not simply to the men and women, young and old, and servants stated in Joel 2:28-29 [i.e. Joel 3:1-2 LXX] but to people from all nations.”

74 Also see the larger discussion of the import of the idea of “all flesh” in the D05 text in Meek (2008:99-102).
by the Greek OT tradition.\textsuperscript{75} When used in conjunction with πᾶς, σάρξ always appears in the singular in the Greek OT tradition (compare the use of כל־בשׂר in the Hebrew tradition).\textsuperscript{76}

It should be noted that D05 frequently shows variation in number with regard to nouns against WH (Yoder 1958:173-174). Although many of these differences in D05 can be coherently explained (e.g., as transcriptional errors or contextual harmonisation), some remain inexplicable and it is possible that ΠΑϹΑϹ ΨΑΡΚΑϹ in D05 is one of the latter (cf. Cerfaux 1950:47). OT awareness, in any case, seems to be a very limited factor in the D05 reading.\textsuperscript{77}

2.4.5. D05 ΑΥΤΩΝ, no equivalent for ὑμῶν / d05 EORUM, no equivalent for vester

Of further interest in Acts 2:17 is the much discussed reading of ΑΥΤΩΝ in D05 where the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition prefers ὑμῶν – for the first two occurrences of the word – and the lack of an equivalent in D05 of both the third and fourth occurrence.\textsuperscript{78} Although some manuscripts change the term to ημων, D05 is unique in reading ΑΥΤΩΝ on both of the first two accounts;\textsuperscript{79} D05 is also unique with regard to all of the OT traditions. Only in the Latin NT tradition is the EORUM of d05 for the first two occurrences of vester\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{75} Contra what is hinted at by Delebecque (1986:292; cf. Chase 1893:18). Although the word σάρξ frequently occurs in the plural in the Greek OT tradition, Delebecque is wrong in stating that “[l]e mot σάρξ est toujours au pluriel dans les LXX (sauf une exception).” The word occurs frequently in both the singular and the plural.

\textsuperscript{76} There are numerous occurrences of the word in the Greek OT tradition. The statement with regard to the word always being used in the singular is based on an eclectic edition of the Greek text. It is conceivable that there are manuscripts with plural readings in some of the instances where the combination of πᾶς with σάρξ occurs, but the evidence to the “normal” usage of the combination (i.e., in the singular) is more than convincing.

\textsuperscript{77} A further suggestion is made by Chase (1893:18), namely that the D05 tradition was influenced by an old Syriac text reading ܒܣܪܐ, which could be either singular or plural. Chase’s argument, however, suffers from a lack of manuscript evidence (as the Peshitta and other Syriac texts have ܒܣܪ).

\textsuperscript{78} Bock (1987:159), perhaps in error for ΑΥΤΩΝ as found twice in D05 and the fact that D05 has no equivalents for ὑμῶν, mistakenly adds that D05 “omits μου after δούλους and δούλας.” On the contrary, in both instances, a ΜΟΥ is present in D05.

\textsuperscript{79} The suggestion by Chase (1893:18) that the D05 readings arose through an interchange of ܒܢܝܟܘܢ (“your sons”) and ܒܢܝܟܗܘܢ (“their sons”) should be kept in mind, but as Epp (1966:68) rightly notes, no known Syriac manuscript reads ܒܢܝܟܗܘܢ, and the weight of the evidence consequently weighs against Chase’s suggestion.

\textsuperscript{80} The Latin possessive pronoun for the Greek personal pronoun in the genitive is a widespread translation choice in the Latin NT tradition. The form is used here instead of the second person personal pronoun (tu) because of this reason. Of course, the possessive pronoun of the Latin took on the gender of its referent, so with “first two occurrences” is here meant vestri and vestrae, respectively. The important point of difference, however, between the greatest part of the Latin NT tradition and d05 is not the choice of the personal pronoun by d05 against the possessive pronoun, but the difference in second person against the third person of d05.
mirrored in some church fathers. The lack of an equivalent for the third occurrence of ὑμῶν is not found in any of the NT traditions, with only one exception. The fourth ὑμῶν is not present in some Greek NT manuscripts and some Latin NT manuscripts and traditions. In the Greek NT tradition, then, only D05 has the combination of no equivalent for both readings, while in the Latin NT tradition, d05 has the support in this combination of merely one witness.

The OT traditions contain the two phrases in which the last two equivalents for ὑμῶν occur in a different order than D05 and the rest of the Greek NT tradition, without variation with regard to this order. Where the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition reads (here the NA text is given as an example)

καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὄρασεις ὀψονται
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται,

the OT traditions read (the LXXGött text is given here as an example of their order):

καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται,
καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὄρασεις ὀψονται.


82 In the Latin tradition, De Rebaptismate 15 (text available in Hartel 1871:88) is the only witness known to not have an equivalent for this reading. In 642 the whole phrase – καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν – is omitted, probably on account of haplography. It was later added at the bottom of the page by a corrector.

83 C04* E08 (also on the Latin side – see the following note) and 1884. Tischendorf’s edition (1843) of Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (C04) gives the reading as being present, although the text is in smaller print; Lyon’s doctoral thesis (1958), which includes a transcription of this manuscript, does not contain the reading. The INTF collations also show the term as not being present. After consulting the facsimile edition and the digital picture of this manuscript made available by the Bibliothèque Nationale de France, the present author is convinced that the reading was not present in the manuscript’s original text. The digital pictures of this manuscript is available at http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b8470433r/f33.item [accessed 14 February 2013]; Acts 2:17-21 can be found on Folio 164a.


85 This witness is De Rebaptismate 15 (text available in Hartel 1871:88). Ropes (1926:17) suggests that D05 might conflate readings from different traditions, and that De Rebaptismate “may alone represent the original.”

86 The variant forms of ἐνύπνια / ἐνυπνιασθήσονται and the lack of an equivalent for this term in D05 will be discussed below.
This difference in order weakens the possible reliance of D05 on these traditions at the outset; however, it is further noteworthy that none of these OT traditions know any variation with regard to these two occurrences of ὑμῶν. The lack of equivalents in D05 for these two occurrences of ὑμῶν cannot be traced to an OT tradition.

2.4.6. D05 has no equivalent for αἱ before ΘΥΓΑΤΡΕϹ / d05 has no equivalent for the article (αἱ)

Only two manuscripts in the Greek NT tradition do not have an equivalent for αἱ before θυγατέρες: C04 and D05. Neither d05 nor the rest of the Latin tradition contain an equivalent for the article. This is not surprising as the article is difficult to represent in Latin. The Greek OT tradition always includes an article, and the word is always definite in the Hebrew tradition by virtue of its construct state (הבנותיכם).

The most likely explanation for the lack of an equivalent for αἱ in both C04 and D05 is homoioteleuton (cf. Holmes 2003:189). In reading ΚΑΙΑΙΘ, the copyist’s eye probably jumped from the first AI to the second. The suspicion that a Vorlage in the D05 tradition had KAIAI in its text is strengthened by the fact that in the previous phrase which stands in parallel to this one, ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥϹΟΥϹΙΝ ΟΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΑΥΤΩΝ, the parallel element ΥΙΟΙ is arthrous.

87 Conclusions drawn from studies such as Epp (1966:66-70), and Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger (2004:181-84), mainly based on the Greek traditions, are therefore on firm footing, at least with regard to their textual presuppositions. As forerunners to Epp in discovering a “theological tendency” in these differences, both Ropes (1926:ccxxxiii) and Haenchen (1954:162) are also correct in their judgement about the text. Whether their judgement about the implications, namely, that D05 shows here a greater universality in making the text apply not only to the ‘Jews’ but rather everyone is a different question, which falls out of the scope of this study (cf. Klijn 1966:107). Nevertheless, Cerfaux’s (1950:47) position, namely that D05 has preserved the original text in these readings, does not stand up to scrutiny.

88 In C04, the article has been added by a later hand. Two minuscule manuscripts, 522 and 1409, do not have an equivalent for the whole phrase (καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν). This is most certainly the result of haplography brought on by ὑμῶν καὶ ... ὑμῶν καὶ.

89 There is no need to suggest, as Pervo (1985:237) does, that “[i]t may be intentional that by dropping the article D appears to imply that only some of their daughters will prophecy, as opposed to all their sons.” See Holmes (2003:189) for more arguments against Pervo’s suggestion.
2.4.7. \textit{D05 has no equivalent for ἐνυπνίοις / ἐνύπνια / d05 SOMNIA}

Acts 2:17 D05 is almost singular in the Greek NT tradition in not having an equivalent for ἐνυπνίος or ἐνύπνια (as most manuscripts of the Greek NT manuscripts have it). Ἐνυπνίος is found in the witnesses usually considered to be of most importance for the Greek NT tradition, although ἐνύπνια is found in the majority of Greek NT manuscripts.\footnote{Only two other manuscripts have no equivalent for the ἐνυπνίοις / ἐνύπνια: 1642 and the lectionary manuscript \textit{I156}.} The reading is always present in some form in both the Latin NT tradition and the Latin OT tradition, while the Hebrew tradition is constant in employing נחמי. Likewise, the Greek OT manuscripts all read a form of this word.

The missing equivalent in D05 is, however, not intentional: The best explanation for D05 not having an equivalent for the term is by postulating ἐνύπνια as the reading in the \textit{Vorlage} of D05 (or the \textit{Vorlage} of another manuscript in the D05 tradition). As the following word, ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, contains precisely the letters of ἐνύπνια, one may reasonably assume omission by way of haplography.\footnote{The same is probably true of the other two manuscripts, 1642 and \textit{I156}, which also do not have an equivalent for ἐνυπνίος / ἐνύπνια at this point.} A copyist in the D05 tradition was confronted by the continuous text in the line

\begin{verbatim}
ΚΑΙΟΠΠΕϹΒΥΤΕΠΟΙΕΝΥΠΝΙΑΕΝΥΠΝΙΑϹΘΗϹΟΝΤΑΙ
\end{verbatim}

and a jump of the eye occurred from one \textit{ENYPNIA} to the other. The probability of an unintentional mistake is heightened by the d05 reading (\textit{SOMNIA SOMNIABUNT}), which does contain an equivalent for ἐνυπνίοις / ἐνύπνια.\footnote{Kilpatrick (1979:96) has previously suggested a similar jump (ENYPNIOσΝΥΠΝΙΑσθησονται), but fails to convince as he took ἐνυπνίοις as the elided word.}

Unfortunately, the reading ἐνύπνια does not provide an answer to the question whether the D05 tradition follows a specific OT tradition or not. Although LXXGöt\textsuperscript{t} prefers ἐνύπνια, this preference is not based on external evidence, but rather the belief that the NT text influenced the LXX at a very early stage. In fact, only two witnesses are listed for ἐνύπνια in the

\begin{verbatim}
© University of Pretoria
\end{verbatim}
Göttingen apparatus\textsuperscript{93} and ἐνυπνίοις should rather be the preferred reading for the Greek OT text.\textsuperscript{94} Moreover, the NT and OT readings could certainly have arisen independently based on stylistic grounds, as ἐνυπνίαζομαι usually takes an accusative object rather than the dative (cf. Holtz 1968:9-10).\textsuperscript{95}

2.4.8. D05 (KAI) ΕΓΩ / d05 (ET) EGO

Although a handful of manuscripts show errors in the transmission of what the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition reads καὶ γε, D05 is unique in reading ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ – and unique, too, in reading a variant to καὶ γε that makes sense in this context.\textsuperscript{96} The Latin NT tradition has no witness reading anything else than et quidem, except for d05. The Greek OT tradition has witnesses to support a καὶ γε reading, but there is no evidence for the D05 reading.\textsuperscript{97} The Hebrew tradition reads וּבּוּ, which is probably the reading behind the Greek NT tradition’s text, but does not explain the ΚΑΙ ΕΓΩ of D05.

The reading could be emphatic, that is to say, strengthening the idea that the Lord (as the D05 text would have it) is pouring out his Spirit and that it is the Lord who speaks (cf. Delebecque 1986:293).\textsuperscript{98} However, it is also likely that the reading arose from a transcriptional error in the Greek NT tradition. A抄写员 made the mistake of writing ΕΓ for

\textsuperscript{93} These witnesses are W and the Apostolic Constitutions. Probably, the preference for ἐνυπνία in the Göttingen text was partly due to the early attestations of this reading (W is a third century manuscript), while the NT manuscripts with ἐνυπνία, although not few in number, are mostly late. In fact, the reading of those manuscripts was deemed so unimportant for the history of the NT text that it does not even appear in the NA\textsuperscript{28} critical apparatus. It should be noted that, if the Vorlage of D05 contained ἐνυπνία, the Greek NT tradition has early attestations to this reading too. Ropes (1926:17) is therefore wrong in stating that among the changes wrought by the author of Acts he “has also permitted himself ἐνυπνίοις, vs. 17, for ἐνυπνία LXX ...”

\textsuperscript{94} This is also the opinion of Holtz (1968:9-10), who makes a case for an original reading of ἐνυπνίοις in the Greek OT text. He further proposes that ἐνυπνίοις is the original reading of Acts 2:17.

\textsuperscript{95} The simple solution offered here obviates the need for suggestions such as that by Klijn (1966:107) that “[i]t is ... possible that D avoids a clear Hebraism” or Haenchen (1954:162), who connects the lack of an equivalent for this word in D05 with the manuscript’s lack of an equivalent for καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, and believes these variations to be stylistic in nature.

\textsuperscript{96} Perhaps the Hebrew tradition (וס) influenced 1884 to read καὶ γαρ μεν. The few remaining variants are evidently erroneous: for γέ, 1243 reads γες, 1501 has εγ, and the supplementary leaves of the lectionary manuscript 156 reads еγе.

\textsuperscript{97} LXXGött has opted to only print a καὶ in its eclectic text. The evidence for this variant unit is divided between καὶ (witnesses normally considered of the best quality) and καὶ γε (a large number of witnesses; by including a reference to Acts 2:18, the LXXGött apparatus (perhaps unintentionally) hints at the possibility of these manuscripts being influenced by the NT text).

\textsuperscript{98} The actor in this quotation decidedly seems to be κύριος, rather than θεός, in the D05 text. Cf. the discussions of (ΛΕΓΕΙ) ΚϹ above and (ΟΝΟΜΑ) ΤΟΥ (ΚΥ) below.
ΓΕ,⁹⁹ of which a subsequent user of the manuscript tried to make sense by supplying an Ω. In turn, the resultant reading influenced the text of the d05 tradition, perhaps at the stage when the Greek and Latin traditions were conjoined.¹⁰₀

At any rate, the D05 reading does not seem to be directly motivated by OT awareness. If the reading is theologically motivated, this change is based on a general understanding of the OT as a whole rather than a specific reference to an OT tradition.

2.4.9. D05 has no equivalent for ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις / d05 has no equivalent for in diebus illis

A singular reading in the Greek NT tradition, the lack of an equivalent for ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις (as found in the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition) in D05 is most likely a purposeful omission, especially since the lack of this phrase is attested in the Latin NT only in manuscripts known to have an affinity with D05.¹⁰¹ An equivalent of the phrase is present in all witnesses to the OT traditions. In this case, as with the KC reading in D05 as discussed above, a likely explanation for the different reading in D05 could be due to the NT context: the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἔσχάταις ἡμέραις which occurs in Acts 2:17 (only in the NT)¹⁰² conceivably rendered the second, similar phrase in Acts 2:18 superfluous in the eyes of a scribe (cf. Bock 1987:159; Metzger 1994:257).¹⁰³ The reading certainly does not have roots in the OT traditions.¹⁰⁴

⁹⁹ Perhaps this mistake was brought on by an orthographic mistake or a misreading in the KAI before this word being heard as KE. Interchanges between α > ε and ι > αι are frequent in D05 (cf. Yoder 1958:27), and it could quite possibly have been so in the Vorlage’s text too. Two later manuscripts have εγ (1501) and εε (l156), respectively.
¹⁰⁰ The Latin text, reading et quidem, could not be the origin of this reading if the transcriptional solution is favoured.
¹⁰¹ Namely, R⁺(+R⁺) V gig De Rebaptismate 15 (text available in Hartel 1871:88) - and of course d05 itself.
¹⁰² See also the discussion of this reading in D05 above (on account of its difference with B03 and 076), especially the discussion of the arguments of Haenchen and Pervo, as well as footnotes 45 and 46 in the present study.
¹⁰³ Metzger (1994:257) further notes that the D05 reading (i.e., with no equivalent for the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἔσχάταις ἡμέραις) could be due “to an accident in transmission”, but offers no example of how this “accident” would have taken place.
¹⁰⁴ Chase (1893:19) posits influence from an old Syriac text as an explanation for the lack of an equivalent of both ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις and the lack of an equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν in D05. In the Peshitta, these two phrases occur directly next to each other (ܘܡܬܐܒܝܗܢܘܢܘܢܛܒܘܢ) and “the double omission in Greek becomes a single omission in Syriac.” Even though Chase’s suggestion narrows the explanation for a possible omission in the D05 tradition down to one omission, a further step – namely influence by the Syriac tradition – must be introduced and the explanation remains complex. Although Chase’s suggestion is attractive, there are
2.4.10. **D05 has no equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν / d05 has no equivalent for et prophetabunt**

An interesting case in the text of D05 is presented in Acts 2:18 by the lack of an equivalent for the phrase καὶ προφητεύσουσιν.\(^{105}\) This lack is a singular reading in the Greek NT tradition. In the Latin NT tradition, the lack of an equivalent for the phrase in d05 is not singular, but the only other witnesses which do not have an equivalent for *et prophetabunt* is the usual Latin allies of both D05 and d05.\(^{106}\) The Greek OT tradition has only a few manuscripts\(^{107}\) that do read καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. The nature of these Greek OT witnesses is such that one could easily argue for influence by the exceedingly strong NT tradition – they are mostly late and only represented in two of the smaller textual groupings. No equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν is known in either the Latin OT tradition or the Hebrew tradition.

The phrase most likely formed part of the “initial” text of Acts, as can be seen from the overwhelming evidence of the manuscript tradition (as also noted by Schneider 1980:262).\(^{108}\) Perhaps the phrase served to emphasise or to summarise the preceding section (Acts 2:17-18a). Could the “omission” be due to a simple copyist’s error, as Zehnle (1971:33, no Syriac witnesses to this effect and the suggestion remains a conjecture. Furthermore, Chase does not explain why this omission might have occurred in the Syriac.

\(^{105}\) Rodgers (1987:95-97) suggests that the D05 reading is original, and not an adaptation to an OT tradition. However, the argument that ἐνύπνια (instead of ἐνυπνίοις – see above) dropped out of Acts 2:17 on account of haplography considerably weakens Rodgers’ case, as he uses this reading to place Priscillian closer to the text of B03 than D05. (Rodgers also does not take into account the reading of d05, where SOMNIA SOMNIAUBUNT reads the same as B03.) Holtz (1968:10) regards the reading as “nachträgliche Angleichung an die LXX”, as does Kilpatrick (1963:66); a position with which Fitzmyer (1998:253) is inclined to agree.

\(^{106}\) In this case, d05 p\(^2\) (\(+p^2\) Priscillian of Avila *Liber Apologeticus* 1.39 (text available in Schepss 1889:32).\(^{107}\) Namely, 36-(46-86-711)-(49-613) 87mg-68-130-311. The LXXGött apparatus also notes Codex Constantiensis (a Latin manuscript), parts of the Coptic tradition (a part of the Sahidic and the Bohairic), the SyroPalestinian tradition and the Armenian tradition.

\(^{108}\) Cerfaux’s (1950:47) position that B03 (and per implication the ‘Alexandrian’ text type) added the words after the formation of the initial text “pour l’emphase” must be rejected. The combination of the evidence of the Greek NT tradition with the Greek OT tradition makes Cerfaux’s stance untenable. Certainly the function of this “addition” to the normal reading of the Greek OT tradition could be emphasis – or, as Clarke (1922:94; cf. Ropes 1926:17) has suggested, to make “the prophecy more appropriate to the events” in the context in which Peter’s speech is set – but there is no convincing reason to suspect anyone besides the author of Acts to be responsible for the “addition”. Cerfaux further connects the lack of an equivalent of καὶ προφητεύσουσιν in D05 with the lack of an equivalent for άίμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἄτμίδα καπνοῦ in the manuscript. Both these instances occur only in D05 in the Greek NT tradition. However, as will be seen in the discussion of the lack of an equivalent for άίμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἄτμίδα καπνοῦ below, there are good reasons why this phrase could have been omitted, while the same cannot be said for the lack of an equivalent of καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. The two readings should probably be kept apart when evaluating their textual worth, as is noted also by Cadbury and Lake (1933:22, footnote 19).
footnote 27) suggests? The only feasible transcriptional error is an accidental omission of the whole line on which ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥϹΟΥϹΙΝ stood in a manuscript within the D05 tradition – and most likely a bilingual manuscript that was already written in sense-lines.110 If the text of this Vorlage was arranged in a way similar to D05, the repetitive occurrences of ΚΑΙ at the start of lines could have resulted in a scribe’s eye skipping from ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥϹΟΥϹΙΝ to ΚΑΙ ΔΩϹΩ on the next line. Of course, this would have been even more likely if the following text had ΚΑΙ followed by Π (or, on the Latin side, ET followed by P instead of the ET DABO of the present state of the text in d05).

As the text comprises a whole phrase and not merely a single word, the possibility of the text of the D05 tradition being changed intentionally is heightened. For an intentional change, two possibilities present themselves. The change could either be on the grounds of theological motivation, or based on OT awareness. However, theological grounds can be ruled out, as the phrases ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΕΥϹΟΥϹΙΝ and ET PROPHETABUNT were not omitted from the text of D05 and d05 in Acts 2:17, a verse in the same quotation. Likewise, these verbs are present without reservation in D05 and d05 at Acts 19:6 in the context of an outpouring of the Spirit. Not much is changed to the theology of the text (this also applies to the text form as found in D05) when these words are added or omitted. This leads to the only viable conclusion if an intentional change is assumed: The D05 tradition conformed its text to the Greek OT tradition (cf. Kilpatrick 1963:66; Wilckens 1974:32; Bock 1987:159; Bruce 1988:60, footnote 59).111

To decide between an unintentional error and a deliberate change in the case of the lack of an equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν in D05 is no easy matter. In both cases, a manuscript closer to D05 in the D05 tradition, perhaps the Vorlage of D05 itself, would better fit with the external evidence of the witnesses to the Greek NT tradition as presented above: A manuscript closer to D05 in the latter’s transmission history would namely explain why only D05 has omitted this phrase. As can be seen from the discussion of variation in D05 against

109 Zehnle (1971:33, footnote 27) notes that “[i]n this case, the omission is probably due to a copyist’s error, and the reading of the vast majority of witnesses is to be preferred.” Zehnle neglects, however, to state what this copyist’s error is.

110 For an example of a similar error in transcription made by the scribe of D05, see the discussion of Acts 2:31 under the discussion of the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28 in the chapter on the quotations of the Psalms in this study.

111 This could, of course, have occurred in the Latin tradition too, but the same argument would apply as which follows in the discussion below.
other manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition thus far, it does not seem that there was an intentional adaptation of D05 towards the Greek OT text in its final stage(s) of transmission (i.e., at the point when it was written down on D05 or immediately before) (cf. Ropes 1926:17). Consequently, it is slightly more likely that the omission of the phrase was caused in error by skipping a line in the copying process. The strong similarity between D05 and the OT traditions, however, should not be left too far out of sight.\footnote{See the discussion of the assessment made by Ropes (1926:17) on this specific reading in D05 in the reflection on the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 in the discussion below.}

2.4.11. D05 has no equivalent for \(\alpha\imath\mu\alpha\) καὶ π\(\ddot{u}\)ρ καὶ \(\acute{a}\)τμίδα καπνοῦ / d05 has no equivalent for sanguinem et ignem et vaporem fumi

D05 is the only manuscript in the Greek NT tradition without an equivalent for \(\alpha\imath\mu\alpha\) καὶ π\(\ddot{u}\)ρ καὶ \(\acute{a}\)τμίδα καπνοῦ. An equivalent of the phrase is likewise lacking in d05 and its usual Latin allies.\footnote{These witnesses are Codex Gigas, \(\rho^*\) (+ \(\rho^\prime\)) and Priscillian of Avila Liber Apologeticus 1.39 (text available in Schepss 1889:32).} Witnesses to the Greek OT tradition and manuscripts of the Hebrew tradition always contain the whole phrase, while the Latin OT tradition has no witnesses which omit the phrase completely.\footnote{All manuscripts contain at least a part of this phrase. In \(\Delta^\prime\)Έ et ignem is omitted, while in U and some manuscripts of Jerome Commentarii in Danielem 2.6 (text available in Glorie 1964:832), vaporem is replaced with a genitive (vaporis). These differences have no bearing on the question at hand.} In this case, then, D05 and d05 are at odds with the OT traditions.

The same suggestion of a transcriptional basis as in the case of the lack of an equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν in D05 could perhaps be offered: The phrase \(\alpha\imath\mu\alpha\) καὶ π\(\ddot{u}\)ρ καὶ \(\acute{a}\)τμίδα καπνοῦ would most likely have occupied a line on its own had it been in a bilingual manuscript written in sense-lines in the D05 tradition, and could have been passed over and omitted unintentionally. Different from the case of καὶ προφητεύσουσιν, however, \(\alpha\imath\mu\alpha\) καὶ π\(\ddot{u}\)ρ καὶ \(\acute{a}\)τμίδα καπνοῦ could not have been omitted because of homoioarchton. The phrase would not have had a letter at the start of the line through which a scribe could have become confused (as καὶ προφητεύσουσιν could have had \(\text{KAI} \ \Delta\text{ΩCΩ} – \text{see above}\)). An error based on homoioarchton is more likely in the d05 tradition, where the two successive lines of an assumed Vorlage could have started with SANGUINEM and SOL. This explanation is still not too likely, as it is based on only one letter (S).\footnote{Perhaps the letters in the secondary position, \(A\) and \(O\), could have been visually similar in a manuscript in the d05 tradition, although this is unlikely.}
Another solution based on an error in the copying process has been offered by Bock (1987:159; also noted by Elliott 2003:26). The ΚΑΤ of the word ΚΑΤΩ and the ΚΑΠ of the word ΚΑΠΝΟΥ could have caused confusion in a manuscript in the D05 tradition. This solution seems possible in Greek. If the manuscript was divided into sense-lines and the letters were similar to that of D05, ΚΑΠΝΟΥ would have been positioned below ΚΑΤΩ, somewhat to the right. The scribe would have attempted to determine the end of the last line that he copied, misread ΚΑΠΝΟΥ for ΚΑΤΩ, and then have started copying from the next line. The difference in ending in these two words (Ω and ΝΟΥ) and the slight difference in line length in the supposed Vorlage, however, count against this suggestion.

Alternatively, the lack of an equivalent for the phrase αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἁτμίδα καπνοῦ could have been intentional. In the context of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17, a perceived incongruence of this line of text with its surroundings may have been responsible for the omission of the line. As the αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἁτμίδα καπνοῦ do not agree with what has happened on the day of Pentecost, which Peter is explaining, the phrase could have been seen as superfluous (Delebecque 1986:293; cf. Bock 1987:159; Sloan 1990:157, footnote 17). A less likely but similar solution is offered by Cerfaux (1950:47). According to him, the τέρατα and σημεῖα of Acts 2:19 refer to the wonders and signs that were performed by Jesus (cf. Acts 2:22). The phrase αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἁτμίδα καπνοῦ, which stands in epexegetical apposition to the τέρατα and σημεῖα, could not serve as explanation for the deeds of Jesus, and the phrase was therefore elided. Cerfaux (1950:47) asserts that this “omission” was done by the author of Acts, but the manuscript evidence counts too heavily against his suggestion.

116 Bock (1987:159) views this suggestion as less likely than an intentional change, as will be discussed below.
117 Kilpatrick (1979:82) suggests that σημεῖα (which does not occur in the Greek OT tradition) may have been intended to replace αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἁτμίδα καπνοῦ by the author of Acts. However, Kilpatrick offers no evidence to substantiate this claim.
118 See the essay by Sloan (1990: passim) on signs and wonders for the possible referents of these terms in the text of Acts. Kilpatrick (1979:97), too, proposes that the line αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἁτμίδα καπνοῦ could have been intentionally left out by the author of Acts, and the words ὄνο ... σημεῖα ... κάτω in Acts 2:19a be inserted in the text as compensation. These words are most likely expansions added to the text of the Greek NT tradition, as both the Greek OT tradition and the Greek NT tradition are relatively firm with regard to the text of Acts 2:19a and its Greek OT counterpart, Joel 3:3 (LXX).
119 Barrett (1994:137-138) and (Elliot 2003:26) both consider the D05 reading as a probability, but states their case with much more caution than Cervaux.
120 Rius-Camps (1999:257) further notes that the lack of the phrase αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἁτμίδα καπνοῦ removes the “connotación vindicativa” of the Greek OT tradition.
The explanations for the lack of an equivalent of αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ in D05 mentioned in the previous paragraph could be labelled contextual. Although these seem to provide theological grounds for the lack of the phrase in D05, there is one objection offered by Barrett (1994:138) that must be considered. Barrett points out that the “omission” of the phrase does not necessarily solve all the contextual problems noted above. Even if the phrase is not present, the phrase Ο ΗΛΙΟϹ ΜΕΤΑΣΤΡΕΦΕΤΑΙ ΕΙϹΚΟΤΟϹ / ΚΑΙ Η ΨΕΛΗΝΗ ΕΙϹ ΑΙΜΑ (as it reads in D05) remains: the sun and moon are “heavenly portents” which do not fit well with the quotation as an explanation for Pentecost or the ministry of Jesus on earth. One way around Barrett’s objection is to posit a scribe with a two-tiered understanding of the eschaton. In this understanding, the sun and the moon as signs were still to be realised (ΠΡΙΝ ΕΛΘΕΙΝ) at the time Peter makes his speech, while the τέρατα … καὶ σημεῖα (including the αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ) was seen to be already fulfilled. Such an explanation is perhaps too intricate, as it involves very finely nuanced assumptions on the part of a scribe (or perhaps reviser, in the case of D05). However, irrespective whether the text contains the phrase αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ, it is clear that a new sentence starts at ὁ ήλιος μεταστραφήσεται. The sun and moon, therefore, do not have such a direct link to the τέρατα and σημεῖα grammatically than the αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ, and may have seemed less disruptive or erroneous to a scribe wishing to smooth references with their context.

The reason for the lack of an equivalent for the phrase αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ in d05 could thus be either unintentional or intentional, with a slight preference towards the latter. Whatever the case may be, the D05 reading certainly does not stem from any OT awareness.

2.4.12. D05 has no equivalent for καὶ ἐπιφανῆ / D05 has no equivalent for et manifestus

There are only three manuscripts in the Greek NT tradition which do not have an equivalent for καὶ ἐπιφανῆ: 801, D05 and the fifteenth century miniscule 886. The evidence of 801, in

---

121 Most likely, εἰς σκότος is intended for ΕΙϹΚΟΤΟϹ as found here in D05. See the discussion in the footnote under the section “The physical text of D05” above.
122 Cf. Zahn (1922:109), who notes that the phrase in Acts 2:20 is “wesentlich dasselbe” as the line without equivalent in D05 in Acts 2:19.
123 This manuscript contains commentary text between the text of Acts.
this case, should be approached cautiously. The scribe of א01 did not write down an equivalent for ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ at the end of Acts 2:20, but also left out the whole of Acts 2:21. The scribe left an open space after ΜΕΓΑΛΗΝ, and continued on the next line, indicating Acts 2:22 as a new paragraph by way of ekthesis. It was only afterwards (either immediately after or in checking his own work somewhat later) that the scribe himself (cf. Tischendorf 1872:14) realised his mistake and supplied the text of Acts 2:21 in the open space of about 7-8 letters after ΜΕΓΑΛΗΝ, in a much smaller script. It is entirely possible that the scribe overlooked ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ in his correction. That is not to say that the scribe definitely had ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ in his Vorlage, but the evidence by א01 in not having an equivalent is considerably weakened.124

Similar to D05, d05 stands almost alone in the Latin NT tradition.125 The exact phrase (καὶ ἐπιφανῆ) is always present in the Greek OT tradition, and the Latin OT tradition consistently contains an equivalent, although the phrase rather reads et horribilis (or variations thereof).126 The Latin NT tradition’s et horribilis stems from the Hebrew tradition’s זרアナא, which is firmly attested in the manuscript tradition.

The Greek OT reading probably arose through a misreading of נרא for נרא (Conzelmann 1972:34; Gelston 2010:34).127 There is thus a discrepancy between the Greek OT tradition and the greatest part of the Latin NT traditions on the one hand, and the Latin OT tradition and the Hebrew tradition on the other. This discrepancy could have influenced a user of D05 (and א01) or d05: Confronted with two readings which appeared irreconcilable, a scribe could have opted to elide the phrase entirely. However, this seems less likely than a conflated reading or a change in the text to what was felt to be the more authoritative version.

124 This is a good example of the benefits of keeping the metadata of manuscripts in mind instead of merely readings in a textual apparatus. NA28, for instance, does not include this information in its textual apparatus. In fact, Acts 2:21 has no notes in the NA28’s text-critical apparatus. This is, of course, correct, as the scribe corrected the text himself and the text of Acts 2:21 was in his Vorlage. However, the reader is not alerted to the possible connection between this scribal blunder and the “omission” of καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.

125 Apart from d05, only Codex Gigas and Priscillian of Avila Liber Apologeticus 1.39 (text available in Schepss 1889:32) do not contain an equivalent for this et manifestus.

126 ΔMS reads et terribilis. Only the Latin manuscript Q reads et honorabilis, which could perhaps be due to καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, but is more likely a corruption of et horribilis. Some manuscripts of the Latin NT tradition also read forms of horribilis (C, but in the margin; T reads orribilis). These Latin NT manuscripts were probably influenced by the Latin OT tradition.

127 This misreading also occurs at Joel 2:11; cf. Eynikel, Hauspie & Lust (2003:s.v.). As this occurrence is still in the same book, the preference for ἐπιφανῆς as a translation equivalent for א01 was not widespread.
Therefore, OT awareness with regard to this variant is possible, but probably did not provide an impetus for the omission of this phrase.

Visual errors could also have played a part in creating a lack of the phrase καὶ ἐπιφανῆ in D05. Metzger (1975:298; Metzger 1994:258, followed by Schneider 1980:262; Bock 1987:159) suggests that the ΑΝΗ of ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ could have been confused with the ΑΛΗΝ of ΜΕΓΑΛΗΝ. The scribe then continued from ΚΑΙ ΕϹΤΑΙ, as this was the text which followed. If the Vorlage in which this mistake occurred was already written in sense-lines, this solution seems all the more possible. Most likely the phrase ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ would have been placed on the same line as ΜΕΓΑΛΗΝ, as it still forms part of the clause contained on this line (ΙΙΠΙΝ ΕΑΘΕΙΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ ΚΥ ΤΗΝ ΜΕΓΑΛΗΝ) rather than the following line’s clause (ΚΑΙ ΕϹΤΑΙ ΠΑϹ ΟϹ ΑΛΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΚΑΛΕϹΗΤΑΙ ΤΟ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΤΟΥ ΚΥ’). The scribe would then have glanced at the end of the line (at ΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ) and returned to the left margin, with no further reflection on his error. A second suggestion by Metzger (1975:298; Metzger 1994:258; followed by Bock 1987:159) is that homoioarchton caused a scribe’s eye to jump from the ΚΑΙΕ in ΚΑΙΕΠΙΦΑΝΗ to the ΚΑΙΕ in ΚΑΙΕϹΤΑΙ.128 This solution, seemingly preferred by Elliott (2003:26), who does not note the first option, is more likely to have happened in a manuscript where the text was not yet arranged in sense-lines. This would place the mistake a few copies back in the D05 tradition, perhaps very early.

2.4.13. D05 (ONOMA) TOY (KY) / d05 has no equivalent for the article

D05 is almost entirely alone in reading an article before KY in Acts 2:21; the only other manuscript with this reading is the fifteenth century manuscript 886.129 Of course, the article is difficult to represent in Latin, and it is not surprising that d05 and the rest of the Latin NT tradition have no equivalent for the article here. The case is similar with the Latin OT tradition, where no attempt was made to represent an article. Furthermore, the Greek OT

---

128 Both the solutions offered here do not work as well in the Latin text. In the Latin NT tradition, almost all witnesses read magnus as equivalent for the Greek NT tradition’s μεγάλην. As an equivalent for ἐπιφανῆ, most manuscripts read manifestus, although some read praeclarus or horribilis (under influence from the Latin OT tradition). None of these readings show a strong visual similarity in the end of the word, except for the letters us. For the Greek καὶ ἔσται, the Latin NT tradition reads et erit. Although et in et manifestus (and other variants for this word) agree with the start of et erit, the chances are slim of this creating a jump of the eye, as the similarity only concerns two letters.

129 886 contains commentary text between the text of Acts. Although it agrees with D05 in the last two readings discussed above, it disagrees with D05 in the rest of its text, where it follows a text closer to the Majority text.
tradition has no equivalent for the article, and the Hebrew tradition invariably has the Tetragrammaton.

2.5. Conclusion

In the discussion above, a number of interesting facts have emerged. Although many of the variant readings of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 D05 most likely have a contextual explanation for their origin, this “context” does not extend to other instances in the text where an allusion to Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) can be found in the text of D05 as it was at the time of its production. The only possible exception is the allusion to Joel 3:5b (LXX) in Acts 2:39, which could have prompted the scribe to change θεός to Κ̅Ϲ̅, but this connection could have been made based on the text of Acts itself as it is found in D05, and it is not necessary to posit a recourse to an OT tradition. That is to say, most of the changes are contextual, but confined to the immediate context within Acts.

OT awareness in D05 can perhaps be shown in the introductory formula of this quotation’s lack of an equivalent for Ἰωήλ. If this is the case, however, it is not possible to show whether the name of the prophet was elided or added due to this OT awareness. External evidence favours that it was deleted, but the argument is not entirely convincing either way. Nevertheless, in the final stages of the D05 tradition, there seems to have been a lesser amount of OT awareness in Acts 2:16-21 than in other manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition. This possibility of a lessened OT awareness in the final stages of the D05 tradition comports especially well with the cases identified above where the D05 reading is most likely secondary, but moves further away from the OT traditions (e.g., the fact that D05 has no equivalent for ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις). A lesser degree of OT awareness of this quotation also fits well with the fact that the quotation has not been indented in D05 (although the quotation does form its own passage in D05).

Nonetheless, even though the general thrust of the changes in D05 seems to be to move away from the OT traditions in this quotation, there are isolated instances where the possibility exists that the D05 and d05 texts were changed to bring it into conformity with the OT.

130 A similar stance was taken by Ropes (1926:16), who notes with regard to this quotation that “[i]n some cases manifestly, and probably in all, the departures in D from the LXX-text spring from one motive, namely to adapt the quotation to the situation to which Peter here applies it.”
tradition (e.g., the fact that D05 has no equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν / et prophetabunt or the EFFUNDAM SPĪM (SPIRITUM – Acts 2:18) MEUM of d05).

A number of possible origins have been proposed above for the divergent readings of D05. In most cases, there are more than one possibility. Only in two instances, the case of a lack of an equivalent for ἐνυπνίοις / ἐνύπνια and the lack of an article before ΘΥΓΑΤΕΡΕϹ can it be determined with certainty how the reading was introduced in the D05 tradition. In both cases, haplography provide the most convincing explanation. In the case of the lack of an equivalent for ἐνυπνίοις / ἐνύπνια, one can reasonably assume the reading ἐνύπνια somewhere along the line of the D05 tradition, quite possibly still within the tradition when the Greek and Latin texts were brought together (as d05 still reads SOMNIA as equivalent).

In conclusion, it is worth making a general note on scholarship’s previous interpretation of the available data with regard to Acts 2:17-21 in D05. The marked differences between D05 and the Greek OT traditions, as set out above, have led some scholars to distrust the text and the intention of the D05 tradition entirely. In other words, this leads them to forget that the D05 tradition itself has a transmission history, and that changes to the D05 tradition’s text were not made in one fell swoop. An example of such a stance, with regard to the lack of an equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν in Acts 2:18 in D05, can be found in Ropes (1926:17):

[Π]In the case of καὶ προφητεύσουσιν, vs. 18, the wiser judgment is perhaps to assume an addition to the author’s quotation before the formation of the text of B, i.e. a ‘Western non-interpolation,’ and to reject the words. If they were originally present, the only reason for omitting them in D would have been the desire to conform to the LXX, but, as has been shown, this motive is the opposite of that which, under any hypothesis, governed the formation of the D-text.

Although it has been noted above that the lack of καὶ προφητεύσουσιν in D05 is more likely to be on transcriptional grounds than based on harmonisation to the LXX, the evidence on which this decision is based has been slight. If the “B” text has a prehistory, then the D05 text must have one too. It is entirely possible that, before the changes to the D05 tradition’s text that do not agree with the Greek OT tradition were made, a scribe was aware of the quotation’s OT provenance and “corrected” the reading by striking out καὶ προφητεύσουσιν to bring the text in alignment with the Greek OT tradition. This may not be the most probable
option, but the strong Greek OT tradition of not reading καὶ προφητεύσουσιν at least makes this possible.


3.1. The physical text of D05

| ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ | SICUT SCRIPTUM EST IN LIBRO PROPHETARUM |
| ΜΗ ΣΦΑΓΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΘΥϹΙΑϹ | NUM QUID HOSTIAS ET SACRIFICIA |
| ΠΡΟΧΝΕΓΚΑΤΕ ΜΟΙ ΕΤΗ Μ̅̅ | OBTULISTI MIHI ANNIS X̅̅̅̅ |
| ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΡΗΜΩ ΟΙΚΟϹ ΙϹΡΑΗΛ | IN SOLITUDINE DOMUS ISTRAHEL |
| ΚΑΙ ΑΝΕΛΑΒΕΤΕ ΤΗΝ ΣΚΗΝΗΝ ΤΟΥ ΜΟΛΟΧ | ET ADSUMPSISTIS TABERNACULUM IPSIUS MOLOCH |
| ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΑΣΤΡΟΝ ΤΟΥ Θ̅Υ̅ ΡΕΜΦΑΜ | ET ASTRUM DI REMPHAM |
| ΤΟΥϹ ΤΥΠΟΤΟΥϹ ΕΠΙΟΙΗϹΑΤΕ ΠΡΟϹΚΥΝΕΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΙϹ | FIGURAS QUAS FECISTIS ADORARE EIS |
| ΚΑΙ ΜΕΤΟΙΚΙΩ ΎΜΑϹ ΕΠΙ [ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ] BABYLONIS | ET TRANSMIGRAUO UOS IN ILLAS PARTES BABYLONIS |

3.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of this quotation can be found on Folio 442b in D05, and this text has not been indented. The quotation has not been indicated as a separate paragraph: the last paragraph marker before the quotation is on the previous Greek folio, at Acts 7:40 (ΕΙΠΑΝΤΕϹ ΤΩ ΑΑΡΩΝ ΠΟΙΗϹΟΝ ΗΜΕΙϹ ΘΕΟΥϹ). The next paragraph marker (if the indented text of the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 is not counted as indication of a new paragraph) is only on the following Greek folio, at Acts 7:54 (AKOYCANTEC ΔΕ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΔΙΕΠΡΙΟΝΤΟ).

3.1.2. Corrections in D05

There is only one correction to the text of this quotation in D05. Unfortunately, the original text is not legible, as all of the letters between ΕΠΙ and BABYLONIS have been erased. By changing the I of ΕΠΙ into an E and drawing KEINA over the erased letters, a corrector has changed the reading to ЕΠΙЕΙΚΕΙΝΑ BABYLONIS. Although not visible today, Scrivener

---

132 The spelling of ISTRAHEL for Israel is normal for d05 (Stone 1946:22).
133 Scrivener (1864:442) assigns this correction to corrector D.
(1864:354) purports to have seen an original PH directly before BABYΛΩΝΟϹ, and prints this in his text, remarking in his editor’s notes that the original reading seems to have been ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ BABYΛΩΝΟϹ. Parker (1992:152) marks the whole phrase pertaining to the correction (ΕΠΙ ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ) as videtur. The collations made for the ECM marks the uncertainty of the original reading as ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ. As ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ best fits the space that the original text must have taken up, and concurs with the reading in d05 (IN ILLAS PARTES), this reading can be regarded as the most likely original reading in D05.

### 3.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation is on Folio 443a. The paragraph markers for d05 are the same as for the Greek with regard to this text (i.e., the paragraph in which the quotation can be found starts on the previous Latin folio at DICENTES AD AARON FAC NOBIS DEΟ and the following paragraph starts on the next Latin folio at AUDIENTES AUTEM EUM DISCRUCIABANTUR). The quotation is on its own lines in both D05 and d05.

### 3.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are no corrections to this text in d05.134

### 3.2. Other quotations or allusions to Amos 5:25-27 in the text of D05

There are no quotations or allusions to Amos 5:25-27 listed in NA28’s list of loci citati vel allegati apart from Acts 7:42-43.

### 3.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula to the quotation of Amos 5:25-27 found in Acts 7:42 in D05 (ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ) shows only one noteworthy variant against the rest of the Greek NT tradition: D05 is the only manuscript of the Greek NT tradition which does not have an equivalent for τῶν before ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ. The reading could

---

134 Above the C of TABERNACULUM, the scribe has drawn a dot, for which there is no apparent reason (cf. Scrivener 1864:442).
have originated through haplography, as the scribe’s eye might have skipped from ΤΩΝ in ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ to the following ΤΩΝ. There is a slight possibility that the reading could have originated through a lack of OT awareness (in reading “a book of prophets”), but the presence of ΒΙΒΛΩ makes this proposition highly unlikely.\footnote{Finally, the lack of an article could be due to influence from d05 (SICUT SCRIPTUM EST IN LIBRO PROPHETARUM), naturally without the article. However, the probability favours the simple copying error described above.} 135 Finally, the lack of an article could be due to influence from d05 (SICUT SCRIPTUM EST IN LIBRO PROPHETARUM), naturally without the article. However, the probability favours the simple copying error described above.


3.4.1. D05 has no equivalent for (θεοῦ) ὑμῶν / d05 has no equivalent for (dei) uestri

The text of D05 in Acts 7:42 agrees with most manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition.\footnote{The only noteworthy variant in the Greek tradition is the phrase (in the NT): ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, the order of which varies considerably. Closest in the Greek OT tradition to the order of D05 (and NA\textsuperscript{28}) is a Lucianic group (22-36-48-51-231-719-46-86-711, and related manuscript 613), although these manuscripts still do not read exactly the same (τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη) (cf. Steyn 2004:66, who considers the reading of A02 in Amos 5:25 to also be close to the reading of NA\textsuperscript{27} (the text of which reads the same as NA\textsuperscript{28})). Even though this passage may point out affinities between larger groups of NT and OT manuscripts, the case of D05 and the manuscripts it is in agreement with seems to be contained within the Greek NT tradition. The Latin traditions are, for the most part, unaware of this problem. The Latin OT mainly follows the Hebrew tradition, both having a different order than D05 (and the Latin NT tradition).} In Acts 7:43, however, there is a variant worthy of note: D05, B03 and a few miniscule manuscripts\footnote{These manuscripts are 94, 453, 610 and 886.} do not have an equivalent for ὑμῶν after θεοῦ. In the Latin NT tradition, a few manuscripts follow d05 in not having an equivalent for uestri.\footnote{These witnesses are Codex Gigas and Philaster 18.1 (text available in Bischoff et al.1957:223).} The situation is different for the Greek OT tradition, where no witness is without ὑμῶν.\footnote{The only text-critical note in the LXXGöt apparatus is a transposition by Codex V – this brings the text in line with the Latin OT tradition and the Hebrew tradition.} The Latin OT tradition and the
Hebrew tradition read somewhat differently, but for what can be seen as equivalents for the Greek texts in this case, an equivalent for ὑμῶν is always present.

There are no visual elements which could be regarded as cues for an unintentional omission of ὑμῶν in either the Greek or Latin traditions. An unintentional blunder would require too great a lapse in concentration. Rather, an explanation for the D05 reading ought to be sought in an intentional motive. Moreover, there is a possibility that B03 and D05 – in agreement – could have preserved the “initial” reading in this text. Ropes (1926:70) states the problem as follows:

The omission of ὑμῶν after θεοῦ in BD gig IrenPhilast might have been due to a reluctance to admit that the heathen divinity was in any sense the Hebrews’ (‘your’) god; but the original writer may have been led by the same motive to omit the word.

Ropes (1926:70; so too Haenchen 1954:161, reiterated 1977:275; Holtz 1968:14-19; Pervo 2009:172) concludes that, in this case, the best option would be to follow B03 and D05 against the rest of the Greek NT tradition. The inclusion of the term ὑμῶν in the latter would be an attempt to conform the text of the Greek NT tradition to the Greek OT tradition. Here, however, caution should be advised. There are more glaring differences between the Greek NT tradition and the Greek OT tradition which stand uncorrected than a single word. The relevant texts read, in the LXXGött and NA (differences in D05 are noted in brackets):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amos 5:25-27a (LXXGött)</th>
<th>Acts 7:42b-43 (NA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατε μοι τεσσαράκοντα ἐτη, οἶκος Ισραήλ;</td>
<td>μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατε μοι ἐτη τεσσεράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οἶκος Ισραήλ;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολοχ καὶ τὸ ἁστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν Ραιφαν,</td>
<td>καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μόλοχ καὶ τὸ ἁστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν (D05) Ῥαιφάν (PEMΦΑΜ – D05),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin OT tradition reads et portastis tabernacula Moloch vestro et imaginem idolorum vestrorum sidus dei vestri quae fecistis vobis (in the Benedictine edition, with no noteworthy text-critical variants save the addition of the name – Rempha – by a number of manuscripts) and the Hebrew tradition, on which the Latin OT tradition is dependent, reads.
Sporadic attempts at conformation between the two texts were made – so, for instance, in B03 itself, which does not have an equivalent for the ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ found in the rest of the Greek NT tradition (also noted by Cerfaux 1950:47). The οὐτόν of the LXXGött text does not have strong attestation, and thus it is understandable that only one manuscript of the Greek NT tradition has added this word. Glaringly, however, the Greek NT tradition’s προσκυνεῖν and Βαβυλῶνος were left intact, with no manuscripts attempting to harmonise these two words with the OT tradition. There are no manuscripts that read exactly as any extant Greek OT manuscript. This demonstrates that attempts to conform the Greek NT text to the Greek OT tradition resulted in only small groups of witnesses in the Greek NT tradition that partially read in agreement with the Greek OT tradition. A widespread change to one word does not occur. This evidence does not completely negate the possibility of ὑμῶν being added to conform the text to the Greek OT tradition, but it does show that this “addition” must have occurred at a very early stage, if indeed it did. In the present author’s opinion, however, the odds are in favour of the lack of an equivalent for ὑμῶν in B03 and D05 being secondary – although this is stated cautiously.

142 The textual tradition is unstable at this point, with a number of different variant readings, mostly concerning word order. The lack of an equivalent for ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ in B03 (and two other manuscripts, namely 365 1251) is conspicuous in its agreement with a part of the Greek OT tradition. It should be noted that ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ is present in a large number of Greek OT manuscripts (for which see the LXXGött apparatus). Interesting to note is that the Greek OT reading of B03 itself does contain ΕΝ ΤΗ ΕΡΗΜΩ. A later hand added ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ to the B03 text, but this was subsequently deleted.

143 In fact, external evidence counts against this reading. See the LXXGött apparatus for the numerous readings against the inclusion of οὐτόν in the Greek OT text. Only one witnesses is explicitly recorded for οὐτόν, namely W.

144 This manuscript is 1409. 1409 does not show any other explicit changes towards the Greek OT tradition in Acts 7:42-43.

145 With regard to the opinion of Ropes (1926:70) that “on the whole it is better to explain the presence of the word [ὑμῶν] … as a case of conformation to the text of the LXX, and to follow BD”, one should also note that he himself states in the case of the reading ΕΠΙ ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ in this very same passage in D05 (see the discussion below) that “a corrector, conforming to the LXX, would not have left βαβυλωνος untouched.” Would not the same principle have applied to ὑμῶν a few words back?

146 It should be noted that a number of manuscripts, without conforming the complete phrase to fit with the Greek OT tradition, add λέγει κύριος ό θεὸς ό παντοκράτωρ ονόμα αὐτοί (876 1611 1832 1890 2138), λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ (431 614 1292 2412) or λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ ονόμα αὐτοί (1831v). All of these variants ostensibly go back to Αμών 5:27b in the Greek OT tradition (λέγει κύριος, ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ ονόμα αὐτοί, as it reads in LXXGött).

147 Similarly, ομόν is presented in the NA²⁸ text with square brackets, indicating the editors’ cautious stance toward the word. However, Metzger (1975:351; 1994:308) did not deem it necessary to discuss the reading in
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Regardless of whether the lack of an equivalent for ὑμῶν in D05 corresponds to the “initial” text or not, the D05 reading shows little evidence of OT awareness. Nevertheless, if the assessment of the D05 reading as secondary is correct, this would indicate that a change was made against the OT traditions, resulting in a more clearly defined lack of OT awareness.

3.4.2. D05 ΡΕΜΦΑΜ / d05 REMPHAM

Another noteworthy variant in Acts 7:43 is the unique reading of ΡΕΜΦΑΜ in D05.148 NA28 opts for Ῥαιφάν, which is most likely original (Ropes 1926:70; Klein 2006:139), but no less than nineteen different variant readings for the god’s name (if orthographical differences are included) are attested in the Greek NT tradition. This makes the agreement of D05 with the greatest part of the Latin NT tradition (Rempham) all the more conspicuous.149 The Greek OT hardly knows any variation, and the Latin OT, following the Hebrew tradition, reads completely different.150 Here, D05 finds more allies among the Latin NT than any OT tradition.

His textual commentary explaining the UBS editors’ decisions, indicating that there was a certain degree of confidence in the UBS (and NA) text.

148 On the textual tradition of the divine names and the implications for the initial text of Acts, see Prato (1993:181-196). Prato succinctly discusses both the textual tradition of Acts 7:42-43 (p. 183-184) and of Amos 5:26 (with which he is mostly concerned) in the MT, the Greek OT tradition, the Targum Jonathan, the Peshitta and the Vulgate (p. 187-188). Also see Klein (2006:139-140) for possible solutions to the difference Ῥαιφαν / Ῥομφαν through transcriptional reasons. Klein notes that in the papyri (as opposed to the later majuscule manuscripts), an Α and a Μ could easily be confused. With regard to D05, Klein (2006:139) notes that “D (5Jh.) mit ihrem Ῥεμφαμ steht zu Gunsten von Ῥαιφαν, wohl durch einen Hörfehler beim Diktieren entstanden.” Klein does not elaborate, and although the αι > ε shift is easy to imagine, the addition of two M sounds to the word is not so easily explicable. Moreover, D05 was probably not written by way of dictation (Parker 1982:passim) (although, of course, a manuscript in the D05 tradition could have been).

149 Closest to the reading of D05 is ρεμφαν, attested by quite a number of manuscripts. With regard to this variation unit, the Latin NT tradition is by no means homogenous. Nevertheless, the weight of the support is such that Gryson and Weber (2007) and Wordsworth and White (1905) opted for Rempham in their eclectic Vulgate edition.

150 Two Latin OT manuscripts (Θ8 Q, according to the Benedictine sigla) add rempha, but place it at the end of the line. Prato (1993:187-188) believes the Vulgate reading, imaginem idolorum vestrorum, sidus dei vestri, quae fecistis vobis to be a translator’s solution to a difficult Hebrew Vorlage.
3.4.3. **D05 EΠΙ [TA MΕPH] BABΥΛΩΝΟϹ / d05 IN ILLAS PARTES BABYLONIS**

The reading EΠΙ [TA MΕPH] BABΥΛΩΝΟϹ in D05 is unique in the Greek NT tradition, while the *IN ILLAS PARTES BABYLONIS*\(^{151}\) of d05 is reflected in a number of Latin NT manuscripts – although only d05 reads *ILLAS*.\(^{152}\) The greatest part of the OT traditions read ἐπέκεινα (or equivalents) followed by an equivalent of Damascus, rather than Babylon, at this juncture. The firm tradition of reading Βαβυλῶνος in the NT traditions doubtlessly points to influence from the NT on the two Greek OT witnesses which differ from the rest by reading βαβυλῶνος.\(^{153}\) The Latin OT tradition reads *Damascum*,\(^{154}\) and the Hebrew tradition, similar to the other OT traditions, unanimously reads מַהֲלאָה לְדָמֶשֶׂק.\(^{155}\)

The idea of “beyond” (ἐπέκεινα), then, is shared by NT and OT tradition alike; the NT traditions read Babylon while the OT traditions read Damascus. Could the EΠΙ [TA MΕPH] of D05 be on account of this general discrepancy between the NT and OT traditions? This seems possible, but perhaps only indirectly. The Βαβυλῶνος of the Greek NT tradition was likely an attempt to adapt the text to include a reference to the Babylonian exile (Haenchen 1954:161; Roloff 1981:124; Bruce 1987b:50; cf. Johnson 1992:132).\(^{156}\) Such an attempt would make sense in the context in which this quotation has been embedded, Stephen’s compendious retelling of the history of Israel (Acts 7:2b-50). Stephen’s summary would

---

\(^{151}\) The use of *ILLAS* is singular at this point in the Latin NT tradition. According to Stone (1946:41), the use of *ILLAS* here in d05 is an example of the tendency in d05 to use pronouns as an attempt to render the Greek article. See Stone (1946:41-42) for more examples with *ille* as well as other pronouns in d05. This would imply that the reading as found in d05 can probably be traced to a Greek NT text, and did not originate within the Latin NT tradition.

\(^{152}\) The Coptic knows this reading too, as the Sahidic also adds an equivalent for *ILLAS* at this point. Other manuscripts reads *in partes* (or *partem* in e08 and p) *babylonis* (or *babylonie* in Codex Gigas), namely e08, Codex Gigas and p.

\(^{153}\) These two witnesses are the sixth century Codex Marchalianus, which have BABΥΛΩΝΟϹ as a marginal note only, and the tenth century miniscule 26.

\(^{154}\) The only text-critical variant is found in the Latin OT manuscript U, which reads *damasco*.

\(^{155}\) Cyril of Alexandria (Pusey 1868:476) explains that the difference between the OT tradition (or, more precisely, the “LXX” – ἕτ’ ἐκδόσεις τῶν ἑβδομήκοντα) and Stephen’s account in the NT tradition is because the latter is quoting according to the Hebrew tradition (κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραίων ἔκδοσιν): “Because, it seems, for them [i.e., Hebrew-speakers] “beyond Damascus” was called the (land) of the Babylonians.” (Δ[Λ]οκεῖ γὰρ σύντομος ἐκδικίως τὸ ἐπέκεινα Δαμασκοῦ ὄνομασθαι τὴν Βαβυλωνίων.) It is questionable where Cyril got this information from; at the very least, no trace of the reading (“Babylon”) remains in the Hebrew tradition.

\(^{156}\) Williams (1964:109) adds two more possible (but not necessarily plausible) reasons why the author of Acts (or, as Williams states, “Stephen”) could have opted for “Babylon” instead of “Damascus”: either because it was an early Christian designation for Rome or because the Christians had “some connection with the Damascus sect, which was related to that of the Qumran sect …”
otherwise lack any reference to the Babylonian exile. This change, however, left the text with what some scribes understood to be an error, as ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος implies a region beyond Babylon. The D05 tradition probably corrected this “historical inaccuracy” (or in other terms geographical, as noted by Haenchen 1954:161) by changing ἐπέκεινα into ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη (Ropes 1926:70).

The change that resulted in the ΕΠΙ [ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ] BABΥΛΩΝΟϹ as found in the D05 text shows a degree of familiarity with the history of Israel as conveyed in the Greek OT tradition (as well as the other OT traditions). This could be described as a general awareness of the OT tradition. However, the change goes against what can be described as OT awareness in a specific sense, namely that the text was an explicit quotation of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43. Certainly the text was not adapted to a specific reading of the OT, and the change, based on “historical accuracy”, does not necessarily imply knowledge of an Amos 5:25-27 text, but rather only a general familiarity with the history of Israel.

157 De Waard (1966:45) is of the opinion that it is the Greek OT tradition that was later adapted to read Δαμασκοῦ. De Waard’s conclusion rests on the evidence from Qumran, but his external evidence is slim. In any case, if De Waard is correct, the change would have been completed by the time of the writing of Acts, and even more so, at the time of the production of D05, as the extant manuscript evidence shows. On the idea of Damascus being equated with Qumran, etc., see De Waard (1966:45, footnote 2), who offers a summary and a short discussion.

158 The “error” is not as serious as one might think. If the city Babylon is in view, some of the exiles indeed went beyond Babylon. Kilpatrick (1979:83) takes the difference in D05 to reflect a shift from the first exile (of Israel, in the eighth century BCE) to the second exile (of Judah, in the sixth century BCE).

159 Perhaps the change was occasioned, too, by the infrequent occurrence of the word ἐπέκεινα in the Greek NT tradition (where it is a hapax legomenon, as pointed out by Delebecque 1986:296) and the Greek OT tradition. The word was probably not that well known. However, the expression ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη – at least with regard to the Greek NT and Greek OT tradition – does not fare much better with regard to frequency.

160 Similar arguments to Ropes (1926:70) – sometimes expressly following him – are found, amongst others, in Haenchen (1954:161); Holtz (1968:15); Hemer (1989:194); Barrett (1994:371); Fitzmyer (1998:382); Steyn (2004:68-69); Rius-Camps & Read-Heimerdinger (2006:65). A different stance is taken by Cerfau (1950:47), who believes the B03 text of the quotation of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42b-43 to be secondary on account of its lack of an equivalent for ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, which is likely an adaptation towards the Greek OT tradition. According to Cerfau, this clear indication that the B03 text is secondary also leads to the conclusion that B03 replaced the “primitive” ἐπὶ τὰ μέρη with ἐπέκεινα. Cerfau fails to explain how Βαβυλῶνος, which he simply labels a “bévue flagrante” was left standing in a text so heavily conformed to the text of the Greek OT tradition as he supposes B03 to be (cf. Ropes 1926:70; cf. also the explicit critique of Cerfau by Haenchen 1954:161). Cerfau furthermore fails to account for the evidence of the rest of the Greek NT tradition, the manuscripts of which mostly do read ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ and still read ἐπέκεινα Βαβυλῶνος. The suggestion by Chase (1893:73-74) that the [ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ] of D05 is on account of the Old Syriac tradition is too involved. Chase believes the Old Syriac reading to be an “embellishment” by reading Δαμασκοῦ (“to the places of Babylon”), as “place” seems to be a technical expression meaning ‘the foreign countries of exile’.” It is not necessary to introduce a further complication (the recourse to the Syriac tradition) to see the D05 reading as harmonisation.
3.5. Conclusion

The quotation of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43 does not differ all that drastically from the rest of the Greek NT tradition. In fact, as has become clear in the discussion above, the D05 text follows the Greek NT tradition much closer than it follows any of the OT traditions.

The introductory formula of this quotation shows no real evidence of OT awareness. Although the lack of an equivalent for τῶν before ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ could indicate a lack of OT awareness – i.e., a failure to detect from the introductory formula that the quotation stems from the OT – the phrasing of the rest of the introductory formula in D05 makes this unlikely.

The text of the quotation itself shows little OT awareness. The lack of ὑμῶν after ΘΥ is certainly not based on an OT tradition; rather, a theological motive regarding the “house of Israel” (ΟΙΚΟϹ ΙϹΡΑΗΛ) yields the best explanation. The name of the god as found in D05, ΡΕΜΦΑΜ, stems from the Latin NT tradition, and any direct OT influence can be discounted for this variant reading. A general sense of OT awareness may be seen in the ΕΠΙ [ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ] BABΥΛΩΝΟϹ of D05, a singular reading in the Greek NT tradition. The best explanation for this variant reading is one which presupposes a scribe who knew the history of Israel as portrayed by the OT tradition in general. The reading was seemingly changed to fit with this general history of Israel. However, in changing this reading to fit with the general history of Israel, a scribe in the D05 tradition has moved further away from the OT tradition’s text of Amos 5:27. In a broad sense, then, this shows OT awareness, but no direct familiarity with the OT text of Amos.

The discussion above has also illustrated, with regard to previous conclusions regarding the lack of ὑμῶν after ΘΥ in D05, that possible OT awareness with regard to the whole text and context of a quotation should be kept in mind when assigning variant readings an OT provenance. For example, in the case of the θεοῦ ὑμῶν (as is read in the bulk of the manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition), it is difficult to prove an addition of ὑμῶν as conforming to the text of the Greek OT tradition when the rest of the quotation in the Greek NT differs so markedly from any Greek OT tradition.
4. Acts 13:41 / Habakkuk 1:5\(^{161}\)

4.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO EIPHMEMON EN TOIC ΠΡΟΦΗΤAI</th>
<th>QUOD DICTUM EST IN PROPHETIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΙΑΤΕ ΟΙ ΚΑΤΑΦΡΟΝΗΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΘΑΥΜΑΣΚΑΤΕ</td>
<td>UIDETE CONTEMPTORES ET ADMIRAMINI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ΑΦΑΝΙÇΟΗΤΕ ΟΤΙ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΕΡΓΑΖΟΜΑΙ ΕΓΩ</td>
<td>ET EXTERMINAMINI QU[I]A OPUS OPEROR EGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΝ ΤΑΙC ΗΜΕΡΑIC ΥΜΩΝ</td>
<td>IN [D]IEBUS UESTRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ο ΟΥ ΜΗ ΠΙϹΤΕΥϹΗΤΕ</td>
<td>QUOD NON CREDITIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΑΝ ΤΙC ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ ΥΜΕΙΝ</td>
<td>SI QUIS EXPOSUERIT UOBIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΙ ECEΙΗΤΗϹΑΝ</td>
<td>ET TACUERUNT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of the quotation of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41 is on Folio 470b in D05 – this text is not indented. The paragraph in which this quotation occurs starts at ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΟΥ ΕϹΤΩ ΥΜΕΙΝ ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ (Acts 13:38)\(^{162}\) and the text directly following the quotation starts the next paragraph (ΕΞΙΟΝΤΩΝ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΩΝ ΠΑΡΕΚΑΛΟΥΝ – Acts 13:42). The words ΚΑΙ ECEΙΗΤΗϹΑΝ, then, form part of this passage in D05.

4.1.2. Corrections in D05

There is only one correction to this text in D05: On top of the CE of ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ two dots have been placed to indicate its deletion.\(^{163}\)

---


\(^{162}\) The ink of this text has partly rubbed off.

\(^{163}\) The corrector is left unidentified by Scrivener (1864:444), although he indicates it as secondary. The arrangement of ΠΙϹΤΕΥϹΗΤΕ in relation to ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑI on the next line could suggest that the scribe’s eye wandered from the one to the other in the Vorlage of D05, especially if the reading in D05 was the orthographical variant ΠΙϹΤΕΥϹΗΤΑI (i.e., ΑΙ for Ε). However, interchanges between η > ε or ε > η are very infrequent in the orthography of D05 (cf. Yoder 1958:32-33), making this proposition highly unlikely.
4.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation can be found on Folio 471a in d05. The paragraph markers are the same as for the Greek text (NOTUM ERGO SIT UOBIS UIRI FRATRES – Acts 13:38 and PROGREGIEN TIBUS UERO EIS ROGABANT – Acts 13:42). Similar to D05, ET TACUERUNT forms part of the same passage in which the rest of the quotation is found.

4.1.4. Corrections in d05

This text does not contain any corrections in d05.164

4.2. Other quotations or allusions to Habakkuk 1:5 in the text of D05

Apart from Acts 13:41, no other passage is listed in NA28 list of loci citati vel allegati which quotes from or alludes to Habakkuk 1:5.

4.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41 can be found in the previous verse, Acts 13:40. In D05, the phrase TO EIPHMENON EN TOIC ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙϹ is in exact agreement with the rest of the Greek NT tradition.165 Similarly, the QUOD DICTUM EST IN PROPHETIS of d05 is in agreement with the majority of witnesses to the Latin NT tradition.166 There is therefore no change in OT awareness in D05 with regard to this introductory formula.

164 QUIA was originally written as QUA, and the I has been drawn on top of and between U and A. Scrivener judged this correction to have been made prima manu, but as the ink has rubbed off of the right part of most sentences of the text of the quotation, it is difficult to confirm his findings. The rubbed off text also eliminated any trace of what must have been the D of DIEBUS.
165 Apart from orthographical differences, the seventh century P74 does not have an equivalent for ἐν in this phrase, while a small number of manuscripts (614 1292 1611 1890 2138 2412) read ἐπὶ ὑμᾶς at the end of the phrase.
166 The Latin manuscript D reads quodcumque. Two further manuscripts, U and S, read per where the rest of the tradition reads in.
4.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

4.4.1. D05 has no equivalent for ἔργον (ὁ) / d05 has no equivalent for opus (quod)

In Acts 13:41, the second ἔργον found in the earliest manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition – apart from D05, that is – is most likely original, although there are a number of later Greek NT manuscripts which agree with D05 in not having an equivalent for the term. The originality of the second ἔργον in the Greek NT text can be defended by the quality of the manuscripts that have this reading (cf. Steyn 1995:190). Two voices from scholars who normally differ in their point of view should serve as a warning against too easy an assumption: Both Cerfaux (1950:46) and Haenchen (1954:161) agree that the second ΕΡΓΟΝ of B03 is secondary, and that the D05 reading should prevail. Cerfaux (1950:46) thinks that the word has been added in the B03 tradition “pour faire plus expressif,” while Haenchen (1954:161; cf. Kilpatrick 1963:70-71) adds that similar repetition occurs often in B03. Nevertheless, both Cerfaux and Haenchen seem to be concerned with the text of B03 alone, rather than the Greek NT tradition as a whole. The relatively strong external evidence for the ἔργον’s presence still tips the balance in favour of the D05 reading being secondary.

The preference for the second ἔργον as part of the “initial” text is corroborated by the Latin NT tradition. Here, only a few manuscripts do not have an equivalent for this second opus.

167 The ΚΑΤΑΦΡΟΝΙΤΕ of D05 is an orthographic variant for καταφρονηται; likewise, ΥΜΕΙΝ is a variant spelling of ὑμιν.
168 Also see the discussion of the phrase ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΩ Κ̅Ω̅ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ in Acts 15:18 in D05 below.
169 In fact, more than sixty manuscripts do not have an equivalent for the term. Of these, the following uncials are of note, apart from D05: E08 L020 P025 049 097 0142. The supplementary leaves of H014 also do not have an equivalent for this second ἔργον.
170 If the text was to be based on the majority of the manuscripts, however, the reading should probably be left out, as is done in the edition of Pierpoint & Robinson (2005:282).
171 The article in which Haenchen (1954:161) states his view on the secondary nature of the second ΕΡΓΟΝ in Acts 13:41 was written in direct response and as a critique to the essay by Cerfaux (1950:46). Their agreement should thus not be taken lightly.
172 Compare also the suggestions by Ringgren (1986:234), who thinks that the second ἔργον has been added “possibly for the sake of clarity,” and Jeska (2001:239), who takes the second ἔργον to emphasise the “Universalität der Heilsbotschaft” in the NT context of the quotation. Both Ringgren and Jeska see the change as made by the author of Acts; however, the same argument could naturally apply to a change made by a later redactor of the text of Acts, as found in the B03 tradition and the earliest Greek NT manuscripts.
173 The usual allies of d05, namely e08, Codex Gigas, and p.
No reference to this second ἔργον can be found in any of the OT traditions, and if the second ἔργον is original as supposed, the lack of the term in D05 is most likely adaptation towards an OT tradition (also noted by Schneider 1980:127, footnote β; Metzger 1994:367; Pervo 2009:329). A sense of OT awareness can therefore be seen in the text of Acts 13:41 in D05. However, whether this reading originated with D05, d05 or a manuscript close to either of these two in their respective transmission history is difficult to determine, since the reading is attested in a number of Greek NT and Latin NT manuscripts.

4.4.2. D05 ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ / d05 EXPOSUERIT

Related to the question of an equivalent for a second ἔργον in Acts 13:41 is the case of the ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ of D05 (in the future tense) where the majority of manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition reads ἐκδιηγησθαι (in the subjunctive). Only a small number of Greek NT manuscripts agree with D05. The Greek OT tradition knows only three manuscripts in agreement with D05: Codex Sinaiticus (reading ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΗΤΑΙ – it was later corrected), Codex Marchalianus (reading ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ, later corrected to ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΗΤΑΙ), and 534 (reading εκδιηγησθαι). The reading of D05 may be due to the reading of an OT manuscript, but it should be noted that the quotation as it is found in D05 has by no means been completely changed to fit with the OT text. For instance, the Greek OT, with only one exception, reads καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε after καταφρονηταί, which D05 does not. For the sake of comparison, it will be helpful to present the Greek NT tradition and the Greek OT tradition in a table (notable differences in D05 in Acts 13:41 in brackets):

---

174 Metzger (1994:367) and Elliott (2003:17) consider the possibility of an omission based on stylistic reasons. Although this position is not inconceivable, the likelihood of an omission of this “rhetorically effective and theologically central repetition” (Pervo 2009:329) is less than a revision towards an OT tradition, which unanimously lack this second instance of ἔργον.

175 Namely, 88 103 326 441 467 621 915 1837. Similar to these manuscripts are 61 330 1241, which read εκδιηγησθαι, and 1838 with εκδιηγησθαι.

176 Could the reading of D05 have emerged through revision to the Hebrew text, which reads an imperfect (יספר)? Maybe so, but this is more likely to have happened in the Greek OT tradition.

177 The eleventh century manuscript 763, rightly indicated by Ziegler (1984:204) as changed towards the NT text.
In contrast, some Greek NT manuscripts do partially follow the longer text normally read in the Greek NT tradition in the OT reading (including Codices Sinaiticus and Marchalianus).178

The future reading of D05 could perhaps be explained on account of the reading in d05, *EXPOSUERIT*. This reading of d05 is singular in the Latin NT tradition, the most widely preferred reading being *enarraverit* (adopted by, e.g., Gryson & Weber 2007). The form of *EXPOSUERIT* could either be future perfect or subjunctive. If *EXPOSUERIT* was understood in a future sense, as the context clearly allows, it is likely that the D05 reading was changed to (partially) agree with the Latin.179

It is also possible to explain ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ as a mistake in copying. In the arrangement of the text on D05, the word directly above ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ is ΠΙϹΤΕΥϹΗΤΕ. The two words, both situated to the end of the line, start almost at the same distance from the left margin, and the ΤΕΑΙ of ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ is about a letter further to the right than the ΤΕΑΙ of ΠΙϹΤΕΥϹΗΤΕ. It is entirely possible that in the Vorlage of D05, these two words could have been arranged as follows:

---

178 Greek NT manuscripts, for instance, which add ἐπιβλέψατε or replace θαυμάσατε in the Greek NT tradition with ἐπιβλέψατε are: 5 097 104 228 383 436 4244 441 467 614 621 623 1162 1270 1501 1595 1611 1735 1827 1838 1842. There are also variation with regard to word order and other additions to the Greek NT text.

179 Although the distinction between future and future perfect was observed fairly closely in Latin, the translation from Latin to Greek could have been problematic for a scribe. Note the comment in the grammar of Allen & Greenough (1903:300): " … the Future Perfect is much commoner in Latin than in English. It may even be used instead of the Future, from the fondness of the Romans for representing an action as completed …" Hence, it is quite possible that a scribe, translating from Latin to Greek, could have imbued the Greek with only future force.
ΠΙϹΤΕΥϹΗΤΕ
ΕΚΔΙΗĠΗΤΑΙ

The endings HTE and HTAΙ would probably have sounded similar to the scribe of D05, since ε and αι is often interchanged in the manuscript (cf. Yoder 1958:27). A slip of the eye could have produced the still intelligible ΕΚΔΙΗĠΗϹΕΤΑΙ. However, D05 shows very little orthographic shifts between η > ε or ε > η (Yoder 1958:32-33),180 and since this scenario would require the shift η > ε, the confused grammatical influence from the Latin tradition suggested above is the best explanation for the D05 variant.

4.4.3. D05 KAI EϹΕΙĠΗϹΑΝ / d05 ET TACUERUNT

D05 stands almost completely alone in reading KAI EϹΕΙĠΗϹΑΝ181 at the end of Acts 13:41. Three Greek NT manuscripts have a similar reading, of which 614 and 2412 read somewhat different than D05 in having a singular (και εσιγησεν) and only 1127 truly reflects D05 (with και εσιγησαν). An equivalent for ET TACUERUNT is not found in the Latin NT tradition (except d05), or any of the OT traditions. To be sure, the phrase was probably not seen as part of the narrative in D05 and not part of the quotation or the speech (cf. Epp 1966:82, 155; Delebecque 1986:368; Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger 2007:79) – although the next paragraph in the layout of D05 starts only after this phrase.182 The inclusion of this phrase in the same passage as the quotation is more likely due to the spatial shift on a narrative level, i.e., the people moving out of the synagogue (ΕΞΙΟΝΤΩΝ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΩΝ / PROGREГIENTEΠIΒU UERO EΙΣ), which was taken to indicate a new section.

Mackenzie (1985:643-646) has made a well-argued and cautious case for the possibility of the originality of KAI EϹΕΙĠΗϹΑΝ as found in the D05 text based on internal evidence.183

180 One should keep in mind that Yoder measured the spelling of D05 against WH.
181 EϹΕΙĠΗϹΑΝ is an orthographic variant for εσίγησαν.
182 Delebecque (1986:368; similarly Zahn 1927:447; cf. Epp 1966:82-83; Schneider 1980:127, footnote γ; Mackenzie 1985:645) connects KAI EϹΕΙĠΗϹΑΝ with the effect on the audience and the success in convincing achieved by the quotation: “Ce silence est le signe que les frères n’avaient rien à répliquer aux paroles de Paul, surtout achevées sur une citation des Prophètes.” Whether the audience is meant or Paul and Barnabas, however, is unclear (Haenchen 1977:397, footnote 2). See also the discussion below under “4.4. Reflection”.
183 Mackenzie (1986:643) also notes, with regard to internal evidence, that the word σιγάω can be seen as typical of Luke–Acts – although this could also be said of the synonymous σιωπάω. According to Mackenzie, these two words are used interchangeably in the D05 text. Also see the discussion in Rius-Camps & Read-Heimerdinger (2007:103-104). Rius-Camps & Read-Heimerdinger (2007:79, 103) suggest that KAI EϹΕΙĠΗϹΑΝ could be a
Mackenzie notes that a reaction by the audience is recorded after most speeches in Acts. This pattern is not completely lacking in a text without an equivalent for KAI ECEIΓΗϹΑΝ, but the reaction in Acts 13:42 (when the crowd begs Paul to speak with them again on the following Sabbath) is not as immediate and slightly different from the pattern set by the reaction to other speeches in Acts. Consequently, Mackenzie argues, the presence of KAI ECEIΓΗϹΑΝ in Acts 13:41 makes the text conform to the pattern as found in the rest of the Acts narrative.¹⁸⁴

Mackenzie’s argument cuts both ways. The same pattern that Mackenzie has identified could have been identified by a scribe, who then corrected this perceived deficiency in the narrative by supplying a known reaction to speeches from the text of Acts (cf. Acts 15:12, 13).¹⁸⁵ In any case, whether the phrase was original or not, it cannot be traced to any OT tradition and does not betray any OT awareness.

4.5. Conclusion

The textual layout of Acts 13:41 and its surrounding text in D05 show that OT awareness was probably not a consideration in dividing the paragraphs in D05. The passage following after the quotation of Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41 starts only after KAI ECEIΓΗϹΑΝ, a phrase with rather weak attestation which is, in D05, probably to be taken as part of the narrative and

¹⁸⁴ Mackenzie’s argument implies that the plural form (as found in D05) is the more original of the two forms (plural and singular) of equivalents for the variant as noted above. Pervo (2009:341; cf. Bruce 1988:262, footnote 89) is of a different opinion, noting that the reading “is probably a way of marking the end of the speech, and the singular is more original.”

¹⁸⁵ In Acts 15:12, an equivalent for the phrase ἐσίγησεν … πάν τὸ πλῆθος found in the majority of manuscripts is also read in D05 (ECEIΓΗϹΕΝ ΠΑΝ ΤΟ ΠΛΗΘΟϹ). In D05, however, this line of text is preceded by the phrase (singular in the Greek NT tradition) ΣΥΝΚΑΤΑΘΕΜΕΝΩΝ ΔΕ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΕΣΒΥΤΕΡΩ̅ / ΤΟΙϹ ΥΠΟ ΤΟΥ ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΙϹ, which modifies and enhances the effect Peter’s speech had on the elders (i.e., in this context, the crowd). Perhaps this is evidence of the same tendency that made a scribe supply KAI ECEIΓΗϹΑΝ in Acts 13:41.
not to be seen as part of the quotation. Similarly, the quotation does not start in its own paragraph in D05.

The introductory formula of this quotation reads the same as the rest of the Greek NT tradition, and it is difficult to gauge the OT awareness of users of the D05 tradition in this regard.

Certainly some degree of OT awareness must have existed, as the best explanation for the lack of an equivalent for the second occurrence of ἔργον (as was most likely the original reading of the Greek NT tradition) is a readjustment towards the text of the Greek OT tradition. However, as has been shown in the discussion on the reading ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ in D05 above, the rest of the quotation was left intact, although the text differs from the rest of the Greek OT tradition. The omission of ἔργον in D05 thus assumes a vague familiarity with the Greek OT tradition, rather than a pointed readjustment of one text to another.

The discussion has also suggested that agreement in one reading between manuscripts, e.g. the partial agreement of ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ of D05 with three Greek OT manuscripts, does not necessarily prove dependence between these manuscripts or their traditions. The most likely explanation for ΕΚΔΙΗΓΗϹΕΤΑΙ is influence from the Latin tradition, but a mistake in copying based on the physical layout of a Vorlage in the D05 tradition is also a reasonable explanation.
5. Acts 15:16-17(18) / Amos 9:11-12 (LXX)\textsuperscript{186}

5.1. The physical text of D05

| ΚΑΙ ΟΥΤΩϹ ΣΥΝΦΩΝΗϹΟΥϹΙϹ | ΕΤ SIC CONSONAT |
| ΟΙ ΛΟΓΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΙΤΑΙ | SERMONES PROPHETARUM SICUT SCRIPTUM EST |
| ΜΕΤΑ ΔΕ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΕΠΙϹΤΡΕΨΩ | POST HAEC AUTEM CONUERTAR |
| ΚΑΙ ΑΝΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗϹΩ ΤΗΝ ΚΗΝΗΝ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ | ET AEDIFICABO TABERNACULUM DAUID |
| ΤΗΝ ΠΕΙΤΩΚΥΙΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΚΑΤΕΚΑΜΜΕΝΑ ΑΥΤΗϹ | QUOД CECDIT ET QUAE DIMOLITA SUNT\textsuperscript{187} EIUS |
| ΑΝΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗϹΩ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΟΡΘΩϹΩ ΑΥΤΗϹ | RAEAEDIFICABO ET ERIGAM ILLUD |
| ΟΙϹ ΑΝ ΕΚΖΗΤΗϹΩϹΙϹ ΟΙ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΙΠΟΙΟΙ | ET EXQUIRAM\textsuperscript{188} RESIDUI |
| ΤΩΝ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΩΝ ΤΟΝ Θ̅Ν ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΕΘΝΗ | HOMINUM D̅ M̅ ET OMNES GENTES |
| ΕΠΙ ΟΥϹ ΕΠΙΚΕΚΑΗΤΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΟΝΟΜΑ ΜΟΥ | SUPER QUOS\textsuperscript{189} INUOCATUM EST NOMEN MEUM |
| ΕΠΙ ΑΥΤΟΥϹ ΛΕΓΕΙ Κ̅Ϲ̅ ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ | SUPER IPSOS DICIT DN̅ FACIENS HAEC |
| ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΩ Κ̅Ω̅ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ· | NOTUM A SAECULO EST D̅Ñ̅ OPUS IPSIUS |

5.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of the quotation of Amos 9:11-12 (LXX) in D05 can be found on Folio 477b. The quotation is not indented, and the previous paragraph marker starts at CYΜΕΩΝ ΕΞΕΓΗϹΑΤΟ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ Ο Θ̅Ϲ̅ (Acts 15:14). A new paragraph starts at Acts 15:18, which is sometimes seen as part of the quotation (ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΩ Κ̅Ω̅ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ·). The next paragraph starts at ΜΩ̅ՅϹΗϹ ΚΑΡ ΕΚ ΓΕΝΕΩΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΩΝ (Acts 15:21) at the bottom of this folio.

\textsuperscript{186} For an investigation of the Vorlage of Amos 9:11-12 as it is found in the NA\textsuperscript{28} text, see Steyn (2004). Ådna (1997) investigates the reception history of this quotation, especially with a view to Acts. See also Stowasser (2001), who places special emphasis on the quotation’s use in Acts (together with Acts 7:42-43 / Amos 5:25-27). See Meek (2008:56-94) for a discussion of the quotation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 against its OT background and the gentile mission.

\textsuperscript{187} See Stone (1946:31) for more examples where a deponent is assigned a passive meaning in d05.

\textsuperscript{188} Stone (1946:63-64) notes that the first person and third person were sometimes confused in d05, and claims that “this confusion is the result of phonetic difficulty with final m and n.” He cites EXQUIRAM in Acts 15:17 as one of his examples; most likely, exquirant was intended. The first person singular further does not make sense, as the plural RESIDUI is clearly the subject and DÌM the object of this verb. The likelihood that this first person form (EXQUIRAM) arose unintentionally is strengthened by the context of the reading, in which first person verbs (cf. RAEADIFICABO and especially ERIGAM in the previous line) and references to the first person (cf. NOMEN MEUM in the following line) can be found.

\textsuperscript{189} Stone (1946:27-28) notes the incongruity in gender between the relative pronoun (QUOS) and its antecedent GENTES, amongst other examples, through which he concludes that d05 stands at the very beginning of the breakdown between the grammatical categories of gender, number and case in the Latin language. In the case of the QUOS of d05, however, it is also possible that the translation rendered the pronoun ad sensum (together with RESIDUI HOMINUM) or on analogy of the (masculine) equivalent in the Greek NT tradition (ο θ̄ς).
5.1.2. Corrections in D05

This text has seen some corrections. In the introductory formula, ΟΥΤΩϹ has been corrected to ΤΟΥΤΩ by rubbing out the C and supplying a small T above the line before the word. ΚΥΝΦΩΝΗϹΟΥϹΙΝ has been changed to ΚΥΝΦΩΝΟΥϹΙΝ by partially rubbing out HC. The ΔΕ at the start of the quotation has been rubbed out by a later hand. The phrase ΛΕΓΕΙ Κ̅Ϲ̅ ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ has also been changed; by supplying a O in front of Κ̅Ϲ̅, partially rubbing out ΗϹΕΙ and drawing ΩΝ over it, a later hand has changed ΛΕΓΕΙ Κ̅Ϲ̅ ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ into ΛΕΓΕΙ Ο Κ̅Ϲ̅ ΠΟΙΩΝ.

5.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of this quotation can be found on Folio 478a. The paragraph markers for the Latin with regard to this quotation are the same as that of the Greek: The paragraph starts at Acts 15:14 (SYMEON EXPOSUIT QUEMADMODUM PRIMUM D̅ S̅), and Acts 15:18 begins a new paragraph (NOTUM A SAECULO EST D̅ N̅ O̅  OPUS IPSIUS). The next paragraph starts at Acts 15:21 (MOYSES ENIM EX PROGENIEBUS ANTIQUIS).

5.1.4. Corrections in d05

The text of this quotation contains only one correction, which has been made by the scribe himself. In RAΕΑΕΔΙＦΙϹΑϹΟ, the second A has been erased and immediately redrawn. Scrivener (1864:443) suggests that this has been done because the first A was in the shape of a Greek alpha rather than a Latin A. Resulting from this correction is a space of about one letter between RAΕ and AΕΙϹΑϹΑΒΟ.  

190 Apart from corrections, the text also contains a ligature, which is not common in D05: The N of ΠΕΠΤΩΚΥΙΑΝ and the K of the following word, ΚΑΙ, share a vertical line. This may have been a countermeasure employed by the scribe, as the line on which this occurs is relatively long, and the scribe was probably expecting to run out of space. The end of the line is also squeezed in a little, with the THC at the end of the line written slightly smaller, and the text tilting a little towards the right as the scribe neared the end of the page.

191 According to Scrivener (1864:443), this T was made by corrector C. Scrivener placed the C in brackets, as it is not clear whether corrector C was responsible, or a previous corrector perhaps erased the C in ΟΥΤΩϹ to intentionally change the word to ΟΥΤΩ, dropping the movable C before a consonant (cf. Smyth 1963:34, paragraph 136).

192 Scrivener (1864:443) intimates that this could be corrector C, but is cautious in doing so.

193 As this is only an erasure, the correction is only identified as s[ecundaj m]anu/ by Scrivener (1864:443).

194 According to Scrivener (1864:443), this was done by corrector H.
5.2. Other quotations or allusions to Amos 9:11-12 in the text of D05

The NA’s list of *loqui citati vel allegati* does not list any other passage with an allusion to or quotation from Amos 9:11-12 apart from Acts 15:16-17.

5.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 can be found in Acts 15:15 (KAI OYTΩC CYNFΩNHCOCICIN / OI ΛΟΓΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ in D05; *ET SIC CONSONAT / SERMONES PROPHETARUM SICUT SCRIPTUM EST* in d05). D05 differs slightly from the rest of the Greek NT tradition in reading OYTΩC where the majority of manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition read τούτῳ.195 In the Latin NT tradition, OYTΩC has an ally in the *SIC* of d05 and Irenaeus and the *ITA* of Codex Gigas (where the majority of witnesses to the Latin NT tradition prefer *huic*). The difference does not impact the general meaning of the introductory formula, at least not with regard to the introductory formula’s degree of OT awareness.

A difference between D05, d05 and the rest of the Greek and Latin NT traditions lies in *CONSONAT*. The reading in D05 could be either aorist subjunctive or future indicative. Neither of these options fit the context of the introductory formula. Most likely, the reading is due to a straightforward mistake by a scribe. The *CONSONAT* of d05 is not entirely unique in lexical choice196 (most witnesses to the Latin NT tradition prefer *concordant*), and is a fair translation of the verb συμφωνέω, but is unique in being singular in number.197 The singular verb does not make sense in this sentence, and the most likely explanation is a scribal blunder based on a linguistic phenomenon: The loss of an *n* in the copying process through an error of hearing or pronunciation.198 Stone (1946:21) notes that

---

195 The only difference noted in other manuscripts is τουτο, but this is doubtlessly an erroneous reading for τούτῳ. The use of OYTΩC with ΚΑΘΩϹ as found in D05 is not unnatural (cf. Blass & Debrunner 1984:383, paragraph 453), even though καθώς normally precedes οὕτως (cf. Arndt & Gingrich 1952:602; Smyth 1963:307, paragraph 1245). The sense of the passage dictates that this OYTΩC rather goes with the following ΚΑΘΩϹ than the ΚΑΘΩϹ in Acts 15:14.

196 *Consonant*, in the plural, is read by e08 and *De Rebaptismate* 12 (text available in Hartel 1871:83).

197 With regard to the verb *concordo*, the Latin manuscript I also reads a singular (*concordat*).

198 This is not to imply that d05 was copied in a process of dictation. Rather, a scribe either read the text aloud while copying (a very likely situation in the ancient world), or sounded the word in his head.
the loss of an $n$ in the text of d05 is not uncommon, although he does not list the \textit{CONSONAT} of Acts 15:15 among words where this phenomenon occurs. However, one can reasonably assume that this is the ground for the mistake in grammar in d05 as it stands today.\textsuperscript{199} In essence, then, aside from a few copying errors, D05 and d05 agree in this introductory formula with the rest of the Greek and Latin NT traditions.\textsuperscript{200}

5.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation\textsuperscript{201}

5.4.1. \textit{ΔΕ} … \textit{ΕΠΙϹΤΡΕΨΩ} / d05 \textit{ΑΤΕΜ} … \textit{СОУНЕРИТВΑ}"

In Acts 15:16, the phrase \textit{ΜΕΤΑ} \textit{ΔΕ} \textit{ΤΑΥΤΑ} \textit{ΕΠΙϹΤΡΕΨΩ} \textit{ΚΑΙ} (as it reads in D05; the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition reads μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω καὶ) precedes the text that can be identified as Amos 9:11-12 in the Greek OT tradition. This text is manifestly to be seen as part of the quotation, as it follows on the quotation’s introductory formula (\textit{ΚΑΙ} \textit{ΟΥΤΩϹ ΣΥΝΦΩΝΗϹΟΥϹΙΝ} / \textit{ΟΙ ΛΟΓΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ} – Acts 15:15b, as it reads in D05). The text has been identified as an allusion to Jeremiah 12:15 (e.g., in the list of \textit{loci citati vel allegati} of NA \textsuperscript{28} – cf. Steyn 2004:60),\textsuperscript{202} but other suggestions have also been offered,\textsuperscript{203} the most notable of which is Zechariah 1:16 (cf. Holtz 1968:24, Stowasser 2001:58; Rusam 2003:424).\textsuperscript{204} These possible allusions, of course, do not

\textsuperscript{199} See also the discussion below on the possible origins of \textit{ΠΟΗϹΕΙ} in D05.

\textsuperscript{200} The \textit{SERMONES} in d05 (as also in \textit{De Rebaptismate} 12 – text available in Hartel 1871:83), where the Latin NT tradition mostly prefers \textit{verba}, is merely a different translation equivalent. In several cases d05 reads a form of \textit{sermo} where the general Latin NT tradition prefers \textit{verbum} and where the Greek NT tradition has a form of \textit{λόγος}; cf. Acts 2:22; 2:40; 5:5; 5:46; 7:22; 7:29; 14:12; 15:6; 15:32; 16:36; 18:5; 17:15.

\textsuperscript{201} See De Waard (1966:25-26) for the view that the reading of Amos 9:11-12 as found in the “initial” text of Acts agrees with the Hebrew text of 4QFlor. See Meek (2008:57-64) for a concise summary of the text-critical problems between the general Hebrew OT, Greek OT and Greek NT traditions.

\textsuperscript{202} The text of Jeremiah 12:15, in LXXGöt, reads (verbal parallels with Acts 15:16 have been underlined): καὶ ἔσται μετὰ τὸ ἐκβαλεῖν με αὐτούς ἐπιστρέψω καὶ ἐλεήσω αὐτούς καὶ κατοικίων αὐτούς ἐκατοστόν εἰς τὴν κληρονομίαν αὐτού καὶ ἐκατοστόν εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ. The verbal parallels are not entirely convincing to show an allusion to Jeremiah 12:15 in Acts 15:15, but the contexts of the two passages (Jeremiah 12:15 and Amos 9:11-12) are similar (pace Smits 1955:201). At the very least, one could interpret Jeremiah 12:15 as referring to a rehabilitation of the nations after their dispersal in Jeremiah 12:14. This evinces a concern for the nations other than Israel, as in the context of Amos 9:11-12 / Acts 15:16-17. The passage in Jeremiah 12:15 could, however, also refer to Juda. De Waard (1966:24, footnote 5), thinks the evidence of allusion to Jeremiah 12:15 to be too scant, resting on only one word. De Waard does note, however, that the \textit{ΕΠΙϹΤΡΕΨΩ} of D05 contributes to the likelihood of an allusion, if the D05 reading is original.

\textsuperscript{203} Ådna (1997:1; cf. Shepherd 2011:12) also picks up a reference to Hosea 3:5.

\textsuperscript{204} The LXXGöt text of Zechariah 1:16 reads (verbal parallels with Acts 15:16 have been underlined): διὰ τούτου τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἐπιστρέψω ἐπὶ Ἰερούσαλημ ἐν ὁμοθυμίᾳ, καὶ ὁ ὅλος μου ὄνομα ὑποκυνδυνάμηται ἐν αὐτῇ, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ, καὶ μέτρον ἐκτάθηται ἐπὶ Ἰερούσαλημ ἐπί. As with Jeremiah 12:15, the context of rebuilding links this passage with Acts 15:16-17. In Zechariah 1:16, the verbal parallels are stronger than
necessarily mean that the D05 tradition distinguishes between two separate quotations, or that it is aware of this part of the quoted text stemming from more than one source.205

D05 almost singularly has ΔΕ in this phrase in the Greek NT tradition206 and d05 stands alone in the Latin NT tradition with AUTEM. This adversative conjunction, which does not fit well after the introductory formula, does not negate the status of the phrase as part of the quotation. On the contrary: it creates the impression that the exact text of an OT tradition is quoted – but no manuscript of the Greek OT tradition reads δὲ in Jeremiah 12:15 or Zechariah 1:16.207

Within this phrase, another reading in D05 is singular in the Greek NT: ΕΠΙϹΤΡΕΨΩ as an equivalent to the rest of the Greek NT tradition’s ἀναστρέψω. Variation between compound verbs in the Acts of D05 against a text such as WH (which is similar to א01 and ב03) is not uncommon (cf. Yoder 1958:149),208 however, the reading of Acts 15:16 is worth noting, for in the greatest part of the Greek OT tradition, Jeremiah 12:15 and Zechariah 1:16 also read ἑπιστρέψω. Only a small number of Greek OT manuscripts209 of Jeremiah 12:15 read ἀναστρέψω, while Zechariah 1:16 shows no variation at all. The D05 text seems to be in agreement with the d05 text against the NT traditions, as the Latin NT tradition only has one manuscript210 agreeing with d05 in reading convertar – the rest reading revertar, the equivalent of ἀναστρέφω. The difference is slight, but may be of importance. Although there

---

205 Meek (2008:63-64) has recently argued against a conflation of texts in the composition of Acts, and prefers to ascribe “stylistic adaptations” in Acts 15:16-17 to the author of Acts. However, even if the original intention was not a conflation, later scribes could still have picked up on the similarities between the “added” text in Acts 15:16 (and 15:18) and other OT passages. Cerfau (1950:49) makes a case for the allusion noted in Jeremiah 12:15 in Acts 15:16 and Isaiah 45:21 in Acts 15:18 by noting that there are also points of contact between the contexts of these two verses and Acts, especially in D05. He advocates a testimony source for the whole quotation, noting that ἑπιστρέφω dans Jér. 12. 15 et ἑπιστράφητε dans Is. 45. 22; οἱ ποιῶν ταῦτα (Amos) et ἐπόησε ταῦτα (Is.); οἰκοδομηθήσεται (Jér. 12. 16) et οἰκοδομήσω (Amos), plaide aussi en faveur d’un recueil.” Cerfau’s evidence does not necessarily point to a testimony source (the author of Acts could have seen these connections himself), but it does add weight to the possibility of allusions of Jeremiah 12:15 and Isaiah 45:21 in Acts 15:16-18. On Acts 15:18, see the discussion below.
206 There is only one late manuscript, 1874, that also reads δὲ.
207 According to Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger (2007:189), the ΔΕ of D05 “expresses the notion that the Prophets build on the teachings of the Torah, not just repeat them.”
208 Yoder (1958:149) notes 29 cases where a compound verb in D05 differs from a compound verb with the same root in WH.
209 Namely, 87-91-490-567 – identified by Ziegler (1984:90, 204) as the main Catena group.
210 This is the Latin manuscript S.
is a degree of semantic overlap between ἐπιστρέφω and ἀναστρέφω, the more natural translation equivalent for ἐπιστρέφω is *converto*, while ἀναστρέφω is more regularly translated as *revertō* – and vice versa. The Latin OT tradition of Jeremiah 12:15 unanimously reads *convertar* with d05. The Hebrew tradition reads בָּשַׁי. The Hebrew verb בָּשַׁי can be translated as either ἀναστρέφω or ἐπιστρέφω (cf. Muraoka 1998:148), but there is a slight preference for ἐπιστρέφω. This suggests that the D05 tradition could have picked up on the Jeremiah 12:15 tradition in Acts 15:16 and changed ἀναστρέφω to ἐπιστρέφω accordingly (or revertar to convertar in the d05 tradition, with a resultant change in the D05 tradition).

Nevertheless, the conclusion that D05 picks up the Jeremiah 12:15 or Zechariah 1:16 OT traditions should not be made too hastily. For one thing, Amos reads ἐπιστρέψω (*convertam*) only two verses further on, in Amos 9:14 (although the verb is there used transitively). The Amos quotation is more readily identifiable than the three words purportedly alluded to in Jeremiah 12:15 or Zechariah 1:16, and should be the first OT text to suspect influence from. Even closer at hand for a possible redactor of the Bezan tradition is the NT text itself, including D05, which reads ἐπιστρέφουσιν (*convertuntur* in the Latin NT tradition, but *CONVERTANTUR* in d05) in Acts 15:19. Therefore, Holtz (1968:24) could be correct in arguing that D05 simply follows the word better known in the text of Acts (similarly Smits 1955:201-202; Delebecque 1986:297).

211 Compare, for instance, the entries listed in a modern semantic dictionary of the New Testament, that of Louw and Nida (1988a:194; 1988b:17 for ἀναστρέφω and 1988a:194, 300, 373-374, 510 for ἐπιστρέφω). Although the use of ἐπιστρέφω is somewhat more varied – as it also occurs more often – both these verbs could simply mean “to return”. The main difference in the act of returning, according to Louw and Nida (1988a:194), is that ἀναστρέφω places emphasis on the return itself, while ἐπιστρέφω could emphasise the act of turning about.

212 This is also indicated in the Wordsworth and White (1905:137) apparatus for Acts 15:16. Compare, too, the entries in Hederich’s (1832a:74, 313; 1832b:50, 150) Greek-Latin / Latin-Greek lexicon: while revertō is noted next to ἀναστρέφω, but only when the latter word is used intransitively, ἐπιστρέφω only has converto listed next to it; in the reverse situation, converto is given only with ἐπιστρέφω as translation equivalent and revertō only as ἀναστρέφω.

213 The verbs ἀναστρέφω and ἐπιστρέφω by no means exhausts the translation possibilities for בָּשַׁי (cf. Muraoka 1998:148), but only these two Greek words occur as variants in either Jeremiah 12:15 or Acts 15:16.


215 Cf. Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger (2007:188): “The D05 verb follows Jer. 12.15 LXX.” Cerfoux (1950:49), without any satisfactory explanation, takes the D05 reading to be closest to the “initial” text in this case. Probably, Cerfoux started with the idea that the quotation is from Jeremiah 12:15, and assumes that the author of Acts quoted this text as it appears in the Greek OT (cf. Haenchen 1954:164, who makes a similar assumption).

216 See, for instance, Acts 15:16-18 in Codex Sinaiticus in this regard, where the diplé indicates an OT quotation, with the quotation’s source indicated as Amos (ΑΜΩϹ) in the margin (cf. Schmid 2010b:87).

217 However, it should be noted that Holtz’s (1968:24) reference to D05 also having ἐπιστρέφων against the “übrige Überlieferung” in Matthew 13:13; 16:23 and Luke 10:6 is considerably weakened as evidence if the
5.4.2. D05 TA KATAKAMMENA / d05 QUAE DIMOLITA SUNT

Although the Greek NT tradition reads, for the most part, κατεσκαμμένα in agreement with D05 in Acts 15:16, a few notable manuscripts, including א01, read κατεστραμμένα (similarly, B03 reads κατεστρεμμένα, most likely an orthographical variant of the א01 reading). The two words show semantic overlap in conveying the idea of destruction, but κατασκάπτω is definitely the stronger term of the two, meaning to “destroy utterly, raze to the ground” (Liddell & Scott 1883:772). The Greek OT tradition of Amos 9:11 is secure in reading κατασκαμμένα with only three unconvincing witnesses to the contrary (κατεστραμμένα): Only a correction to Codex Alexandrinus and the original text of Codex Marchalianus read ΚΑΤΕΣΤΡΑΜΜΕΝΑ, while 106 reads the corrupted form καταστρεμμένα. These three manuscripts have most likely been influenced by the Greek NT tradition, and influence from the Greek OT tradition on א01 and its allies can be excluded.

The d05 reading, QUAE DIMOLITA SUNT (which is a misspelling for quae demolita sunt), is shared only with Rebapt., but these readings do not serve to explain the Greek NT variant. The d05 reading is a fair translation for the κατεσκαμμένα of the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition, as is diruta, the translation of the majority of witnesses to the Latin NT tradition. The Latin OT tradition, with negligible variation, reads quae corruerant, and the Hebrew tradition reads a noun, הרסה, which could have given rise to any of the readings mentioned before – but is less likely to be the basis of ΚΑΤΕΣΤΡΑΜΜΕΝΑ of א01. All in all, the agreement of the Greek OT tradition, the Latin NT tradition and the rest of the Greek NT tradition makes it unlikely that א01 and its allies have preserved the original reading, and the reading of D05 was most probably part of the “initial” text (cf. Cerfaux 1950:49).

5.4.3. D05 TON ΘΝ/ d05 DM

Acts of D05 stems from a different manuscript tradition than the Gospels, as Parker (1992:118-19) maintains. Meek (2008:61) points out, in a footnote (30), that “[t]he verb ἐπιστρέφω is more common, occurring 18 times in Luke-Acts and 18 more in the rest of the NT, while ἀναστρέφω occurs only twice in Acts and seven times in the rest of the NT.” (These figures are based on the NA27 text.)

Apart from א01, κατεστραμμένα is read by Ψ044 33 361 326 915 1409 1837 2344 and the supplementary text to the lectionary manuscript 1188. Also worth mentioning is E08 (and 1884), which reads ανεσκαμμένα.
A singular reading of D05 among manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition is TON Θ̅Ν where the rest of the Greek NT tradition reads τὸν κύριον. The Latin NT tradition knows a few more witnesses agreeing with the D̅ M̅ of d05,219 but these witnesses are not enough to convincingly show influence from the Latin NT tradition on the text of D05.

The OT traditions have an equivalent for κύριον only in some witnesses to the Greek OT tradition,220 but never θεόν. In fact, the OT traditions differ among themselves and with regard to the NT traditions: After mutually proclaiming the rehabilitation of something which had previously fallen to ruins in Amos 9:11,221 the OT traditions differ somewhat on the result of this rehabilitation. These differences can be seen in the table below, which shows the general gist of each tradition.222 Differences between these traditions have been underlined, and instances where D05 differs from the NA28 have been supplied in brackets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>למלני ירדש</td>
<td>ut possideant reliquias Idumeae</td>
<td>ὡποὺς ἐκζητήσωσιν</td>
<td>ὡποὺς ἐκζητήσωσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והשאירת אדום</td>
<td>et omnes nationes</td>
<td>οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν</td>
<td>οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והכלנהים</td>
<td>eo quod invocatum sit</td>
<td>ἄνθρωπον</td>
<td>ἄνθρωπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשראיכרא</td>
<td>nomen meum super eos</td>
<td>τὸν κύριον</td>
<td>τὸν κύριον (TON ΘΝ – D05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>שמי עלים</td>
<td>dicit Dominus</td>
<td>καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,</td>
<td>καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וסאראיה</td>
<td>faciens haec</td>
<td>ἔφ’ οὗς ἐπικέκληται</td>
<td>ἔφ’ οὗς ἐπικέκληται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אוּשֶ使者</td>
<td></td>
<td>τὸ ὅνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς,</td>
<td>τὸ ὅνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτούς,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עשלא זאַ</td>
<td></td>
<td>λέγει κύριος</td>
<td>λέγει κύριος (KC – D05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὅ ποιὸν ταῦτα.</td>
<td>ποιὸν ταῦτα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

219 These witnesses are Θ e and De Rebaptismate 12 (text available in Hartel 1871:83).
220 These witnesses are A-106-26-49-198-407-456-534 86meg. The Syrohexapla and the Arabic translations also attest to a κύριον at this point of the text.
221 Amos 9:11, when taken in toto, also differs among the OT traditions, but these differences show no discernable influence on the text of Acts 15:16 in D05, which follows the general Greek NT tradition in the text which can be identified as quoted from Amos 9:11.
222 It should be noted that variation isolated within each tradition does not affect the general difference between them has not been indicated in this table.
The Hebrew tradition and the Latin OT tradition can be grouped together in reading the remnant of Edom as that which will be taken up by Israel as a possession. This reads differently in the Greek OT tradition and the Greek NT tradition: here, the text does not speak of the relationship between Israel and Edom, but rather about the people seeking out the Lord (κύριος, or Θ̅Ν in D05). As there are manuscripts of the Greek OT tradition that read κύριον as object of ἐκζητήσωσιν, it is possible that the author of Acts found this reading in his Vorlage.

Within the Acts narrative itself, as it is found in a number of manuscripts, including such heavyweights as P74, α01, A02, and B03, there is one passage above all which is similar in context and wording and could be the motivation behind the TON Θ̅Ν of D05: Acts 17:27. In Acts 17:27, in the context of Paul’s speech on the Areopagus, Paul states that God had created every nation “to seek God” (ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν). This reading could have been familiar to a scribe, who then altered the D05 reading in Acts 15:17 to also read θεόν. However, it should be noted that Acts 17:27 D05 singularly reads ΜΑΛΙϹΤΑ ΖΗΤΕΙΝ ΤΟ ΘΕΙΟΝ ΕϹΤΙΝ rather than ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, contra the majority of Greek NT manuscripts which read ζητεῖν τὸν κύριον (although these are all later than D05). If the D05 reading in

---

223 It is probable that the translation offered by the Greek OT tradition originated through a misreading of the Hebrew text: the Hebrew text יארשׁו (Edom) was read as אדם (man” or “humankind”). (Perhaps הָעַי was in a form without the ה mater lectionis in the Greek translator’s Vorlage.) Such an explanation would be especially fitting if the Hebrew Vorlage of the Greek translator did not contain the object marker (את) before שארית. However, the opposite could also be true: אדם (“humankind”) could have been understood as אדם (“Edom”) in the Hebrew tradition itself and supplied with a matres lectionis to reflect the new vocalisation, in which case the Greek OT tradition has preserved the earlier reading.

224 The Hebrew tradition’s idea of יירשׁו (“they will possess”) was transformed into ἐκζητήσωσιν. Ἐκζητέω could mean “to seek out” in a positive way, which it regularly does in the Greek OT, but could also imply the idea of to seek out with the idea of vengeance or “to give account to” (cf. Thayer 1901:195; Arndt & Gingrich 1952:239; Louw & Nida 1988b:77, 1988a:331, 553). Perhaps the translation was made with this idea in mind; however, the use of the verb in the rest of the Greek OT of Amos seems to belie this position. (Cf. Amos 5:4, 5, 6 and 14 – all of which uses ἕκζητεο in a positive sense.)

225 The converse could also be true: namely, that the group of Greek OT manuscripts that contain κύριον as object of ἐκζητήσωσιν was influenced by the Greek NT tradition. Most of these manuscripts are related, according to the textual grouping of Ziegler (1984:204-205). The lack of an object for ἐκζητήσωσιν, however, probably inspired a scribe to insert one. In the context of Amos (cf. Amos 5:4, 6), κύριον would be a good choice – even though the text here concerns the nations and not Israel.

226 The relevant portion of C04 is missing. E08 and the majority of the minuscules read the similar ζητειν τον κυριον.

227 In d05, the phrase reads somewhat differently: QUÆRERE QUOD DIUINUM EST. There is no equivalent for the MAJICTA found in D05, but the infinitive (ΖΗΤΕΙΝ / QUÆRERE) is similarly made dependent on ECTIN / EST and instead of θεόν (“God”) a term for “the divine” (ΤΟ ΘΕΙΟΝ / QUOD DIUINUM) is read. The QUOD in this sentence is either an attempt to render the Greek article in Latin (a usage not unknown in d05, according to Stone 1946:42), or the TO of D05 is a corruption of the relative pronoun (ὅ) (cf. Clark 1933:112-113; Metzger 1994:405).
Acts 15:16 was influenced by Acts 17:27, this happened at a stage before the D05 tradition’s text was changed to the more conservative reading in Acts 17:27.228

The choice for θεός instead of κύριος seems to be consistent with a tendency in D05 to use θεός when the reference is in the context of non-Jewish people, as observed by Read-Heimerdinger (2002:286).229 However, it is important to note that the phrase against which D05 shows variation in Acts 15:17 (τὸν κύριον) does not occur in most Greek OT manuscripts, and not at all in the OT traditions. The D05 reading does not necessarily show OT awareness, but could imply that the text was free to change because it was not known to be present in an OT tradition.

5.4.4. D05 ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ / d05 FACIENS

The rest of the quotation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 contains very little deviation when D05 is compared with other manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition. A final singular reading of D05 in the Greek NT tradition, however, deserves some attention: the ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ found in D05 as an equivalent for the much better attested ποιῶν of the Greek NT tradition. The participle of the Greek NT tradition is reflected in the d05 reading (FACIENS), which is also the reading of the rest of the Latin NT tradition. None of the OT traditions reflect any direct knowledge of this reading. However, the Latin NT tradition in combination with the Latin OT tradition may provide a solution for the D05 reading. The Latin NT manuscript Θ reads facient, a third person future indicative. Through the loss of an n, which was not always pronounced, this reading could have been changed to faciet (the Greek of which would be ποιήσει).230 A Latin OT manuscript, Codex Sangallensis, attests to this phenomenon in the

228 Most likely, a scribe felt that “God” was not something that could be “touched” (ψηλαφήσειαν – Acts 17:27). Metzger (1994:405) points out that there are two additional reasons why the term θεός could be preferred: θεός is the subject of the verb in Acts 17:24, and the τὸ θεῖον occurs only two verses further on, in Acts 17:29.

229 Read-Heimerdinger (2002:286) further notes the use of θεός in D05 where some other manuscripts prefer κύριος in Acts 8:24 (in direct speech by Simon Magus) and 10:33 (in direct speech by Cornelius). According to Read-Heimerdinger, “D05 reserves κύριος for situations involving people of Jewish origin or for reporting their words, whether they be believers in Jesus or not thus creating a distinction between Gentiles and Jews.” Other than in Acts 15:17, D05 is not alone in Acts 8:24 and Acts 10:33 in opting for κύριος.

230 Stone (1946:21) notes that the loss of an n in the text of d05 is not uncommon. The same principle could then easily apply to other Latin NT texts from the same milieu with which D05 could have come in contact. The phenomenon of dropping an n in pronunciation was perhaps not so widespread as was first believed – see, for example, Lindsay (1894:136-137). Lindsay refers to Quintilian Instituto Oratoria i. 7. 29. Quintilian’s text, however, reads: et columnam et consules exempta n littera legitimus (text as in Butler 1920:142-144); this legitimus should rather be understood as “we find” than “we read aloud” (as correctly translated by Butler 1920:143-145). Cf. also Penney (2011:234), who takes the loss of an n in the abbreviation of consul (i.e., cos) as
relevant passage in Amos. In Codex Sangallensis, the reading faciens is written as facies – a second person singular future. Θ is one of only a few NT Latin manuscripts that follow d05 in reading DEUM where the rest of the tradition has dominum in Acts 15:17. Similarly, D05 is the only Greek manuscript that reads ΘΝ where the Greek NT tradition has κύριον. These similarities between D05 and Θ heighten the possibility of D05 following a Latin NT tradition. However, it should be noted that this (admittedly precarious) solution will only be valid if the passage in Greek was adapted to a Latin text other than d05.

Alternative solutions have been proposed. Read-Heimerdinger (2002:251-252), for instance, lists ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ as a possible instance of asyndeton in the Acts text of D05. She notes that the future tense of ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ is in line with the future tense of the verbs in Acts 15:16. Perhaps the reading is a mere error, as Ropes (1926:144) opines. Nevertheless, important for the purpose of this study is that there is no reason to suspect that the reading arose due to an OT tradition.

5.4.5. D05 ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΑΙ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΩ ΚΩ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ / d05 NOTUM A SAECULO EST DΝΟ OPUS IPSIUS

The end of Acts 15:17 and the short phrase in Acts 15:18 (somewhat longer in D05) have often been seen as an allusion to Isaiah 45:21 (as noted, e.g., in the margin of NA28). In the indicative of archaic Latin language. Nevertheless, that the practice of not pronouncing an n continued is shown by the fact that the grammarian Pompeius uses the very example of columna / columna as the speech used by “barbarians” (cf. Schenkeveld 1996:29).

This manuscript was produced, however, at a much later date – circa 780 (see Fischer 1985:182). Digital pictures of the manuscript is available online at http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/csg/0044/107/large [accessed 19 February 2013].

Another suggestion is offered by Chase (1893:92). According to him, “[t]he Bezan scribe took θ as a participle referring to the future; the θ as introducing the divine words; the ‘saith the Lord’ as referring to the succeeding, not preceding context.” However, Chase’s explanation does not account for the third person singular of the verb ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ as found in D05 – especially if this phrase is to be taken as the direct speech of the “Lord”.

In Read-Heimerdinger’s later work in cooperation with Rius-Camps, they (2007:189) view this reading as “an emphatic declaration by James, prefacing his final citation from the Prophets in the D05 text.” What follows, according to them, is a possible allusion to Isaiah 45:21, also in the D05 text. They also note the doubtful possibility of the reading arising through homoioteleuton of a relative pronoun (i.e., ΚΥΡΙΟϹ ΟϹ ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ) – which would eliminate the need of suggesting asyndeton – because of the nomen sacrum in D05 (and presumably, the nomen sacrum of its Vorlage) (cf. Read-Heimerdinger 2002:252).

Ropes (1926:144) suggests that ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ was “perhaps introduced in an attempt to make D conform to the B-text.” He does not elaborate on how D05’s reading could have arisen from such an attempt.

The choice for IPSIUS where most manuscripts have suus is a regular feature of d05, according to Stone (1946:40), who offers Acts 15:18 as an example.
context of an address by the Hebrew deity to those “saved from the nations” (as it reads in the Greek OT tradition) or the remnant of the nations that have been saved (as is the likely meaning of the Hebrew tradition), the group is told to come closer “so that they may know (γνῶσιν) at once who made these things known (ἀκουστὰ ἐποίησεν ταῦτα) from the beginning (ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς)” (Isaiah 45:21). The allusion, if there is any, rests on the context more than verbal parallels, as evidence is scant with regard to the verbal parallels themselves (cf. Smits 1955:202; Kilpatrick 1979:84). In the following table, these parallels have been underlined:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἵνα γνῶσιν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός τῆς ἀκουστᾶ ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς</td>
<td>λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα γνωστὰ ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος.</td>
<td>ΛΕΓΕΙ Κ̅ ΨΩΙΗΣΕΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΓΝΩΣΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ</td>
<td>ΕΣΤΙΝ ΤΩ ΚΩ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reading of NA28 is founded upon the evidence of only a few manuscripts, notable among which is א01, B03 and C04. The assumption behind this text, as stated by Metzger (1994:379), is that the reading γνωστὰ ἀπ᾽ αἰῶνος best explains the other variants, as it “is so an elliptical expression that copyists made various attempts to recast the phrase, rounding it out as an independent sentence.” If this is the case, the process must have started relatively early.

---

237 The phrase seems to stem from Isaiah 45:21, but “scheint nämlich nicht den LXX-, sondern vermutlich den MT-Text zugrundezulegen” (Ådna 1997:10). Meek (2008:63; similarly De Waard 1966:25; Barrett 1994:728; cf. Johnson 1992:265), perhaps rightly so, is skeptical about the phrase as stemming from Isaiah 45:21, noting that the wording is “not a particularly close parallel.” See also the discussion in Steyn (2004:74-75) for other possible interpretations of the phrase as found in NA28.

238 The group addressed is different in the Hebrew tradition, where this group is viewed in a negative light, and the Greek OT tradition, where the group is seen in a positive light (cf. Van der Bergh 2009:172). On the differences in the context of Isaiah 45:21 (i.e., Isaiah 45:18-25) in the Hebrew tradition and the Greek OT tradition and its implications for quotations in the Greek NT tradition, see Van der Bergh (2009).

239 Kilpatrick (1979:84) notes that “there is little contact between our quotation [i.e. Acts 15:18] and Is 45, 21 in the LXX.” He also finds contact with the Hebrew text in this case not a viable option.

240 There are no noteworthy text-critical variants for this phrase noted in the LXXGött apparatus. The Hebrew tradition reads slightly different (although the idea is similar). The Hebrew can be translated as “indeed, let them take counsel together: Who announced this thing from before, at an earlier time related it?”

241 There are also a number of minuscules that confirm this reading, e.g., 33 81 323 1175 1505. The Coptic tradition as well as Eusebius provides further support for the reading.
early, as both D05 and A02 attest to a closely related longer reading, 242 both with the singular ΕΡΓΟΝ. A variety of other, similar, readings is attested, most of which are full sentences and prefer the plural ἔργα.243 The reading in D05 (and A02), however, speaks of more than just a simple desire to complete a sentence as that found in א01 (ΛΔΓΕΙ ΚΣ ΠΩΙΩΝ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΓΝΩΣΤΑ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ). The ΓΝΩΣΤΟΝ ... ΕΡΓΟΝ, both appearing in the singular, marks the start of a new sentence in D05 (also noted by Williams 1964:182). Whereas a text such as א01 (ΓΝΩΣΤΑ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ) or a text such as that of the majority of Greek NT manuscripts (παντα γνωστα απ αιωνος εστιν τω θεω παντα τα εργα αυτω) elaborate on the things (ταυτα) which the Lord has done through a plural (γνωστά), D05 places the focus on a singular ΕΡΓΟΝ by its singular ΓΝΩΣΤΟΝ (cf. Haenchen 1977:431, footnote 3; Delebecque 1986:232). The distinction between the singular and plural of ἔργον appears to be of significance for the Acts narrative. The term ἔργον occurs about ten times in the text of Acts (in the extant portions of D05, as well as a text such as א01 or NA28); four (or five) times in the plural, 244 and five (or six) times in the singular. 245 When used in the plural, ἔργον invariably refers to the deeds of men, whether good (Acts 7:22; 9:36; 26:20) or bad (Acts 7:41). In the singular, ἔργον refers to the work of God, whether hypothetically (Acts 5:38), as a work effected by God himself (Acts 13:41), or as a charge laid on a group of people by God (Acts 13:2; 14:26). The reference to ἔργον in Acts 15:38, set within the context of the dispute between Paul and Barnabas on taking John Mark with, may fall in the latter class in a text such as א01, but the connection is not as explicit as in the other two cases. In D05, however, the nature of this ΕΡΓΟΝ is clarified by a relative clause (ΕΙϹ ΟΕΠΕΜΦΘΗϹΑΝ – “on which they have been sent”), which follows immediately after ΕΡΓΟΝ:246 This “work” on which they are about to embark is a charge laid on Paul and Barnabas by God. This implies a clear understanding of the difference between the singular and plural use of the term ἔργον in the text of D05; in other words, a clear understanding of the usage of the term elsewhere in Acts.247 This agreement with the rest of the text of Acts

242 The A02 reading, shared by P74, reads ΤΩ ΚΙΩ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ.
243 E.g., the reading as found in E08 (and a number of other majuscule texts and minuscule texts), ECTIN ΤΩ ΘΩ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΕΡΓΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ. These all seem to be variations on the same theme.
244 ἔργον in the plural occurs in 7:22; 7:41; 9:36; 15:18 (in most manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition); 26:20.
245 The singular of ἔργον occurs in Acts 5:38; 13:2; 13:41 (most likely twice in this verse in the “initial” text); 14:26; 15:18 (in D05 and related manuscripts); 15:38.
246 Compare also the relative clause found in P127: ΕΦ ΟΕΠΕΜΦΘΗϹΑΝ.
247 According to Read-Heimerdinger (2002:290-291), the effect of the ΓΝΩΣΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ECTIN ΤΩ ΚΙΩ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ of D05 is to “identify Yahweh as the referent to κύριος”; in conjunction with the ΤΟΝ of D05, the D05 text is less likely to refer to Jesus than Yahweh than a text such as B03, which leaves open the possibility of the people seeking Jesus rather than Yahweh. Read-Heimerdinger’s reading of the importance
does not necessarily imply that the D05 reading is original. In fact, because this reading makes more sense within this context, a change from an original γνωστόν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ἐστὶν τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ to which D05 witnesses to a γνωστά ἀπ’ αἰῶνος (which requires the omission of the whole phrase ἐστὶν τῷ κυρίῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ) is much harder to explain. The most likely scenario remains that the “initial” text read the cryptic (λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα) γνωστὰ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος. However, the next step in the textual tradition’s development is difficult to gauge; it is equally likely that a phrase very similar to ἐστὶν τῷ κυρίῳ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ was added (the plural ἔργα in reference to ταῦτα) to clear up the cryptic reading or that a reading similar to D05 was first added, with its singular ἔργον in compliance with the usage of that term in the rest of Acts. Either of the two scenarios could explain the other one with the same reasoning; that is to say, ἔργον was made plural in reference to ταῦτα or ἔργα was made singular to agree with the normal use of ἔργον in Acts. The external evidence – that is, the agreement of A02 with D05 at this point – would favour the singular ἔργον as the earlier reading of the two latter options.

248 Zahn (1927:521), who is of the opinion that the A02 reading (and hence, elements of D05) is original, takes ἔργον to be the most likely initial text. According to Zahn, the change from the singular (ἔργον) to the plural (ἔργα) was made to the plural, as “in der ganzen Bibel von Gen 2, 3 an zahllos oft πάντα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ (οὐσία κυρίου) und dagegen ziemlich selten vaon dem gesamten Wirken Gottes als einem einheitlichen τὸ ἔργον (τοῦ κυρίου) zu lesen ist.” For the use of the singular (ἔργον) in the Greek OT tradition, Zahn only notes Judges 2:7; 2:10 and Psalm 43:2 (LXX). In the Greek NT tradition, he notes 1 Chronicles 15:58; 16:10 and Philippians 2:30. Contra Zahn (1927:520-522), who takes the reading of D05 (and its partial agreement with the versions) as indicative of the original reading of the text. According to Zahn, ECTIN is a later addition which weakens the force of the concluding remark by James, and both θεῷ and κυρίῳ is a possibility. The phrase itself is a “sehr angemessenes Bekenntnis des Jk, das wie ein volltönendes ἀμήν Wort gibt auf das im Glauben von ihm aufgenommene Wort der Weissagung.” Zahn objects to the text of א01* and B03, as the participle (ΠΟΙΩΝ) has been joined without an article (ὁ). Zahn takes this use of the participle without the article as a causal clause (“indem er diese (Dinge) von altersher bekannt macht”), which, according to Zahn, only makes sense if the sentence is rearranged to “Indem der Herr so spricht, macht er diese Dinge von altersher bekannt.” Zahn further objects that the idea that the restoration of the fallen tent of David, the conversion of the gentiles and the gathering of a new people consisting of gentiles has become known facts already through Amos is unthinkable (he employs the word “Ungedanke” as designation). Zahn fails to explain, however, how this text (which must surely then be the lectio difficilior) could have resulted from a text more akin to the text of D05 (and found in not only one, but at least three of the earliest uncials – א01*, B03 and C04!).

250 Kilpatrick (1979:84) is of a different opinion, namely that the D05 text is original, but does not provide an adequate explanation for how the B03 text could have originated. His suggestion (1979:85) that a whole line carrying the text ECTINTΩΚΩΤΕΠΟΝΑΤΟΥΔΥΟΥOYOY dropped out by accident is, as Kilpatrick himself admits, “purely conjectural”.

251 Ropes (1926:144) also opts for this sequence (א01-like text, followed by D05-like text, followed by the “Antiochian” text, as it is called by Ropes) as the best solution. He further notes that “[t]he Antiochian text seems to have combined the two variant readings, adopting from the B-text the plural (γνωστα, etc.) and making minor changes.
The D05 phrase, then, was understood as its own sentence, and this most likely based on the context of the whole Acts narrative rather than adaptation to an OT tradition. Although the “initial” text could have alluded to Isaiah 45:21, the D05 text has moved further away from such a possible allusion without influence from an OT tradition visible in the text of Acts 15:18 as it stands in D05. However, Ropes (1926:144; similarly Williams 1964:182) has suggested that the change in D05 (and similar texts) could have been “in order … to dissociate from the quotation the words γνωστα απ αιωνος, which are not found in Amos ix. 11 f.” Possibly, the scribe responsible for introducing a D05-like reading in this text had a degree of OT awareness as well as a fair knowledge of the text of Acts itself. At the same time, Rope (1926:144) points out that “no tendency appears to restore, either here by omission or in vs. 16 by addition, the precise text of the LXX, from which Acts in fact departs.”

5.5. Conclusion

The quotation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 is the last explicit quotation of a minor prophet in the text of Acts. The quotation is not indicated as a separate passage in D05, but interestingly, the passage ends at Acts 15:17, and not Acts 15:18, as is usually taken to be the case. This shows that the phrase ΓΝΩΣΤΟΝ ΑΙ ΑΙΩΝΟΣ ΕΚΤΙΝ ΤΩ ΚΩΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ (as it is found in D05) has not been understood as part of the quotation from Amos. The layout of D05, which points to a reading of the phrase as James’ own words, is perfectly in line with the OT tradition of this minor prophet, where the phrase is completely absent. The Bezan tradition shows clear awareness at this juncture of what is (OT) quotation and what is not.

---

252 About a possible readjustment towards the Greek OT tradition in the immediate context of Acts 15:18, Ropes (1926:144) notes that “[i]n vs. 17 o ποιων AC81 Antiochian for ποιων agrees with LXX, but is a natural independent improvement of language.”

253 The passage as indicated in the manuscript starts at Acts 15:14.

254 For instance, the typography of NA28. Compare further Codex Sinaiticus where the new passage is indicated not only by way of diplês, but also by way of ekthesis, as starting at Acts 15:19.

255 Also noted by Haenchen (1954:164) and Rius-Camps and Read-Heimerdinger (2007:211), but based on interpretation of the text rather than its layout; cf. Holtz (1968:22) for similar reasoning with regard to the shorter, better attested phrase. The layout of D05 is a clear interpretation against the notion that everything preceding διό at the start of Acts 15:19 is part of the quotation.

256 In διό and A02, Acts 15:18 (in the respective forms that this verse assumes in these manuscripts) has seemingly been marked with diplês. The diplês are faded on διό and very difficult to see, but there is also a horizontal line indicating the end of the quotation. In A02, there is also other text on the line which includes Acts 15:18, so the exact end of the text indicated by the diplé is unsure. If the verse was meant to be included
The introductory formula of this quotation has been changed in both D05 and d05. However, this change does not have an impact on the degree of OT awareness in the D05 tradition.

The text of Acts 15:16 has been changed in D05. At least one change present in D05, the ΔΕ found at the start of the quotation, creates the impression that the quotation is a direct quotation from the OT – as it does not fit the context of the quotation that well. However, this is not the case, as no OT tradition contains this wording. The ΔΕ probably speaks of a lesser degree of OT awareness than in the rest of the Greek NT tradition. However, in the same sentence, the unique occurrence in D05 of ΕΠΙΣΤΡΕΨΩ (and in d05, CONUERTAR) could possibly be based on Jeremiah 12:15, Zechariah 1:16, or Amos 9:14. This could show a degree of OT awareness, but the reading could just as well be based on the context of Acts itself, where ἐπιστρέψω occurs frequently.

As has been shown above, the ΓΝΩΣΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΩ ΚΩ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ found in Acts 15:18 in D05 gives two important clues about OT awareness in the manuscript. On the one hand, the layout of the text, and the fact that it starts a new sentence while leaving the text that is part of the quotation from Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17 intact, shows OT awareness with regard to the text of Amos. At the same time, the possible allusion to Isaiah 45:21 has been changed drastically, to the extent that one should presume that this allusion was not recognised. OT awareness with regard to Isaiah 45:21 is therefore at a minimum in the text of D05. The discussion has also pointed out that the change in D05 was made with a sensitivity towards the context of the rest of the Acts narrative (cf. the discussion of ἐργον above).

Finally, the different reading ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ found in Acts 15:17 does not betray OT awareness, but it has been argued above that the reading could be on account of a reading in a Latin manuscript different than d05. This could indicate that the text of D05 was subject to influence from the Latin tradition before the two traditions were joined together. However, within the text indicated by the diplēs in Ρ01 and Ρ02, this indicates that the phrase was seen as part of the OT quotation in these two manuscripts.

257 Kilpatrick (1979:85) does not take the layout of D05 into account when he states that “James’ comment [in Acts 15:19] begins with διὸ [the grave accent on the Greek is Kilpatrick’s] and all that comes before is regarded as part of the quotation.” However, the layout of D05 – the only manuscript which contains Kilpatrick’s choice of reading for the “initial” text – counts heavily against Kilpatrick’s assessment.
there are also alternative explanations for this specific reading, and the possibility of Latin influence before the bilingual tradition started should be substantiated by other evidence. This, however, falls outside the scope of the present study.

6. Conclusion

This chapter has dealt with all the quotations from the Minor Prophets in the Acts text of D05. The most obvious conclusion should be stated first: There does not appear to be a consistent revision to a specific OT tradition of the Minor Prophets in D05. Indeed, the basic structure of the Greek NT text – many times incongruent with any OT tradition – has been kept intact in D05. Nevertheless, there are indications of some isolated readings revised to coincide with OT texts. These readings have mostly arisen independently, and although a sense of OT awareness is betrayed by such changes, it should be asked how much OT awareness came into play. As the rest of the Greek NT text was kept intact where it differs from the OT, the most likely assumption would be that scribes did not look up texts when they became aware of a discrepancy between the NT and OT tradition, but rather made corrections off the top of their head, based on their knowledge of how the OT tradition read.

The evidence of the explicit quotations in the Minor Prophets, as discussed above, agree with that of the explicit quotations from the Psalms (and the explicit quotations from Isaiah, which will be discussed in the next chapter) in evidencing a “layeredness” of the D05 tradition and its awareness of the OT text. In other words, various changes to the text of D05, whether based on OT awareness and or a lack of OT awareness, were made at different stages in the D05 tradition’s transmission history. For the Minor Prophets, however, there appears to be less influence from the OT than the explicit quotations of the Psalms and the explicit quotations from Isaiah (which will be discussed in the next chapter).

For the most part, differences between the text of the explicit quotations of the Minor Prophets in D05 and the rest of the Greek NT tradition seem to be based on the immediate context of the quotation in the text of D05. This has long been recognised for the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 (cf. Ropes 1926:16), but it is probably true for differences in the other three quotations too. One could note, for instance, the careful consideration of the context and the use of words in Acts perceptible in the D05 text of Acts 15:18 (ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΩ Κ̅Ω̅ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ).
In the case of the Minor Prophets, the impact of other quotations or allusions in the text of D05 on the explicit quotations on Acts is minimal. Respective verses from the Joel quotation are alluded to in the Gospels and Acts, but the link between these allusions and the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 appear to be further removed in the text of D05 than it is in the rest of the Greek NT tradition. The link between these texts based on OT awareness was not made in D05 or, it would seem, in the D05 tradition.

A clear coherence between the textual layout of D05 and the text of the explicit quotations from the Minor Prophets in the Acts of D05 cannot be claimed. Nevertheless, taking the textual layout of the manuscript into consideration furthers our understanding of how the quotations were interpreted in the tradition – for example, Acts 15:18 was not seen as part of the quotation in D05. At the same time, it would appear that the paragraph division in D05 was not based on a sense of OT awareness. Rather, paragraphs were divided based on elements in the narrative (e.g., the start of the paragraph at Acts 13:42 in D05, after KAI ECEIFHCAN).

The following chapter will investigate the text of the explicit quotations of Isaiah in the text of the Acts of D05. This chapter will build on the findings of the present study in the chapter on quotations from the Psalms and the chapter on quotations from the Minor Prophets.
Chapter 4:
Explicit quotations from Isaiah in D05

1. Introduction

1.1. General introduction

This chapter investigates the Isaiah quotations in the text of Acts D05. Sadly, two of the six quotations from Isaiah in the text of D05 have been lost (Acts 8:32-33 / Isa 53:7 and Acts 28:26-27 / Isa 6:9-10), as the portions of the manuscript in which they occur are not extant. The rest of the quotations will be discussed in the order in which they appear in the text of Acts in D05: Acts 7:49-50 / Isaiah 66:1-2; Acts 13:34 / Isaiah 55:3; Acts 13:47 / Isaiah 49:6; and Acts 15:18 / Isaiah 45:21.¹ Some reflections on the explicit Isaiah quotations in the Acts of D05 and the OT awareness in D05 with regard to these quotations will be given in this chapter’s conclusion.

1.2. Text-critical sources used for this chapter

As with the other chapters in this study, variant readings for the Greek NT were gleaned from the collations made for the Editio Critica Maior by the INTF in Münster. In some instances, manuscripts not used for the ECM but available in, e.g., Tischendorf’s (1869; 1872) Editio Octava Critica Maior, have been noted. For the Latin NT, the edition by Wordsworth & White has been the main source. Unfortunately, the Vetus Latina edition of Acts is still in preparation. Ziegler’s (1983) edition of the Old Greek text of Isaiah in the Göttingen series provides a comprehensive pool of the extant witnesses to the Greek text of Isaiah, and has been used as the main source of Greek OT readings for this chapter. For the Latin OT traditions, the two-volumed

¹ The layout of D05 makes clear that Isaiah 45:21 was not understood as an OT quotation in Acts 15:18, at least not in the final layer of the manuscript’s tradition. It has been included in this paper for the sake of completeness. See the discussion below.
Vetus Latina edition of Isaiah prepared by Roger Gryson (1987; 1993) was used as a source. The Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ) fascicle of Isaiah is, unfortunately, also still in preparation. The Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) has therefore been consulted for the Hebrew OT tradition; to this has been added the evidence from the Judaean desert, mostly gleaned from the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series, as this crucial evidence has not been incorporated in BHS.


2.1. The physical text of D05

ΩϹ Ο ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗϹ ΛΕΓΕΙ
Ο ΟΥΡΑΝΟϹ ΜΟΥ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΘΡΟΝΟϹ
Η ΔΕ ΓΗ ΎΠΟΙΟΙΑΙΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΛΩΝ ΜΟΥ
ΠΟΙΟΝ ΟΙΚΟΝ ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗϹΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚϹ
Η ΠΟΙΟϹ ΤΟΠΟϹ ΤΗϹ ΚΑΤΑΠΑΥϹΕϹΕΩϹ ΜΟΥ ΕϹΤΙ
ΟΥΧ Η ΧΕΙΡ ΜΟΥ ΕΠΟΙΗϹΕΝ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ

SICUT PROFETA DIXIT
CAELUM EST MEUS THRONUS
TERRA UERO SCAMILLUM PEDUM MEORUM
QUALEM DOMUM AEDIFICATIS MIHI DICIT DSM
AUT QUIS LOCUS REQUENS MEA EST
NONNE MANUS MEA FECIT HAEC OMNIA

2.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of this quotation is found on Folio 442b. The quotation is indented by the space of about four letters, but only up to ΠΟΔΩΝ ΜΟΥ; thereafter the scribe reverted to starting

---

2 The groupings of the text proposed by Gryson (1987:16-19) will be adhered to in this study. The following summary of his groups might prove useful to the uninitiated reader. X is, according to Gryson, the “formes anciennes du texte qui ne se laissent pas ramener aux types africain ou européen”. This type includes primarily Tertullian, but also other apostolic fathers and can be dated up to the third century CE. K designates the text witnessed to in Africa in the early centuries, of which the main representative is Cyprian. A later form of this text is grouped under the siglum C. The siglum E has been reserved for the so-called “European” text. This group is difficult to date, but it’s text is rare before the 4th Century CE. The text of Augustine, many times not conforming to K or E, is indicated by A. Finally, Jerome’s witness to the text before his reversion to the hebraica veritas has been assigned the siglum O. The “list of the abbreviations for Latin Patristic authors used in H.J. Frede Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel (4th ed.) Herder, Freiburg 1995” posted on the website of the Institute for Textual Scholarship and Electronic Editing of the University of Birmingham’s website was found very useful in the writing of this study. The list can be downloaded in PDF format from http://arts-itsee.bham.ac.uk/itseeweb/ventuslatina/verbumdata/Fredeabbreviations.pdf

3 With regard to Acts 7:49-50, Shepherd (2011:40) also points to similarities with 1 Kings 8:27, Jeremiah 7:4 and Psalm 10:4 (LXX). These texts, however, did not appear to influence the text of D05.
lines at the standard margin. The previous marker indicating a paragraph is a number of verses before on the previous Greek page, starting with ΕΙΠΑΝΤΕ ΤΩ ΑΑΡΩΝ (Acts 7:40). The paragraph continues onto the following Greek page, where ΑΚΟΥϹΑΝΤΕϹ ΔΕ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΔΙΕΠΡΙΟΝΤΟ (Acts 7:54) marks the start of the next paragraph.

2.1.2. Corrections in D05

A correction of the ΜΟΥ in ΜΟΥ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΘΡΟΝΟϹ to ΜΟΙ, by partial erasure of the Y and printing of a I over it, is clearly visible. There is a dot above the K of ΚΑΤΑΠΑΥϹΕΩϹ (a little off to the right hand side), but this does not seem to be a correction.

2.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation is on Folio 443a. The same two lines are indented as on the Greek side of the manuscript, but the Latin text has been indented slightly more, about the space of five letters. The third line of the quotation, which is not indented, stops exactly beneath the end of the line on top of it. The first indication of a new paragraph is on the previous Latin page (starting at DICENTES AD AARON as in the Greek – Acts 7:40). The next indication of a paragraph is on the following Latin page (AUDIENTES AUTEM EUM DISCRUCIABANTUR – Acts 7:54).

It could be that the scribe was conscious of the length of the next (i.e., the third) line of Greek text, and did not indent the rest of the quotation (starting from the middle of Isa 66:1’s text) for fear of running out of space. (Space would not have been that big a problem on the Latin side, the lines of which are shorter). This seems rather unlikely, however, since the scribe seemed to hold closely to the layout of the Vorlage of D05. Indeed, the scribe is occasionally not able to write all of the text on the next line, an example of which appears in the Latin on the following

---

4 Ropes (1926:73) erroneously indented the whole quotation in his critical edition of the text of Acts, probably because his edition does not print the sense-lines of D05, but only the text. The implicit assumption behind Ropes’s indentation is that the whole quotation was perceived to be part of the OT tradition in the text of D05.

5 The scribe does not follow the line of pricks that was made in the production of the manuscript as closely as in other instances; as for example at the quotation of Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34; see the discussion of that quotation below.

6 Scrivener (1864:442) identifies the corrector responsible for this correction as corrector H.
page (Folio 444a, line 4). There is thus no *prima facie* indication of knowledge on the scribe or tradition’s part that the text that was not indented was part of the OT quotation.

2.1.4. **Corrections in d05**

There are no corrections to the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in d05.

2.2. **Other quotations or allusions to Isaiah 66:1-2 in the text of D05**

According to the list of *loci citati vel allegati* in NA\textsuperscript{28}, there are two allusions to Isaiah 66:1 apart from the quotation in Acts 7:49: Matthew 5:34-35 and John 4:21.

2.2.1. **Isaiah 66:1 / Matthew 5:34-35a**

The allusion to Isaiah 66:1 in Matthew 5:34-35a deserves a closer look. Even if the two word pairs (οὐρανός – θρόνος and γῆ – ὑποπόδιον) were part of a combination that was traditional material rather than an allusion to Isaiah, it could have reminded a scribe of Isaiah 66:1 (or Acts 7:49). The text of these two verses runs (parallels have been underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 5:34-35 (NA\textsuperscript{28})</th>
<th>Isaiah 66:1a (LXXGött)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν μὴ ὀμόσαι ὅλως· μήτε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὃτι θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ, μήτε ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὃτι ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ</td>
<td>Οὗτος λέγει κύριος ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, ἢ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Greek text of Matthew 5:34-35a in D05 entirely agrees with the Greek NT tradition.\textsuperscript{7} There is nothing in Matthew 5:34-35 which would explain any variant readings in the Acts 7:49-50 text of D05. The Latin text of Matthew 5:34b-35a in d05 is compared to the text of Acts 7:49 in d05 in the following table, with the equivalent terms underlined:

\textsuperscript{7} There are no text critical notes for both these verses in NA\textsuperscript{28} or Tischendorf\textquotesingle s *Editio Octava Critica Maior.*
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### Matthew 5:34b-35a (d05) vs. Acts 7:49a (d05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 5:34b-35a (d05)</th>
<th>Acts 7:49a (d05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEQUE IN CAELUM</td>
<td>CAELUM EST MEUS THRONUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEIA SEDIS EST DEI</td>
<td>TERRA UERO SCAMILLUM PEDUM MEORUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEQUE IN TERRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUEIA SUBPEDANEUM EST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDUM IPSIUS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Latin of these two texts differs greatly from each other. The difference is emphasised by the fact that most Old Latin NT witnesses for Matthew 5:34-35 read *thronus* (with the exception of d05 and h with *SEDIS*) and a variant of *scabellum* (with the exception of d05, e and k; h reads *SCAMILLUM*) (cf. Jülicher 1972:25), both readings which agree more closely with the text of Acts 7:49a in d05. The scribe of d05, and presumably the respective scribes of the Vorlagen of d05, was not influenced to change the text of these two passages to fit with each other.

#### 2.2.2. Isaiah 66:1 / John 4:21

The alleged allusion in John 4:21 is difficult to perceive.\(^9\) Certainly there are no verbal overlaps between John 4:21 and Isaiah 66:1, and the “allusion” is to the context only. The possibility that a scribe would have been moved to change something in the text based on this “similarity” is highly unlikely.

#### 2.3. Introductory formula

D05 differs from the rest of the Greek NT tradition in one respect; namely, the introductory formula of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 (*ΩϹ Ο ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗϹ ΛΕΓΕΙ* – Acts 7:48b).\(^{10}\) Where the rest of the Greek NT tradition reads καθὼς, D05 has *ΩϹ*. The Latin tradition, on the other hand, mainly supports the *SICUT* of d05.\(^{11}\) The use of *ΩϹ* in this phrase in D05 does not

---

8 The *DEI* in this passage has been indicated as a *nomen sacrum* by drawing a line above it, even though it is written out in full. A written out form of *deus* indicated as *nomen sacrum* often occurs in the text of d05 (Parker 1992:100-101).

9 The text of John 4:21 in NA\(^{28}\) reads: *λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πίστευέ μοι, γόναί, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ ὀρει καὶ οὔτε ἐν τῷ Ἱεροσολύμωι προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί.*

10 Apart from orthographical differences, the phrase (καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει) occurs without any noteworthy variation in the Greek NT tradition. The only difference is a καί read after καθὼς in E08 103 180 383 424 607 617 876 886 1609 1729 1832 1884 2652.

11 Only one manuscript, the Latin manuscript D, reads different (*SED*).
represent a meaningful change from the rest of the Greek NT tradition’s καθώς. The reading could be due to influence from the Latin, where *sicut* may have more naturally be understood as ὡς. However, both ὡς and καθώς, being synonymous, are functional translation equivalents for *sicut*, and this theory should not be pressed. The ΩϹ of D05 might simply be a mistake, resulting in a synonymous reading.

In reading *DIXIT*, d05 is in disagreement with D05, the Greek NT tradition and the Latin NT tradition. It is possible that the d05 tradition wished to emphasise the fact that what is about to be quoted was already said in the past, but it is equally likely that a scribe in the d05 tradition simply made a mistake. Among manuscripts of the Latin NT tradition, the interchange between *dixit* and *dicit* is fairly common.

The mention of a “prophet” in the introductory formula to the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 could have pointed scribes to the OT. The introductory formula of D05, in any case, does not show more or less OT awareness than the rest of the Greek NT tradition.

---

12 For instance, although Hederich (1832b:156) only lists ὡς as translation equivalent for *sicut*, he does list *sicut* as translation equivalent for καθώς (in the much bulkier Greek-Latin part of his Greek-Latin / Latin-Greek dictionary: 1832a:397).

13 Alternatively, a scribe in the D05 tradition could have unintentionally supplied ὡς, as this word is much more prevalent in the Acts text. In NA28, for instance, ὡς occurs sixty-three times in the text of Acts, while καθώς occurs a mere eleven times. In every other instance of καθώς than Acts 7:48b, however, D05 is in agreement NA28 (cf. Acts 2:4; 2:22; 7:17; 7:42; 7:44; 11:29; 15:8; 15:14; 15:15; 22:3).

14 See also the discussion on the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 in the chapter on the Psalms in the present study.
2.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

2.4.1. D05 MOY ECTIN ΘΡΟΝΟϹ / d05 EST MEUS THRONUS

The first variant reading encountered in the text of Acts 7:49-50 with regard to the Greek NT tradition is the MOY of D05 where the rest of the tradition, with the exception of P74, reads μοι. That the reading stood out against the rest of the tradition is evidenced by the correction of Υ to I by a later hand. The Latin NT tradition knows only d05 with MEUS, while the more common Latin NT reading is mihi. The difference in word order between D05 and d05 (MOY ECTIN / EST MEUS) testifies to a different origin of the two readings. D05 and the Greek OT tradition display a similar situation with regard to word order. While two manuscripts read μοι, their wording is in the order θρονος μου (where D05 has MOY ECTIN ΘΡΟΝΟϹ), and there is no trace of D05’s ECTIN in these manuscripts. The MEUS of d05 finds no straightforward allies in the Latin OT tradition, but there is considerable support for the reading mea. The difference in

---

15 It is generally assumed that nomina sacra reveal little about the textual history of the NT. The nomina sacra of D05 are not discussed in this study; however, it should be noted that the term OYRANOS in Acts 7:49 is written out in full, as is the case in D05, in only a handful of NT manuscripts: P74401 03 33 69 93 326 424 522. For a discussion of Isaiah 66:1-2’s use in the Greek NT tradition against the background of Isaiah 66:1-2’s context in the Greek OT tradition, see Van de Sandt (2004:53-56). Van de Sandt concludes that the quotation is transformed in its new context from a critique against immorality to “an objection to the domestication of the Most High .…” Cf. also Sweeney (2002:200-201), who stresses the appropriateness of the OT background for indicating Israel’s disobedience (which Van de Sandt also admits as a possibility). For a discussion of changes to the text of Isaiah 66:1-2 by the author of Acts, see Koet (2006:66).

The manuscript finds at Qumran have little to offer with regard to variant readings of the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in D05. In 1Qlsa5, the variant reading והיו is found (where the rest of the Hebrew tradition reads יהיו). The 1Qlsa5 reading is listed as a text-critical variant by Ulrich & Flint (2010b:191), but this reading (a perfect instead of the rest of the Hebrew tradition’s imperfect form) does not contribute to the discussion at hand. The rest of the variant readings pertaining to the text of Isaiah 66:1-2 quoted in Acts 7:49-50 in D05 are matters of orthography only (when compared with the text and apparatus of BHS). Ulrich & Flint (2010b:65) notes that “1Qlsa usually exhibits longer forms than those of [MT].” They specifically point out the difference between המנית (BHS) and מנוחתי (1Qlsa5) and כל (BHS) and כל (1Qlsa5). In 1Qlsa5, the variant reading could conceivably be מִנְחָה (gift) with a pronominal suffix, but this is unlikely in this context. It is, in any case, not given as a text-critical variant in Ulrich & Flint (the variants on chapter 66 in 1Qlsa5 are given on 2010b:252).

16 Yoder (1958:196-197) notes that, “[w]here there is variation [against WH], D prefers the genitive of possession.” He lists several other instances where D05 reads a genitive against a dative in WH. According to him, D05 conforms to classical usage with regard to possessive dative and possessive genitive in these instances of variation against WH: genitives place emphasis on the possessor, while datives place emphasis on the thing possessed.

17 The two words are pointed out as a “real difference” between the two columns by Parker (1992:234).

18 This word order is closer to the Hebrew tradition, which reads ויהיו. Cf. the discussion below.

19 The manuscripts in question are 109-736. They are supported, according to the LXXGött apparatus, by the Coptic tradition (that is, the Bohairic, Sahidic and Fayumic) and the Syrohexapla. Schneider (1980:17, footnote ν) goes too far in saying with regard to μου that “[d]ie gleiche Unsicherheit der Überlieferung besteht für Jes 66,1 LXX.”
gender is on the grounds of the pronoun’s different antecedent: these Latin OT witnesses have a form of *sedes* as equivalent to the *THRONUS* of d05. The latter d05 reading, *THRONUS*, stands out in the Latin NT tradition, while there are a number of Latin OT witnesses with this reading. All of these OT witnesses fall into the earliest groups of witnesses, according to the *Vetus Latina* edition of Isaiah,\(^{20}\) but none of these witnesses have *meus*; they rather contain the dative of the personal pronoun (*mihi*). The likelihood of someone changing *mihi* to *meus* on the grounds of other witnesses reading *mea* is much slimmer than the possibility of someone changing *sedes* to *thronus*, with a gender shift in the pronoun as result. Nevertheless, although the possibility of influence from the Old Latin OT tradition should not be excluded, the best explanation for the *THRONUS* of d05 is a straightforward translation from a Greek NT tradition (which read θρόνος).\(^{21}\) The *MEUS* of d05 could then have been due to this original translation, or a later change from *mihi* to *meus*. The Hebrew tradition, although a possible explanation for the genitive form of the MOY of D05, is not a likely candidate for the reading in either D05 or d05. While the pronominal suffix in ἄρα might be the cause of such a genitive (or possessive pronoun in d05), the word order would most likely be inverted.\(^{22}\)

The Hebrew tradition is also not a likely place of origin for the ECTIN after MOY in D05; at least not if a scribe (or translator) was attempting to bring the Greek text in line with the Hebrew. Although it would not be strange to translate the implicit verb of the Hebrew with an explicit form of εἰμί, the Greek would be understandable without this verb – as is attested by the numerous Greek NT and OT witnesses which do not contain the reading. In fact, apart from D05, the only Greek NT manuscript which contains εστιν is 1729 – a fifteenth century manuscript.\(^{23}\) 1729 reads μοι with the bulk of the NT manuscripts (and not μου as D05 does) and has a

\(^{20}\) These are the geographically indefinable group X, the “African” group K, and the “European” group E. The text mainly known as that of Augustine (group A) is divided between reading *thronus* and *sedes*.

\(^{21}\) The Hebrew offers little help in assessing the question of the origin of the *THRONUS* of d05. There is no known variation with regard to כָּסָא. Muraoka (2010:234) lists both διφός and θρόνος as Greek equivalents for כָּסָא when translated as a noun, but the Greek OT tradition shows no variation with respect to θρόνος. The Latin tradition’s *thronus or sedes* are both translation possibilities for the Greek and Hebrew terms. *Thronus* is not that uncommon in later Latin, occurring regularly in the Vulgate, and could easily have been a translation option for θρόνος.

\(^{22}\) As is the case with the Greek OT witnesses reading μου; see the discussion above.

\(^{23}\) Apart from the printed list at the back of the NA\(^{26}\), succinct information about manuscripts can be accessed digitally at the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room (VMR) (http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de). This list, which is in essence a continuance of the Kurzgefaßte Liste, is more up to date than the printed list of manuscripts, and has been consulted numerous times during the writing of this study. The VMR furthermore provides access or links to a large number of digital photos of manuscripts, and has been a great help in checking several readings of manuscripts.
different word order (i.e. μοι θρονος εστιν), and consequently shows no relationship to the reading in D05. No Greek OT witnesses have an equivalent for ECTIN at this point. The most likely explanation for the ECTIN of D05 is contamination by the Latin tradition. In the Latin NT tradition, only Codex Gigas is known not to have an equivalent for est. The ECTIN of D05 could also have arisen through influence by the Latin OT tradition. Critical editions of the Vulgate which do not print an est in their eclectic text might be misleading; the reading is rife in Old Latin witnesses to the text of Isaiah. Among witnesses to the Old Latin text of Isaiah, only the “African” group (K) does not contain est. Nevertheless, no Old Latin witness has the exact word order of either D05 (MOY ECTIN ΘΟΠΟΝΟC) or d05 (EST MEUS THRONUS). With regard to its reading of ECTIN, D05 seems to have been influenced by the Latin tradition, but possibly – on account of D05 and the difference in word order in d05 – from a text other than d05, whether NT or OT.

2.4.2. D05 ὑποπόδιον / d05 SCAMILLUM

The SCAMILLUM which occurs in d05 mostly concerns the Latin tradition, as the Greek OT and NT invariably read ύποπόδιον, and the Hebrew tradition’s הדם is also certain. The Latin NT knows scabellum (as the preferred reading in the Wordsworth & White edition of the Vulgate), scabillum in BFG*SV (I has the similar scabillum), and subpedaneum in h. The latter, with the least attestation, is most likely an independent translation of the Greek; although it is found in the Latin OT tradition in the Vetus Latina’s “African” group (K). The X group of the Vetus Latina reads scabellum and the “Augustine” group (A) reads scabillum. Scabillum and scabellum are most likely different forms of the same variant. The “European” group generally reads scabillum, although a few witnesses read scam(e)illum. The latter reading is closest to d05, as the difference

24 The two hexaplaric manuscripts 109-736 add εστι right at the end of Isaiah 66:1.
25 The bilingual manuscript Codex Laudianus (E08) reads est on its Latin side, although no equivalent for this term is found on the Greek side of E08.
26 The Benedictine edition of the Isaiah text of the Vulgate only lists ΣΤΑΘΘ as containing est; Gryson’s (2007:1163) hand edition does not mention the verb in its apparatus.
27 The difference between MT’s הדם and 1QIsa’s הדם is one of orthography only (cf. Ulrich & Flint 2010b:82). 1QIsa’s the reading is only partially preserved (given in the critical edition as הדם), but seems to have read הדם with the MT.
28 See also the discussion of Matthew 5:33-34 above, where D05 reads SUBPEDANEUM and h reads SCAMILLUM.
between e and i is one of spelling only.\textsuperscript{29} Although d05 is no stranger to orthographic shifts, the shift from b to m is not attested (cf. Parker 1992:107).\textsuperscript{30} Moreover, \textit{scamellum} is an acceptable translation equivalent for \textit{ὑποπόδιον}.\textsuperscript{31} The possibility exists that the \textit{scamillum} of d05 (as a variant form of spelling for \textit{scamellum}) originated directly from the translation of the Greek into Latin. Nevertheless, because \textit{scabillum} and \textit{scamillum} are not only semantically similar, but also acoustically, the reading in d05 could be on account of an error of hearing by the scribe of d05, or on his familiarity with this term rather than the other.\textsuperscript{32} Indeed, \textit{SCAMILLUM} is a habit of the scribe: While \textit{SCAMILLUM} occurs in Mark 12:36, Acts 2:35 and Acts 7:49 in d05 (Stone 1946:175), \textit{scabellum} does not occur once.

\textbf{2.4.3. D05 ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗϹΕΤΑΙ / d05 AEDIFICATIS}

The ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗϹΕΤΑΙ of D05, where most Greek NT witnesses read οἰκοδομήσετε, is an itacism. Of greater interest is the \textit{AEDIFICATIS} of d05, a present form,\textsuperscript{33} where the majority of the Latin tradition reads the future, \textit{aedificatis}, mirroring D05 and the whole of the Greek tradition. The Latin OT tradition has \textit{aedificatis} in only a part of the “African” group of witnesses (K), namely Cyprian, but the evidence for the reading in Cyprian is itself divided.\textsuperscript{34} The evidence from Cyprian is thus not compelling, and the reading of d05 probably originated on its own. The Greek OT witnesses do not have the future, but there are some manuscripts with an aorist form.\textsuperscript{35} The Hebrew tradition has a Qal imperfect of \textit{בנה}. The Hebrew imperfect could imply either present or future, and the context in which the verb finds itself could be understood as either one. Whether the reading in d05 is on account of influence from the Hebrew or not is

\textsuperscript{29} For the same reason, \textit{scabillum} and \textit{scabellum} are probably different forms of the same variant.
\textsuperscript{30} Stone (1946:21) notes two instances of the shift m > b (Matthew 1:13 and Matthew 21:26), but not the other way around.
\textsuperscript{31} Lewis & Short (1879:1638) describes \textit{scamillus} as diminutive of \textit{scamnum}, meaning “a little bench or stool.” According to them, it is listed as \textit{scamellum} (thus, a neuter form) by the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BCE grammarian Priscianus. \textit{Scabellum} is described as, amongst other things, “[a] low stool, [or] footstool …”.
\textsuperscript{32} See the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 in d05, where the manuscript also reads \textit{SCAMILLUM}.
\textsuperscript{33} The form of \textit{AEDIFICATIS} could also be perfect passive participle (either m/n/f) plural, but this is unlikely, because it would then have to be either dative or ablative – which would not grammatically make sense in this context.
\textsuperscript{34} Some manuscripts of Cyprian, \textit{Ad Quirinum} 2.4 attest to the reading \textit{aedificatis}, and in \textit{Ad Quirinum} 3.5, only one manuscript, \textit{E}, reads \textit{aedificatis}. The rest of the passage looks different than d05: it has no equivalent for the \textit{DOMUM} of d05. The text of Cyprian’s \textit{Ad Quirinum} is available in Weber (1972).
\textsuperscript{35} Namely, 147 87 198 534 544.
difficult to determine, but it is a possibility. However, one cannot help but wonder why d05 (or its tradition) was changed or translated to fit with the Hebrew tradition in this case only in the quotation from Isaiah 66:1-2.

2.4.4. D05 ΠΟΙΟϹ / d05 QUIS

The reading of ΠΟΙΟϹ in D05 should best be measured against both phrases in the verse in which an interrogative pronoun occurs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 66:1b (LXXGött)</th>
<th>Acts 7:49b (NA(^{28}))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ποίον οίκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι;</td>
<td>ποίον οίκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢ ποῖος τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεως μου;</td>
<td>λέγει κύριος,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεως μου;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ΠΟΙΟϹ of D05 as equivalent for the rest of the Greek NT tradition’s τίς only occurs in D05.\(^{37}\) The D05 reading is opted for by LXXGött (ποίος τόπος), and is strongly attested in the Greek OT tradition. There are a few manuscripts which have τις,\(^{38}\) and Ziegler (1983:364) points out that the τις in this handful of manuscripts could be on account of influence from the text of Acts.\(^{39}\) Of some importance here is the agreement of the interrogative pronoun (both phrases

---

\(^{36}\) The ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚϹ of D05 is in line with the bulk of the Greek NT manuscripts. Only 044 and 2652 omit the reading, possibly on account of influence from the OT tradition. There are, however, a number of witnesses to the Greek OT which do include these two words, namely: 26, the Lucianic manuscripts 22-48-51-231-763 36-93-96, 239, the Sahidie, as well as Eusebius Commentarii in Esaiam 1.41 and Commentarii in Esaiam 2.56 (the text of these two works are available in Ziegler 1975:ad loci), De laudibus Constantini 1.1 (text available in Heikel 1902:196), Demonstratio evangelica 9.12.4 (text available in Heikel 1913:430), and Theodoret Interpretatio in Esaiam 20.525 (text available in Guinot 1984:332). It is possible that the Greek NT reading was taken from a part of the Greek OT tradition which knew this reading (cf. Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund 2008:257); nevertheless, it is interesting to note that very few Greek NT manuscripts were adopted to fit with the rest of the OT Greek witnesses in not reading λέγει κύριος. See Holtz (1968:29) for a discussion on the origin of Acts 7:49’s λέγει κύριος, which he deems to be from the context in the Isaiah 66 text; see also Rusam (2003:145), who is of the same opinion.

\(^{37}\) Yoder (1958:360) lists another case where D05 reads a form of ποίος against τίνι in WH, namely Mark 4:30. However, the D05 reading is supported by other texts, and there is considerable variation in the verse itself. The addition or substitution of ποίος for other words does not appear to be a characteristic of the D05 text.

\(^{38}\) These are: 26-86\(^{39}\) 534; τις is also found in the Epistle of Barnabas 16.2 (text available in Holmes 2007:ad locum) and Cyprian Ad Quirinum 3.5 (text available in Hartel 1871:ad loci).

\(^{39}\) Holtz (1968:30; similarly Haenchen 1954:159) cogently argues for an original τίς in the author of Acts’ Vorlage by pointing out the similar reading of τίς in the bulk of the NT tradition with the Epistle of Barnabas against the bulk of the Greek OT and Hebrew traditions. Haenchen (1954:159) further points out that through general experience
have ποίος) in the Greek OT tradition, while the Greek NT tradition have, apart from D05, a disagreement (ποίος – τίς). The case of agreement between the two pronouns is attested by the Hebrew tradition, which employs נאכ in both phrases, to which the Greek OT tradition stands closest.

The difference between the two pronouns is reflected in the Latin NT tradition. The Vulgate reads quam domum (i.e., the interrogative pronoun qui, quae, quod) as equivalent for ποίον οἶκον and quis locus (i.e., the interrogative pronoun quis, quid) as equivalent for τίς τόπος. The disagreement is present in d05: QUALEM DOMUM (i.e., the interrogative pronoun qualis, quale) is read for the first instance, and QUIS LOCUS (i.e., quis, quid) for the second. Three manuscripts read qualem domum with d05, namely e08, h and the original hand of p; of these, e08 and p* have quis locus in agreement with d05. In disagreement with d05, h reads qualis domus for the second interrogative pronoun. NA28 presents h as a witness along with the D05 reading (ΠΙΟΟΙΟΚ, where other Greek NT witnesses read τίς). However, h reads qualem domum … qualis domus where D05 has ΠΙΟΟΙΟΝ ΟΙΚΟΝ … ΠΙΟΟΙΟΚ ΘΟΙΟΚ. The reading in h is likely to be an unintentional harmonisation to the immediate context by an inattentive scribe (that is to say, the scribe changed quis locus into qualis domus based on the qualem domum in the previous

(“allgemeine Erfahrung”) one can deduce that it is more probable that two different terms will be changed into the same term than that two successive terms that are initially the same will be changed into two different terms. The hypothetical change from τίς to ποίος could have happened earlier than Holtz’s suggestion of a “hexaplarische Glättung” (cf. Cerfaux 1950:46), which leaves the possibility that the D05 tradition was adapted to this reading earlier than the creation of the Hexapla. See, however, Barrett (1986:58), who opines that “we are not to suppose that [the author of Acts] had a LXX text differing from others …” Barrett takes the difference between the two terms in Acts as stylistic, and does not see any intent hiding behind the difference in the Greek NT and OT traditions. Elliott (2003:17) opts for a different understanding, namely that the D05 reading is original. Elliott points out that repetition is common in the text of Acts, and that the change to τίς could have been a stylistic change to avoid repetition. However, such an order of events is unlikely, as the difference between the terms is attested with such great consistency in other NT witnesses. Furthermore, Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund (2008:256-258) have recently, based on author of Acts’s stylistic use and translation technique in the OT, persuasively indicated the likelihood of τίς being due to a stylistic change to the Greek OT text by the author of Acts.

40 With regard to the D05 text and the use of a second ποίος in the Greek OT tradition, Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2006:67) notes that the “repetition … establishes a clear link between the two rhetorical questions: ‘what house?’ // ‘what place?’.”

41 A number of Greek OT witnesses (Q V 22-48-51-231-763 36-93-96-62-456 403-613 544 and Theodoret Interpretatio in Esaiam 20.525 – text available in Guinot 1984:332), wishing to conform more closely to the Hebrew, have οὐκός after LXXGött’s ποίος; the same thing happened to ποίον οἶκον, where a τοῦτον is read before ποίον in V 62 544 and in Theodoret, who adds τοῦ τοσιε the demonstrative. D05 has not been adjusted (at least not fully) to any of these manuscripts’ texts. Compare also the manuscript tradition of the Latin Vulgate of Isaiah, where most manuscripts have a form of iste or hic following the interrogative pronouns.
phrase), and should be discounted as a fellow NT witness to the reading of D05. The use of ποῖος in both phrases on the Greek side of D05 must be due to some other reason than influence from the Latin NT tradition.

In the Latin OT tradition, there is always a difference between the two pronouns employed, in whatever form they may appear. A number of witnesses to the Old Latin text of Isaiah 66:1 read qualem domum … quis locus with d05, but they vary in other parts of the two phrases in question.

The persistent disagreement between the two interrogative pronouns in Acts 7:49 in the Greek and Latin NT tradition and the Latin OT tradition while D05 and the Greek OT tradition have the two terms in agreement, point to influence of the Greek OT on D05 with regard to the ΠΟΙΟϹ of D05.

2.4.5. D05 KATAΙAICΔΩϹ / d05 REQUENS

The REQUENS read by d05 knows no equivalent in any OT or NT Latin tradition. Most probably, requies was intended, and the reading as it stands is meant to be taken as a nominative, as evidenced by the nominative MEA. Whether this MEA originated at the same time

---

42 Holtz (1968:29) identifies the difference between d05 and h, but does not take the difference in wording in the rest of the manuscript into account. Consequently, Holtz agrees (using the term “ebenso”) with the presentation of, in his case, the NA apparatus.

43 Especially witnesses of the X group, and a part of the “Augustine” group (A) read similar to d05. These Latin OT Isaiah witnesses have no equivalent for the DICIT DΝϹ of d05, which is shared by most Latin NT witnesses (only Codex Gagas, h and p* also p* do not have an equivalent for dicit dominus in their text), have different readings for the AEDIFICATIS of d05 (see the discussion above), and do not have the REQUENS of d05 (see the discussion below). The second pronoun in question, quis, knows almost no other variant in the Latin OT (except for a part of the “African” group (K) reading quem and some witnesses of the H group – that is, the Vulgate – reading qui).

44 Holtz (1968:29; similarly Schneider 1980:446, footnote χ) comes to the same conclusion: D05 is “wohl eine Angleichung an eine LXX-Form.” A less likely possibility is that the scribe of D05 or its Vorlage inadvertently substituted ΠΟΙΟϹ for TIC in the second phrase. In D05, the two phrases which contain ποῖος start at the beginning of two consecutive lines, but the second line’s ΠΟΙΟϹ is preceded by H. Delebecque (1986:245-246) lists the ΠΟΙΟϹ of D05 under changes wrought by the D05 tradition of a “second ordre” – i.e., synonyms or words with the same sense, which sometimes result in a more precise definition in the Acts text.

45 The difference in spelling could be on account of an “error of hearing” – that is not to say that the text of d05 was dictated, but the scribe might have sounded the word in his head while copying.
as *REQUENS* or was later changed to fit with a perceived nominative is impossible to determine. *Requies* is, in any case, not a literal translation of any known Greek OT or Hebrew tradition.46

2.4.6. **D05 MOY ECTĪ̅/d05 MEA EST**

At the end of Acts 7:49, D05 reads ECTĪ̅, which is attested in some Greek NT manuscripts, most of them fairly late.47 The Latin NT tradition contains an equivalent for ECTĪ̅ for the greater part,48 and mostly in the order of the d05 text.49 The Greek OT tradition only has two hexaplaric manuscripts (109-736) with an equivalent for the ECTĪ̅ of D05. Interestingly, there is almost no trace of an *est* at this position in the text in the Old Latin texts of Isaiah.50 The ECTĪ̅ of D05 is not likely to have arisen on account of the Hebrew tradition, which reads מְנוּחָתִי (*מנוחתי*) in 1QIsa

Similar to the previous instance in Acts 7:49 in D05 (at the beginning of the phrase, as discussed above), the ECTĪ̅ of D05 is here on account of the Latin NT tradition.

2.4.7. **D05 ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ / d05 HAEC OMNIA**

A final point that needs to be discussed with regard to the quotation of Isaiah 66:1 in Acts 7:49-50 in D05 is the ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ of D05, where most Greek NT manuscripts read ταῦτα πάντα. D05 is not the only manuscript with this word order, and is in fact in the company of such heavyweights such as Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Ephraemi rescriptus.52 The quality

---

46 The MT reads מְנוּחָתִי; the *מנוחתי* of 1QIsa could conceivably be from נְחָתִי (gift) with a pronominal suffix, but this is unlikely. Such a reading would, in any case, not explain the singular reading of d05. The 1QIsa reading is not given as a text critical variant in Ulrich & Flint’s list of text critical variants (2010b:252), and is probably an orthographic variant of the MT (and 1QIsa) reading.
47 Namely, 044 5 181 623 1729 1827 1874 1875 2344 and the lectionary manuscript l1188s1.
48 There is no equivalent for *est* in Codex Gigas, p* and Bentl.
49 The bilingual e08 reads *EST REQUIETIONIS MEAE*, that is, in a different order; but E08 has no equivalent for the reading.
50 The Vetus Latina edition of Isaiah points to only one Latin OT tradition which partly has *est*; the “European” group (E). The two witnesses in the group which attest to an *est* at the end of Isaiah 66:1 are Codex Fulgentius and the Antiphonale Mozarabicum, of which the critical edition used by the Vetus Latina appeared in 1943.
51 See footnote 46 in the present study on the Hebrew tradition under the discussion of the reading *REQUENS* of d05 above.
52 Other Greek NT manuscripts with the same word order as D05 are: P34 80 025 69 319 365 398 2147 2298 2652 2805 and the lectionary manuscripts I23 and I156.
of these manuscripts and the large amount of other Greek NT manuscripts with this reading rules out any clear cut conclusions on the reading in the direct provenance of D05. Nonetheless, the difference in word order between D05 (ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ) and d05 (HAEC OMNIA) warrants a closer look.53 The Latin NT knows only one witness to the order of D05: e08, which itself could be dependent on the word order of its Greek side.54 Finding a reason for this difference in word order in the OT traditions is not a matter of simply comparing the texts word for word:55 The NT, in both the Greek and Latin traditions, differs markedly from the OT.56 The Greek text illustrates this difference well, as can be seen in the following table (in which parallels have been underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 66:2a (LXXGött)</th>
<th>Acts 7:50 (NA²⁸)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χείρ μου, καὶ ἔστιν ἡμὰ πάντα ταῦτα</td>
<td>οὐχὶ ἡ χείρ μου ἐποίησεν ταῦτα πάντα</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The text in question in D05, ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ, occurs twice in the Greek OT, both times with persuasive support in the order in which D05 presents the text.57 The first occurrence, πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα, has a different word order than D05 only in one part of the hexaplaric tradition58 and some Catena manuscripts.59 The second occurrence is in a different order (that is to say, ταῦτα πάντα, as is read in most Greek NT manuscripts) in a slightly larger group of the hexaplaric tradition60, some Catena manuscripts,61 and a number of other witnesses.62 The Greek NT reading,

53 Parker (1992:234) lists this difference in word order as one of the “real differences” between the columns of D05.
54 The Latin side of Codex Laudianus, e08, appears by and large to be a translation of the Greek, E08 (Parker 2008:289; Tuckett (2006:488).
55 Cf. Holtz (1968:29), who takes the D05 reading to show possible influence by the Greek OT tradition, but urges caution with regard to hasty conclusions on account of the difference between the general NT and OT traditions: “allerdings weicht die ganze Zeile von der LXX ab.” Cf. Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2006:67), who opine that “D05 reproduces Isa. 66.2 LXX.”
56 Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund (2008:257) concludes that the text of Acts 7:50 is likely not due to a different Vorlage, but rather on account of editorial activity by the author of Acts.
57 Note how some of the witnesses listed below (109-736 and Eusebius) switch the order of ἡ χείρ μου and ἐποίησεν around too, aligning themselves with the Hebrew.
58 Namely, 88 and the related Syrohexapla.
59 These manuscripts are: 377-564-565.
60 Namely, 88, the Syrohexapla, 109-736.
61 Namely, 377-564-565 and the related 87.
62 Namely, 46 239-306 407 534 544. Eusebius Commentarii in Esaiam 2.56 (text available in Ziegler 1975:ad locum) and Theodoret Interpretatio in Esaiam 20.525 (text available in Guinot 1984:332) also have this word order.
however, is more likely to be connected with the occurrence of the phrase in the first part of Isaiah 66:2, or at least to have been understood as this part of the verse, since the wording is more closely related and the intervening phrase καὶ ἔστιν ἐμά is not present in the Greek NT. The Old Latin witnesses to the text of Isaiah are divided with regard to word order. Of general interest for the NT text are witnesses to the so-called “Augustine” group (A), which start the first phrase of Isaiah 66:2 with nonne in agreement with the Latin NT (and d05). This group of witnesses could, of course, have been influenced by the NT text. The order of the two words in question in D05 (ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ) is the unvarying order in the Hebrew tradition. Although it cannot be claimed that D05 was directly influenced by the Hebrew tradition (via the Greek OT), the difference between D05 and d05 reflects a much deeper split in the tradition: D05 with the Hebrew and part of the Greek OT traditions, and d05 with the Latin traditions.

2.5. Conclusion

The quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49 is not marked as a paragraph on its own, and is only partially indented. This partial indentation shows a degree of OT awareness. There appears to be no valid reason why the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 was only partially indented in D05, unless the final part of this quotation was not considered to be a quotation at the time of the production of D05. Although the scribe might have taken line length into consideration, other examples from the manuscript’s layout show that this was not a primary consideration and

63 In the Old Latin witnesses to the text of Isaiah, the “African” group (K) reads omnia enim ista for the first part of Isaiah 66:2 (but some witnesses read haec for ista – all in line with D05 and not d05); Augustine’s text (or at least the so-called A group) reads nonne manus mea fecit haec omnia – thus, in line with d05 and not D05 (although some read haec fecit omnia (AU Ad (Var)), others read omnia haec (AU tri) at the end, and some read nonne haec omnia fecit manus mea (this is read by CY te 2 (Var)). The “European” group (E) reads haec enim fecit manus mea – that is, without an equivalent for omnia. The later reading of the Vulgate text (group H) conforms to the Hebrew, i.e., omnia haec manus mea fecit. For the second occurrence of an equivalent in Isaiah 66:2 for the HAEC OMNIA of d05, the “African” group (K) reads omnia ista (although some manuscripts omit this part completely). The “European” group (E) has omnia haec. The most probable Vulgate text is universa (without an equivalent for haec), but some witnesses read omnia in this second part of the verse too.

64 Read-Heimerdinger (2002:98-99) also notes that D05 follows the order of the Greek OT tradition (and the Hebrew OT tradition) with regard to ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ. Read-Heimerdinger is interested in the impact of variants in the D05 tradition in understanding the manuscript’s Acts as a whole. She refers to Winer (1870:686; Winer uses the different order of τὰ ὅταν πάντα in Luke 12:30 and Matthew 6:32 as an example), and concludes: “In the LXX (like the Masoretic text), there is a clear focus on ‘all these things’ that is maintained by the Bezan order in Acts 7.50.” This is in distinction to B03’s (and NA28’s) order, which rather means “‘these things all taken together’.”
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probably did not influence the scribe to start writing the last part of this quotation from the margin instead of indenting it.

There does not appear to be influence from other allusions on this text in D05. The d05 tradition, in any case, shows a greater divergence between the allusion to Isaiah 66:1 in Matthew 5:34-35a and the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 than the majority of manuscripts in the Latin NT tradition.

Although the introductory formula of D05 seems to have been slightly changed (in reading ΩϹ where the rest of the Greek NT tradition reads καθώς), possibly unintentionally, this change did not influence the likelihood of scribes to be aware that the text was a quotation from the OT tradition. The text does not point to a specific book of the OT (as in the case of most of the quotations from Psalms in D05), but the term “prophet” could have provided enough of a clue for a scribe to recognise the text as stemming from Isaiah.

The bulk of the quotation in D05 agrees with the Greek OT, and even more so than what appears to be the “initial” NT text (as D05 reads ΠΟΙΟϹ ΤΟΠΟϹ and has the word order ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ in agreement with the Greek OT tradition). There is a marked difference between Acts 7:50 and Isaiah 66:2, but this difference is unlikely to be the reason for the quotation’s partial indentation, as the last part of Acts 7:49 (which corresponds to Isaiah 66:1b, where the two texts still agree) is not indented in D05 either – yet, in this part of the quotation, D05 shows the clearest influence from the Greek OT tradition (in reading ΠΟΙΟϹ ΤΟΠΟϹ). The reading ΠΟΙΟϹ ΤΟΠΟϹ, part of the text that is not indented, is a change towards the OT tradition which must have occurred before the text was indented. The same can be said for the other possible change in D05 towards an OT tradition, ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ.

Even though these readings are likely to stem from the Greek OT tradition, it is worth noting that the whole quotation has not been adapted towards an OT tradition, but only certain words. The best explanation for this phenomenon would be that the changes were made from memory. Somewhere in the D05 tradition, a person was aware that the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in
Acts 7:49-50 stemmed from the OT, and corrected the text of D05 towards the better known OT reading – albeit only partially.

These observations offer a window into the transmission history of the D05. At a stage earlier than the text of D05, someone (or perhaps more than one person at more than one stage) recognised the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in one of the ancestors of D05 and changed the text towards an OT tradition, but probably made these changes from memory. Although the quotation was now even closer to the Greek OT tradition, the latter stage of the D05 tradition did not view the whole quotation as stemming from the OT.

An observation can also be made concerning the relation between D05 and d05. In the text of the quotation, which in the “initial” text stems from the OT tradition, the D05 tradition was subsequently influenced by the Latin traditions (which read \textit{est}) to read 
\textit{ECTIN} and \textit{ECTI}. As no clear influence from the Latin OT tradition can be proven, this influence was most probably from the Latin NT. However, some variant readings in the text of the D05 tradition seem to stem from a different Latin NT tradition than that of d05 (e.g. the difference in word order \textit{MOY ECTIN ΘΡΟΝΟϹ / EST MEUS THRONUS}). Therefore, the presupposition of this study that the Greek and Latin columns of D05 is not one a translation of the other, but stem from different traditions, appears to be valid with regard to this explicit OT quotation.

At this juncture, it is also worth pointing out that d05 shows close similarities with the Old Latin texts of Isaiah 66:1. Although no Old Latin text of Isaiah 66:1 reads exactly like d05, there are striking similarities: \textit{thronus}, which has been pointed out and discussed above; the \textit{UERO} of d05, a singular reading in the Latin NT, which can also be found in witnesses to the (geographically indefinable) X group of Old Latin witnesses (where others have \textit{autem}), the \textit{SCAMILLUM} of d05 and its \textit{QUALEM DOMUM … QUIS LOCUS}.
3. Acts 13:34 / Isaiah 55:3-4

3.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΟΥΤΩϹ ΕΙΡΗΚΕΝ</th>
<th>ΟΤΙ ΔΩϹΩ ήΜΕΙΝ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΤΑ ΟϹΙΑ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΤΑ ΠΙϹΤΑ</td>
<td>ITA DICIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUIA DABO UOBIS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANCTA DAUID FIDELIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of this quotation is on Folio 469b. The whole quotation (including ΟΤΙ, which serves as introduction to the direct speech) is indented by the space of about five letters. There are two more indentations on this page, both quotations from the Psalms. The last paragraph marker before these quotations is found on the previous Greek page (starting with ΑΝΔΡΕ Ϲ – Acts 13:26). The next paragraph marker is found on the following Greek page (starting with ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΟΥΝ ΕϹΤΩ – Acts 13:38).

3.1.2. Corrections in D05

The text of Acts 13:34 in D05 has no corrections in the quotation from Isaiah 55:3-4.

---

65 Koet (2006:67-68) notes the debated nature of Acts 13:34 as a quotation, since “a more official introductory formula is missing.” He points out, though, that there is a “less formal introductory formula” and that “it is quite possible that Luke is adding some variety, because he has already used the formal introductory formula in his introduction of the first quotation (13,33).” Nevertheless, in D05, Acts 13:34 was clearly recognized as an OT quotation, indicated by indentation. Similarly, Acts 13:34 is indicated in Codex Sinaiticus as a quotation from the OT by way of diplés (cf. Schmid 2010b:86-87). For a discussion of the quotation of Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34 against its OT background, see Bock (1987:249-254).

66 Quite possibly, the occurrence of ὅτι in the text of Acts was part of the cue which the tradition needed to identify the text as a quotation, and was seen as part of the quotation itself. Steyn (1995:177-178) points out the difficulty with taking the quotation as an explicit quotation, but concludes (mainly on the grounds of the first person δώσω) that οὕτως εἴρηκεν ὅτι does function as an introductory formula. Steyn’s conclusion is confirmed by the indentation of D05 (and α01’s diplès – cf. Schmid 2010b:86-87).

67 The indentations of all three these quotations (Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33, Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34 and Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35) follow the straight line of prick marks running across the page from top to bottom created in the production of the manuscript.
3.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin of this quotation is found on Folio 470b. The Latin side also has three indentations to this page, including Isaiah 55:3-4. Similar to the Greek, the whole quotation of Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34 is indented (including *QUIA*). The indentation is about the space of four and a half letters, slightly more to the left than the previous indentation (Acts 13:33 / Ps 2:7), but in line with the next one (Acts 13:35 / Ps 15:10 (LXX)). As is the case with the Greek, the last indication of a new section starts on the previous page (*UIRI FRATRES* – Acts 13:26; this ekthesis extends with a letter and a half into the margin). The next paragraph is indicated only on the following page, at Acts 13:38 (*NOTUM ERGO* – Acts 13:38).

3.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are no corrections to the text of d05 in Acts 13:34’s quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4.

3.2. Other quotations or allusions to Isaiah 55:3-4 in the text of D05

There are no allusions to or quotations of Isaiah 55:3-4 in the Gospels or Acts in the NA²⁸ list of *loci citati vel allegati* apart from Acts 13:34.⁶⁸

3.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula to the quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34 (ΟΥΤΩϹ EIPHKEN / OTI) reads the same in D05 as in the rest of the Greek NT tradition.⁶⁹ The Latin NT tradition reads the same as d05 (*ITA DICIT* / *QUIA*), except that *DICIT* have as equivalent *dixit* in the rest of the Latin NT tradition.⁷⁰ The variant reading in d05 is either a simple mistake or an attempt to

---

⁶⁸ Allusions to Isaiah 55:3 in Hebrews 13:20 and to Isaiah 55:4 in Revelation 1:5 are listed in NA²⁸, but D05 does not contain Hebrews or Revelation.

⁶⁹ Apart from orthography, the only variant reading in the Greek NT tradition is the lack of an equivalent for ὅτι in 808.

⁷⁰ The Latin manuscript S does not read an equivalent for *QUIA*.
make the reading more applicable to the present situation; however, the balance is in favour of the former explanation.

3.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

The Greek NT text of the quotation in Acts 13:34 is relatively stable, with almost no deviation. In the case of D05, only two negligible orthographical differences stand out against the bulk of the NT manuscripts. The same can be said of the Latin NT tradition, where the d05 text agrees with what is clearly the most acceptable text. The Greek OT of Isaiah 55:3-4 differs markedly from the quotation in the Greek NT, as the following table, in which verbal agreements have been underlined, illustrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 55:3b-4 (LXXGött)</th>
<th>Acts 13:34b (NA28)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον, τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά, ἵδοὺ μαρτύριον ἐν ἔθνεσι δέδωκα αὐτόν, ἄρχοντα καὶ προστάσσοντα ἐθνεσιν</td>
<td>οὗτος εἱρήκεν ὅτι δόσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Greek OT tradition shows no notable text critical variation in Isaiah 55:3b-4 with regard to the verbal agreements identified above or to Isaiah 55:3’s διαθήσομαι. The author of this text

---

71 The normal reading of ὑμῖν has as an equivalent ῬῈΜΕΙΝ in d05, and Δαυὶδ is spelled ΔΑΥΕΙΔ (a spelling shared with B03).
72 The only variants noted in the apparatus of Wordsworth & White are: a lack of an equivalent for quia in S, a difference in spelling for dauid in O (dauit), the omission of dauid in S7 and a difference in word order of dauid fidelia in D S7 U.
73 The nature of the difference between the Greek OT tradition and the Greek NT tradition is encapsulated by Holtz’s (1968:137) designation of the quotation of Isaiah 55:3 as “ein sehr freies Zitat.” Despite the differences between Greek NT tradition and Greek OT tradition, Holtz views the Greek OT tradition – the “LXX” – as the author of Acts’s source for this quotation.
74 In Isaiah 55:3, a variant is the reading καὶ κοψω ὑμιν συνθηκην αιωνιον in 86, which Ziegler indicates as Aquila. Aquila’s reading follows the Hebrew very closely, which is not surprising. Another variant is ὅσιον, which has as an equivalent in Symmachus and Theodotion the word ελεη (with 86, Chrysostom In Acta apostolorum homiliae 1-55 29 – text available in PG 60:215, and Procopius Gaius Catena in Esaiam 2 – text available in PG 87:553, as witnesses). Isaiah 55:4 has some witnesses which read ενωκια as equivalent for δέδωκα. These witnesses are B-V 109-736-88 87-91-309-490-49-764 403-613 538 Eusebius Commentarii in Esaiam 2.44 (text available in Ziegler 1975:346) and Demonstratio evangelica 2.3.42 (text available in Heikel 1913:68). Tertullian Aduersus
has apparently replaced Isaiah 55:3’s διαθήσομαι, which has the covenant (διαθήκην) as its object, with Isaiah 55:4’s δέδωκα (which has David as its object) and by removing διαθήκην αἰώνιον. The future tense of διαθήσομαι has been kept in δίδωμι’s new context in Acts 13:34. The reason(s) for these changes are not as important for the purpose of this study as the end result of the author of Acts’s changes: It is remarkable that there are no manuscripts in the Greek NT tradition which have adjusted the text to fit with the Greek OT tradition, including D05 – even though the text was perceived and marked as a quotation. The Latin OT tradition only partly explains the reading in the Latin NT tradition (which is the same as d05), as the following table illustrates:

---

Marcionem 3.20.5 (text available in Braun 1994:ad locum) has posui and Cyprian Ad Quirinum 1.21 (text available in Bévenot & Weber 1972:22) has manifestavi.  
75 Holtz (1968:138-139) argues that the author of Acts found and used the quotation in an already changed form (“zurechtgemacht”). Holtz bases his argument partly on the introductory formula of the quotation following the present quotation of Isaiah 55:3 in Acts 13:34, namely Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35. See the discussion of that introductory formula in the chapter on the Psalms in this study.  
76 Barrett (1986:60; 1994:647; similarly Pesch 1986:39) does not mention the occurrence of δίομι in Isaiah 55:4, but rather opines “no better explanation is on hand than that Paul has been influenced by the occurrence, in association with the adjective ὅσιος, of the verb διδόναι which occurs in the next verse in the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) …” Steyn (1995:179) notes that the δίομι could be a replacement for the whole phrase διαθήσομαι ... διαθήκην αἰώνιον. The link between the use of ὅσιος is also pointed out by Barrett (1994:647) and Sterling (2009:109). Although the link could quite naturally have been made by the author of Acts between these two texts on account of the ὅσιος, most scholars do not point out the difference in number (Acts 13:34 – plural; Acts 13:35 – singular; but cf. Barrett 1994:647) between the two uses of the term; but even so, the rewritten quotation of Isaiah 55:3 could have been understood as a parallel to the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in the next verse (cf. Cerfaux 1950:48, who uses the parallel structure of the two quotations in an argument about the use of testimonies for this source; also cf. Van de Sandt 1994:34). Smits (1955:196, footnote 1) takes neither δώσω nor ὑμῖν as part of the quotation.  
77 Rusam (2003:403-404) points to Rese (1969:87) who sees in this “omission” by the author of Acts a decided avoidance of a “Davidbund”. Rusam, however, is not convinced; the context of the quotation rather points to a promise-fulfilment motif than that of an everlastong covenant (cf. Barrett 1986:67; Steyn 1995:179-180). In any case, Holtz (1968:137-138) is probably correct when he opines that the two changes to the text (i.e., the change of the verb διαθήσομαι to δίομι and the “omission” of διαθήκην αἰώνιον) “gehören innerlich zusammen.” See also Koet (2006:68), who sees the “omission” resulting in a focus on David, the promise to which is fulfilled in Jesus.  
78 For a discussion of the difference in context between the Old Greek tradition and the NT tradition of Isaiah 55:3, see Van de Sandt (1994:33-42).  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isaiah 55:3b-4 (Old Latin group E)</th>
<th>Acts 13:34b (Gryson)</th>
<th>Isaiah 55:3b-4 (Gryson’s Vulgate text)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>et disponam vobis</em> testamentum aeternum sancta David fidelia ecce testimonium illum dedi gentibus principem et imperantem*</td>
<td><em>ita dixit quia dabo vobis sancta David fidelia</em></td>
<td><em>et feriam vobis pactum sempiternum misericordias David fideles ecce testem populis dedi eum ducem ac praecptorem gentibus</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The equivalent of LXXGött’s διαθήσομαι in the Vulgate text is *feriam*; the Vulgate reading is on account of the Hebrew tradition’s reading of a form of חָרֵם (“cut”).<sup>80</sup> To “cut a covenant” is a typical Hebrew idiom which has been translated literally in the Vulgate text.<sup>81</sup> The Old Latin text of Isaiah knows as equivalent for διαθήσομαι the terms *disponam* (in the X group and the “European” E group) and *constituam* (in the O group, which contains alternative readings of Jerome), but nowhere is a form of *dare* found at this position in the text. As an equivalent for LXXGött’s δέδωκα, the *dedi* of the “European” group (E; the text can be found in the table above) has as equivalents *posui* in group X of the Old Latin witnesses to Isaiah (as well as some witnesses to the alternative text of Jerome, the O group); the “African” group (K) has *manifestavi*. With the exception of the K group, these equivalents are acceptable translations for the Hebrew tradition’s use of חָרֵם.<sup>82</sup>

The Vulgate’s reading of *misericordias* as equivalent for the TA OCIA of D05 is not found among witnesses to the Old Latin text of Isaiah, where *sancta* is read throughout, except for some witnesses of the X group, which read *religiosa*. The Vulgate’s rendering bespeaks the difficulty with translating the Hebrew tradition’s *חסדי* with τὰ ὅσια and a following genitive, as

---

<sup>80</sup> The Hebrew tradition knows at least two different readings at this point, but both these readings have חָרֵם as stem. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> has כּוֹפְּרָה where 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> has כּוֹפְּרָה. The MT’s כּוֹפְּרָה is most probably an orthographical variant for the 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> reading. 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> has an unfortunate gap at this point, but judging by the partly remaining א is supports the 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> reading (or, on account of spatial considerations, the MT’s shorter form) (cf. Ulrich & Flint 2010b:177).

<sup>81</sup> Similarly, Aquila’s translation of Isaiah 55:3 has κοψω, a more literal translation of the Hebrew tradition’s אֲכַרְתוּ. The variants of כּוֹפְּרָה in the Qumran scrolls and the MT are listed by Ulrich & Flint (2010b:177) as variants of text critical importance: 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and 4QIsa<sup>c</sup> reads כּוֹפְּרָה, while 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and MT have כּוֹפָרָה. This difference has no impact on the understanding of the relation between the texts of the Hebrew, Greek OT and Latin OT.
the translator(s) of the LXX have seemingly done. The Hebrew tradition knows no variant at this point of the text. Muraoka (2010:87) lists only one instance of יָשָׁן being translated with ὅσιος (i.e., Isaiah 55:3); however, twenty-six places are known where ὅσιος is used as translation for יָשָׁן (cf. Hatch & Redpath 1896:1019; Holtz 1968:137). Nevertheless, in the face of the absence of extant Hebrew witnesses to the reading יָשָׁן, it is likely that the reading in the Greek OT tradition came about through a translator’s one-off link between the related meanings of יָשָׁן and יָשֶׁן, producing the reading ὅσια. This is unlikely to have happened in both the Greek and Latin OT traditions; more likely, the Old Latin witnesses to the text of Isaiah 55:3 are straightforward translations of the Greek text. The same is true for the Latin NT (including d05) – it is more likely to be a translation of the Greek tradition (whether OT or NT), or to be based on a Latin OT tradition that was a translation of the Greek OT tradition, than to be a direct translation of the Hebrew tradition.

The discussion above makes clear that many of the Old Latin witnesses to the text of Isaiah 55:3b-4 bear a resemblance to the Latin text of Acts 13:34b, agreeing more with the Greek OT tradition than with the Hebrew tradition. Yet, although the Latin NT’s wording of Acts 13:34b is partly similar to some of the Old Latin texts, the text unquestionably follows that of the Greek NT, not including testamentum aeternum (or its equivalents) and having a form of

---

83 For a short discussion of the peculiar nature of this translation, see Johnson (1992:235).
84 This once-off translation of יָשָׁן with ὅσιος has, according to Goldsmith (1968:323), been taken advantage off by the author of Acts.
85 A reading of יָשְדִי דוד as “the faithful ones of David” in the text of a translator who opted for ὅσιος is an unlikely possibility, as Isaiah 55:3’s reading has a neuter form – thus not referring to people, but to things.
86 On the phrase τὰ ὅσια Δαυίδ as a translation of the Hebrew tradition’s יָשְדִי דוד, as well as its use in Acts 13:34, see Gentry (2007:279-304). Gentry (2007:300) argues that “David” is the subject of this clause, and that the name (“David”) is used in Acts 13:34 as a rubric for the Messiah.
87 Later translations of the Hebrew in the Greek OT tradition most likely had יָשָׁן in their Vorlagen: both Symmachus and Theodotion have ελεη̄ as an equivalent. Theodotion’s translation purposefully moved away from the Greek OT tradition espoused by Christians (Müller 1996:71; cf. Jellicoe 1968:75-76), and in so doing kept very close to his version of the Hebrew text (Jobes & Silva 2000:271-272). In similar vein, Holtz (1968:137) sees the difference between the Greek OT tradition and the Hebrew tradition as an argument for the Greek NT tradition’s dependence on the Greek OT tradition. Bock (1987:251), in contrast, notes that the two texts could have been brought together by “midrashic linking” even in the Hebrew tradition through Isaiah 55:3’s יָשָׁן and Psalm 15 (LXX)’s יָשְדִי, but this does not increase the likelihood of the translation using the same terms.
dare at the start of the quotation. In so doing, the Latin NT goes with the Greek NT against the OT traditions, including the Hebrew tradition,\textsuperscript{88} without any later adjustment whatsoever.

### 3.5. Conclusion

The quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34 in D05 is not indicated as its own paragraph, but it is indented. This evinces a degree of OT awareness with regard to the quotation, but, as will be discussed below, this OT awareness did not coincide with a consultation of manuscripts of the OT traditions of Isaiah.

The introductory formula of the quotation reads the same in D05 than in the rest of the Greek NT tradition (and the same is true for d05 and the Latin NT tradition). The introductory formula provides no clear indication of the OT origin of the quotation, and the impression could be created that it stems from the Psalms,\textsuperscript{89} as it is wedged between two quotations from that book.

The fact that there is no deviation from the rest of the NT tradition in this quotation in D05 should not be ascribed to the D05 tradition’s identification of this text as an OT tradition. The OT traditions read markedly different than D05 (and the rest of the Greek NT tradition), yet the D05 text of Acts 13:34 have been indented. Furthermore, it should be noted that the OTI (in D05) and \textit{QUIA} (in d05), in both cases markers of direct speech which are not part of the OT text, have also been indented. The indentation seems, at this point, to be mechanical and on the grounds of the introductory formula only. Apart from the quotation’s indentation, there is no sign that the quotation was known to read differently in the OT traditions.

---

\textsuperscript{88} The text relevant to this discussion has no text critical note in the BHS apparatus. Three of the scrolls discovered at Qumran contain parts of Isaiah 55:3b-4 (1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}, 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b} and 4QIsa\textsuperscript{c}). 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} and 1QIsa\textsuperscript{b}, although containing some minor variants (for which see Parry & Qimron 1999:91; Ulrich & Flint 2010b:177), agree in general with the MT. The order of the fragmentary text of 4QIsa\textsuperscript{c} agrees with other OT traditions, at least with regard to the verbs \textit{כרת} and \textit{נתן}. (In 4QIsa\textsuperscript{c}, only two snippets of Isaiah 55:3b-4 have been preserved: \textit{לעמה ראיהיה} on line 13 and \textit{אורים} on line 14; cf. Skehan & Ulrich 1997:70).

\textsuperscript{89} Cf. the discussion of the introductory formula of the immediately following quotation in D05, that of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35.

4.1. The physical text of D05

| ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΤΕΤΑΛΚΕΝ Ο ΚϹ | ITA ENIM MANDATUM DEDIT NOBIS ĐŊŚ |
| ΙΔΟΥ ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ ΣΕ ΤΟΙϹ ΕΘΕϹΙΝ | ECCE LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS |
| ΤΟΥ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΣΕ ΕΙϹ ΩϹ ΩϹ ECXATOY ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ | UT SINT IN SALUTEM USQUAE AD ULTIMUM TERRAE |

4.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of this quotation is on Folio 471b. The left side of this page has been cut off, but the writing has thankfully been preserved. The quotation has not been indented nor treated in any special way by the scribe, save for the fact that the next paragraph starts directly after it (KAI AKOYONTA – Acts 13:48), by way of the first letter (K) being written more than halfway in the margin. The quotation starts on its own line. The previous indication of a new paragraph is at the beginning of the direct speech in Acts 13:46 (ҮΜΕΙΝ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΗΝ ΛΑΛΗΘΗΝΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΟΝ (sic, corrected to ΛΟΓΟΝ secunda manu) TOY ΘΥ, as it reads in D05).

4.1.2. Corrections in D05

The original ENTETALKEN has been changed into ENTETALTE ΗΜΙΝ (intending ἐντέταλται ήμίν) by partially rubbing out the K and supplying a crossbar on top of the remaining vertical line, by rubbing out the diagonal line of the N and supplying a horizontal bar in the middle to produce a H, and writing MIN in smaller script above the line.91

The last line of the quotation goes way outside the margin on the right, and ΓΗϹ is written in smaller letters, especially the final two. The C of the THC before ΓΗϹ deserves a closer look,

---

90 For a recent discussion of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 within the context of the gentile mission, see Meek (2008:24-55); for a discussion on the quotation against its OT background and within the context of Acts with regard also to other Isaiah quotations in Luke-Acts, see Koet (2006:69-72).

91 This has been done by corrector D, according to Scrivener (1864:443). The correction brings the D05 text in line with the bulk of NT manuscripts, which read ἐντέταλται ήμίν (cf. Parker 1992:152).
since the scribe seems to have made an in scribendo correction which has escaped Scrivener’s notice, as can be seen in the picture below:

Figure 5: Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis, Fol 471b, line 15 (Source: Cambridge University Library MS Nn.2.41).92

A straight vertical line has been drawn on top of which the C has been superimposed. The straight line could have been intended as the vertical line of the following Γ. The horizontal stroke to the left at the bottom of the letter’s vertical line, as this stroke seems to have, does not necessarily agree with the shape that a Γ would have in D05. A similar horizontal stroke sometimes occurs in a K (usually decorative, at the beginning of a line, but then much longer), or in a B. In the case of the B, however, the horizontal stroke is caused by the B’s bottom semicircle, as the scribe drew the letter past the vertical line from right to left. The best explanation for the correction in Acts 13:47 is that the little horizontal stroke is a smudge, and in that case, an intended Γ remains the most viable option.

4.1.2. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation is found on Folio 472a. The quotation is not indicated in any way, except that what follows directly after the quotation is indicated as a new paragraph by an

92 This image is reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.
enlarged letter being written completely in the margin (*ET CUM AUDIRENT* – Acts 13:48). As in the Greek, the quotation starts on its own line. The paragraph in which the quotation occurs starts at the beginning of the direct speech in Acts 13:46 (*UOBIS OPORTEBAT PRIMUM LOQUI UERBUM DNT*). The sentence ending on *TERRAE* is quite long; the result is that both *A* and *E* are written smaller – the diagonal stroke of the *A* interestingly with the same length as other *A*’s in the text (thus, taking up the same amount of space as a normal *A*).

The motivating factor in establishing the paragraph seems to be the D05 tradition’s awareness of this text as direct speech. Hence, the start of a new paragraph immediately after the Isaiah 49:6 quotation gives no indication that the text of the quotation was treated or understood in any special way.

4.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are no identifiable corrections to the text of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 d05.

4.2. Other quotations or allusions to Isaiah 49:6 in the text of D05

Isaiah 49:6 is alluded to in Matthew 12:18, Luke 2:32, John 8:12 and Acts 1:8, according to the NA’s list of *loci citati vel allegati*.94

4.2.1. Isaiah 49:6 / Matthew 12:18

Matthew 12:18-21 is a quotation from Isaiah 42:1-4. Isaiah 49:6 is mostly seen as an allusion in the final phrase of Matthew 12:18 (καὶ κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ) on thematic grounds: Both

---

93 The Greek and Latin differ in this opening line of the paragraph: D05 has ΘΥ while d05 has *DNT*.
94 Meek (2008:42) also discusses Acts 26:22-23 as a possible allusion to Isaiah 49:6, but this text has not been preserved in D05, as the manuscript breaks off at Acts 22:29. Pao (2000:84-86) further identifies Luke 24:46-47 as containing an allusion to Isaiah 49:6. He (2000:86, footnote 91) notes that “[e]ven if one is not willing to accept the link between Acts 1:8 and Luke 24:47, a direct connection can be established between Luke 24:47 and Acts 13:46 through the use of the same phrase εἰς ... τὰ ἔθνη in both Luke 24:47 and Acts 13:46.” As Pao’s link is by no means evident, this possible allusion will not be discussed in this study. However, it is worthy to note that in Luke 24:47 D05, the phrase εἰς πᾶντα τὰ ἔθνη on which Pao builds his link has as an equivalent ΩϹ ΕΠΙ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑ ΕΘΝΗ – effectively obscuring the link between the two texts in D05.
Isaiah 42:1-4 (Matthew 12:18-21) and Isaiah 49:6 speak of the suffering servant. D05 reads with the rest of the Greek NT tradition in this phrase, and no influence on the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 is discernable. The Itala (cf. Jülicher 1972:73) shows very little variation in the phrase in question, or in the context of the phrase in the Latin NT tradition. In fact, the *ET IUDICIUM GENTIBUS ADNUNTIABIT* of d05 agrees with most Old Latin texts of the NT, differing only slightly from the manuscripts *c*, *h* and *l* and the generally accepted Vulgate reading (cf. Wordsworth & White 1898:86), all of which read *nuntiabit*. Furthermore, there is no reason to suspect influence of the Old Latin of Isaiah 42:1 on the quotation in Acts 13:47.

4.2.2. Isaiah 49:6 / Luke 2:32

The allusion in Luke 2:32 occurs at the end of Simon’s eulogy,95 which is composed from a number of OT references including Isaiah 49:6. The allusion to Isaiah 49:6 is slight: the only words in common found in Luke 2:32, Acts 13:47 and Isa 49:6 are φῶς and ἐθνῶν, but the respective terms for salvation (σωτηρία / σωτήριον) are also worthy of note. Parallel terms have been underlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἵδον τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἴναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς</td>
<td>ὁτι εἴδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ σωτηρίον σου, ὃ ἔτοιμας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.</td>
<td>οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος·τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἴναι σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Luke and Isaiah speak of a “servant”; the contexts are therefore similar and could easily have called Isaiah 49:6 to a scribe’s mind.96 In the D05 version of Luke 2:30-32, however, there
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is no equivalent for ἑθνῶν (the D05 text reads ΦΩϹ ΕΙϹ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΞΑΝ). The scribe of D05 himself could have left out an equivalent of ἑθνῶν for theological purposes,97 but if the word was not present in the Vorlage of D05 either, which is more likely, the reference to Isaiah 49:6 (and Acts 13:47, if a case of harmonisation between the two NT texts is what is sought for) is considerably harder to notice in the text of Luke 2:30-32 in D05. Similarly, there is no equivalent for ἑθνῶν in Luke 2:30-32 in d05, whereas other Old Latin NT manuscripts read gentium (or oculorum in the case of b and e)98 (cf. Jülicher 1976:22). The references to Isaiah 45:21 in Luke 2:30-32 and Acts 13:47 in D05 did not inspire a change of one text based on the other.

4.2.3. Isaiah 49:6 / John 8:12

The text of John 8:12 in D05 reads, for all practical purposes, the same as that of NA28,99 except for one case of difference in word order.100 Direct influence on the text of John 8:12 in D05 on account of text of Acts 13:47 in D05 can thus be ruled out. Keeping in mind the difficulties of translating Greek into Latin, the text of John 8:12 in d05 agrees with that of D05, except in one case of word order (D05 reads O ΑΚΟΛΟΥΘΩΝ ΕΜΟΙ, while d05 reads QUI ME SEQUITUR).101 This difference in word order cannot be explained by way of influence from

---

97 See Meek (2008:27-43) for a concise discussion of Isaiah 42:6 and Isaiah 49:6 against the background of the Servant Songs of Isaiah. Meek’s discussion follows the Hebrew text, but he gives due consideration to the Greek OT tradition where the texts differ.

98 Wordsworth & White (1898:319) add a number of witnesses for oculorum, but d05 is the only NT Latin witness with no equivalent for ἑθνῶν.

99 D05 has an orthographical variant for σκοτίᾳ (ϹΚΟΤΕΙΑ).

100 D05 transmitted the words αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν in a different order (ΕΛΑΛΗϹΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙϹ) than the greatest part of the tradition (but cf. Elliott, Parker & Schmid 2007:340, which shows that a different order (αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν) predominates among the majuscules, with the Textus Receptus reading yet another order (ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν)). The order of D05 is the same as that of D05, and all the Old Latin witnesses to the text of John in which an equivalent for the phrase is present have the equivalent text in this order (with the exception of b c q; cf. Jülicher 1963:87; Wordsworth & White 1898:563). Influence on the D05 text of John 8:12 by the Latin NT is a possibility here, but there are other Greek witnesses which have this order (1 33 127 209 etc. – cf. Tischendorf 1869:836; Elliott, Parker & Schmid 2007:340).

101 There is also one difference with regard to tense, but this difference could be due to an orthographical shift. Where D05 reads ΟΥ ΜΗ ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΗϹΗ, d05 reads NON AMBULAUIT. The aorist subjunctive of D05 (in agreement with the rest of the Greek NT tradition) could be understood as describing a present or future possibility (“will certainly not walk in darkness”), but not past (“certainly didn’t walk in darkness”), as the following verb in the future tense (ΕΧΕΙ) makes clear. The perfect tense of d05, which can only be understood in a past sense, is mirrored in some witnesses to the Latin text of John (cf. Jülicher 1963:87; Wordsworth & White 1898:563). The best explanation for the reading of d05 is an orthographical shift of b to u, the “most common” (Parker 1992:107)
either Acts 13:47 in d05 or the Latin text tradition of Isaiah 49:6. Both the Latin NT tradition and the Latin OT tradition did not influence the text of John 8:12 in d05. The lack of influence from both the Greek and Latin traditions on John 8:12 (or vice versa) is not surprising, as there are little to no verbal clues, except for the catchword φῶς (to use the Greek as example), to connect John 8:12 with Acts 13:47.102 The association in the mind of a reader (or scribe) of the texts between the φῶς ἐθνῶν of Acts 13:47 (as most of the Greek NT manuscripts read) and the φῶς τοῦ κόσμου and φῶς τῆς ζωῆς of John 8:12 relies heavily on context. The association of John 8:12 with Acts 13:47 becomes even more difficult to perceive in the text of D05, where ΦΩϹ is not qualified by a genitive, as the ἐθνῶν of the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition has as an equivalent in D05 ΤΟΙϹ ΕΘΝΕϹΙΝ at the end of the clause.103 Moreover, with regard to d05, two different terms are employed as equivalents for φῶς (LUX / LUCEM in John 8:12 and LUMEN in Acts 13:47), which makes it very unlikely that the text of John 8:12 in d05 had any influence on the text of Acts 13:47 in d05. If anything, both D05 and d05 are further removed from John 8:12 than the greatest part of the NT tradition (and the text of NA28, on which the list of loci citati vel allegati relies).

4.2.4. Isaiah 49:6 / Acts 1:8104

The allusion to Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 1:8 occurs on Folio 416b in D05. The phrase ΚΑΙ ΕΩϹ ECXATOY THC ΓΗϹ is on its own line,105 and the same conditions are true for the Latin text on Folio 417a. The whole phrase, ET USQUE AD ULTIMUM TERRAE, is written on its own line. There is a difference in the spelling of USQUE (Acts 1:8) and USQUAE (Acts 13:47) in d05. This difference in spelling is an orthographical shift of a type which is common in d05 orthographical shift in d05 with regard to consonants. Thus, the intention of d05 is most likely ambulabit, which essentially agrees with D05.

102 The difficulty in seeing the similarity (either with Isaiah 49:6 or Acts 13:47) is exemplified by the fact that the allusion to Isaiah 49:6 in John 8:12 was not indicated in the margin or list of loci citati vel allegati in NA27, but has only been included in the thoroughly revised list of NA28.103 See the discussion of the text of Acts 13:47 in D05 below.

103 See the discussion of the text of Acts 13:47 in D05 below.


105 There is a dot before this line in the margin. Scrivener (1864:328) does not print the dot in his transcription of the manuscript, but prints a dot on the I of ΚΑΙ. The meaning of the dot is unclear: no other OT quotation, in any case, is indicated in the Acts of D05 in this way. The Latin of Acts 1:8 in d05 has no equivalent dot in the margin.
(cf. Parker 1992:107). Noticeable, however, is that the **ULTIMUM** of Acts 1:8 in d05 agrees with the **ULTIMUM** of Acts 13:47 in d05. Although *ultimum* is the most common text of the Latin NT tradition in Acts 1:8, the same cannot be said for Acts 13:47 (as will be discussed in more detail below).

### 4.3. Introductory formula

The introductory formula of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 D05 (ΟΥΤΩϹ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΤΕΤΑΛΚΕΝ Ο ΚϹ) differs in two respects from the majority of manuscripts in the Greek NT tradition. The first of these differences is ENTETALKEN, which is read as ἐντετάλται by most manuscripts. Only one eleventh century manuscript, 1838, reads εντεταλκεν with D05. The only difference between the two forms of the word is that ENTETALKEN is active, while ἐντετάλται is in the middle form – the latter being the most common Greek usage. The difference in meaning, however, is negligible.

Although the introductory formula in d05 (*ITA E NIM MANDATUM DEDIT NOBIS D̅ N̅ S̅*) is unique in reading MANDATUM DEDIT as an equivalent for ἐντετάλται (and praecepit) in the Latin NT tradition, this reading is not remarkable. MANDATUM DEDIT offers a reasonable translation of the word as found in D05 or the rest of the Greek NT tradition.

Of greater importance than the ENTETALKEN of D05 is the lack of an equivalent in the manuscript for ἡμῖν, which normally follows ἐντετάλται. Although a few manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition read these two words in a different order, only D05 and the thirteenth century manuscript 378 do not contain an equivalent for ἡμῖν. In the Latin NT tradition, every witness – including d05 – attests to nobis, except Cyprian. Here, the best explanation for a lack

---

106 The Greek spelling of the phrase ΕΩϹ ΤΟΥ ΕϹΧΑΤΟΥ ΤΗϹ ΓΗϹ is exactly the same in D05 as in the rest of the Greek NT tradition.
107 The form ενταλκεν is found in 0142 81 630 1175, and εντεταλκεν in 1751 and 1852. Although the latter is possible, it could also be due to an error of sight (mistaking α for ο or ε for ο in miniscule script).
108 Compare Codex Gigas and Gaudent, with manduit.
109 The order ἡμῖν ἐντετάλται is read in: 43 383 607 614 629 630 1241 1251 1292 1501 1563 1611 1852 1890 2138 2147 2243 2412 2652. Some of these manuscripts use different spellings. Additionally, ὑμῖν ἐντεταλκεν is read by 2718.
in D05 for ἡμῖν would be the difference in number that is created between this pronoun and the σέ as found in the quotation, in both D05 and the rest of the Greek NT tradition. In other words, the introductory formula of the Greek NT tradition describes the addressees of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in the plural, “to us” (ἡμῖν), and the quotation itself clearly refers to a singular “you” (σέ). This discrepancy in number was alleviated by the D05 tradition in removing ἡμῖν from the text. There are two possible grounds for the omission of ἡμῖν rather than changing σέ to ὑμᾶς (and thus resolving the discrepancy in number by changing both pronouns to the plural). The first is that, through a sense of OT awareness, the scribe realised that the quotation was from the OT and did not want to change the OT text (cf. Pao 2000:100-101, footnote 167). The second reason could be that the σέ occurs twice, and that it was easier to remove one word than change two. However, this reason seems less likely.

4.4. OT awareness and the text of the quotation

4.4.1. D05 ἹΔΟΥ / d05 ECCE

The reading of ἹΔΟΥ in D05 at the start of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6, for which most Greek NT manuscripts do not have an equivalent, is not unique. However, the number of Greek NT

---

110 Schneider (1980:146, footnote 27; implicitly Johnson 1992:242) points out the discrepancy in number between the introductory formula and the quotation, and attempts to solve this problem by taking the singular σέ to apply only to Paul. Van Eck (2003:300) proposes an intermediate step as a possible solution: the quotation was aimed at Jesus, and then “concluseren Paulus en Barnabas uit de belofte van God aan de komende Christus dat het hun taak is om Hem aan de volkeren te verkondigen.” Van Eck continues to propose another possibility, namely that it “is ook mogelijk dat zij in de tweede persoon enkelvoud een persoonlijke opdracht hebben gehoord.”

111 Pao (2000:100, footnote 167) notes that the singular σε could be “due to Luke’s faithfulness to the text [of his Vorlage].” He further notes that, as the servant in the context of Isaiah 49:6 could be considered as a collective, this collective understanding could have been transferred from the context of Isaiah 49:6 into the context of Acts – that is to say, the collective understanding of the singular has been applied to both Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13:46-47 similar to how it is (possibly) applied in the context of Isaiah 49:6.

112 A result of the change by the scribe in the D05 tradition is that the CE of D05 can now be understood as Jesus (cf. Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps 2007:120), especially if the KC was understood as Yahweh.


114 See the discussion of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in the introductory chapter of this study, especially with regard to the quotation of Delebecque (1986:211), who takes the ἹΔΟΥ of D05 to stem from the OT, but does not make any distinction with regard to when this ἹΔΟΥ was added to the D05 tradition.

115 The most likely reading for the initial text of Acts 13:47 did not contain an equivalent for the ἹΔΟΥ of D05. Scholarly discussion has centred on why the author of Acts did not insert an ίδον at this point. Cf. Steyn (1995:199) and Rusam (2003:414) for summaries and suggestions of this debate. A plausible suggestion is offered by Van de
manuscripts with this reading is not large, and out of this group, D05 is definitely the earliest witness.116 In the Latin NT tradition, only e08 and Cyprian support the ECCE of d05. The situation is quite different with regard to Greek OT manuscripts, where an ἰδού occurs without fail. The Latin OT tradition is not unanimous, but reads an ecce for the largest part of the tradition, with some witnesses of the X group, the later “African” group (C), the “European” group (E) and the witnesses to Jerome’s alternative text which is different from the Vulgate (group O); the ecce slipped into some Vulgate manuscripts too. Conspicuously, no extant witness to the Hebrew tradition has an equivalent for the ÏΔΟΥ of D05. The most likely explanation for the ÏΔΟΥ of D05 and the ECCE of d05 is influence from the Greek OT tradition, although influence from a Latin OT tradition is also a possibility.117

4.4.2. D05 ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ CE TOIC EΘΝΕϹΙΝ / d05 LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS118

The ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ CE TOIC EΘΝΕϹΙΝ of D05 and the LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS of d05 is conspicuous in the Greek and Latin NT traditions. Not only is the word


116 Other Greek NT manuscripts which have an equivalent for the ΙΔΟΥ of D05 are E08 104 1175 1735 1838 1884. Here, the reading of 1884 is of lesser value for the reconstruction of the text, as it appears to be a direct copy of E08 (cf. Van der Bergh 2013:135 – footnote 21). To the list of Greek NT manuscripts reading ἰδου should be added 23, according to Tischendorf (1872:119; followed by Ropes 1926:128).

117 Possibly, the D05 tradition was reminded of the OT reading by the ἰδού present in the text of Acts 13:46b (ἵδον στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἐθνη). In D05, Acts 13:46’s ΙΔΟΥ occurs at the start of the line two lines before the text quoted from Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47. An error of sight – the scribe starting the new line with ΙΔΟΥ, and then continuing with the rest of the text of the Isaiah 49:6 quotation – is unlikely, since there is a whole line of text between the two times that ΙΔΟΥ occurs, and the texts following each instance of ΙΔΟΥ differs. Of course, the same argument applies to the text of d05, where the reading could also have originated.

118 Pervo (2009:343, footnote 117) remarks that, “[p]erhaps because of the tradition that viewed Jesus as the servant, the D-Text (Boismard, Texte, 228) reads οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν ἡ γραφή ἰδού φῶς τέθεικά σε τοῖς ἐθνεσιν (“For thus the Scripture said: ‘Behold, I have placed you as a light to the nations.’”’) Were it not for this clearly secondary introduction, this form of the citation would have some claim to priority, as it deviates more from the LXX.” Pervo’s argument is somewhat defective, as he relies on the edition by Boismard for his so-called “D-Text” – i.e., a reconstructed text of which the reading for Acts 13:47 is not found in any Greek NT manuscript. The introductory formula of D05 has not been revised in as severe a fashion as the text given by Boismard, yet the text of the quotation in D05 is the only text containing the quotation exactly as Boismard’s text. By his argument, Pervo would seriously have to consider the text of D05 as original. The criterium of difference from the Greek OT, however, is not sufficient to explain the unique nature of the D05 text. On the introductory formula in D05, see Delebecque (1986:275). Delebecque suggests that the reading of ENTETAAKEN in D05, unique among the NT writings, might be a stylistic improvement. For similar occurrences of possible improvements to the text of D05 by writing an active for the middle voice, see Yoder (1958:406).
order of D05 unique, but the dative form of TOIC ΕΘΕΝΕΙΝ has no other Greek manuscript that supports it. In the Latin NT tradition, the word order of d05 is seemingly supported by Cyprian’s text, but Cyprian attests to lucem where d05 has LUMEN and inter gentes where d05 has SUPER GENTIBUS. Together with d05, the Latin manuscripts D, Θ and Codex Gigas (as well as Cyprian) do not have an in preceding their respective equivalents for lumen; however, D and Θ have in gentibus where d05 has SUPER GENTIBUS. The text of d05 therefore seems to be unique.

In the Greek OT tradition, there are no witnesses reading the word order of the ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ CE of D05 or the dative TOIC ΕΘΕΝΕΙΝ. With regard to the Old Latin text of Isaiah 49:6, all

---

119 The different word order of D05, together with the ΙΔΟΥ of D05, places emphasis on the φῶς rather than the addressee, σε, according to Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2007:113). “In D05, the pronoun σε may well apply to Israel, in line with the tradition alluded to in the opening sentence of the speech, namely that the Jews were given the Torah in order that they might ultimately enlighten the nations.” Another possibility offered by Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps (2007:120) is that the quotation could apply to “Jesus as the servant of YHWH,” although they urge caution since “[i]t is questionable how established such an interpretation would have been in the first century.” For the Greek NT tradition as a whole, this latter suggestion should be considered with the fact that, independent of word order, the addressee of the quotation is in the singular – even though Paul and Barnabas are referred to (ἡμῖν – but not in D05!) in the introductory formula of the quotation. In answering this difficulty, Grelo (1981:368-372) has proposed – similar to Read-Heimerdinger & Rius-Camps – that the σε of Acts 13:47 refers to Jesus as the suffering servant. Bruce (1987a:73) – with reference to the allusion of Isaiah 49:6 in Luke 2:32 – prefers to think of Paul and Barnabas being “associated” with Jesus through this quotation, while Steyn (1995:197-198) takes the quotation, on account of its introductory formula, as “a direct command of the κύριος (Jesus), to his messengers, (Paul and Barnabas).” The question is taken up and discussed, with a concise summary of the different views, by Meek (2008:46-53).

120 As found in Cyprian Ad Quirinum 1.21 (text available in Bévenot & Weber 1972:24).

121 Cerfaux (1950:46) places great emphasis on the similarities between D05, d05 and the text of Cyprian. It is unlikely, according to Cerfaux – without explaining why he is of this opinion, that Cyprian would have been dependent on Acts, and therefore one has to presuppose a reading similar to the D05 text in what amounts to a reshuffled LXX. This source lies behind the “initial” text and Cyprian, according to Cerfaux. B03 (and witnesses reading the same) is evidence of a move back to the LXX, while at the same time removing the ἰδού. Cerfaux’s reasoning, however, is flawed on multiple accounts. For one thing, Cyprian clearly has connections with the “Western” tradition – and with d05 – as is evidenced in many other cases. Furthermore, why would the B03 tradition change the reading back to the LXX, but remove the ἰδού (cf. Haenchen 1954:160)? Haenchen (1954:160) notes the improbability of the Alexandrian editors (which Cerfaux presumes) to change the reading back into the “barbaric” Greek of the Greek OT tradition, if the D05 tradition has preserved the original reading in better Greek. Haenchen (1954:160) is of the opinion that something else happened to the D05 tradition: basing his argument partly on the τίθηκα of Acts against the δέδωκα of the Greek OT, he argues that the “initial” text of Acts 13:47 had a quotation that was close to the Hebrew (but not the Greek OT) (i.e., a text similar to B03 / NA28). This was changed into better Greek, “wobei man das zu der pathetischen Wortstellung passende ἰδού wieder aufnahm.” Haenchen is certainly wrong in stating that the quotation in the “initial” text does not stem from the Greek OT tradition unless one assumes a very free treatment of the material by Luke (cf. Steyn 1995:199), as the difference between these texts lies only in one word (τίθηκα / δέδωκα) – a word which is not impossible as a translation of the Hebrew tradition’s text. It should be noted that Haenchen, too, argues as if the changes in D05 were made by the same hand and at the same stage. In any event, the overwhelming amount of witnesses to the B03 reading makes Cerfaux’s position highly unlikely.
witnesses are likewise in disagreement with the order of the LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS of d05. Furthermore, only in a part of one of the groups identified by the Vetus Latina edition, the “European” group (E), does the reading gentibus occur, and this reading is without the preposition super.122 In most witnesses to both the Greek and the Latin OT traditions, an equivalent for εἰς διαθήκην γένους is read after σε in Isaiah 49:6.123 An equivalent for this reading cannot be found in any known witness to the Hebrew tradition,124 and Ziegler (1983:305; cf. Holtz 1968:33; Meek 2008:26-27) is probably correct in identifying the reading as harmonisation to Isaiah 42:6, which has a motif similar to Isaiah 49:6 (but cf. Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund 2008:261-262).125 More to the point, no Greek or Latin NT manuscript has an equivalent of εἰς διαθήκην γένους added to its text. The NT traditions’ persistence in not amending the text is likely to be a disregard for the OT traditions altogether, rather than a high regard for the Hebrew tradition (cf. Holtz 1968:32-33).126 In the case of D05, at least, the text is even further removed from the Hebrew tradition, reading a different word order and having a dative (TOIC EΘNECIN) where the most literal translation of a Hebrew text would have a preposition followed by a genitive (as translation for the two words in the status constructus, לארז

122 In Jerome’s 129th Epistle, the reading is cunctis gentibus. The two other witnesses have gentibus (in the Gesta conlationis Carthiginiensis) and in gentibus (in the text of Magonus Sucatus Patricius of Irene).

123 In fact, in the Latin OT tradition, it is only the X group of the Vetus Latina edition and the Vulgate which do not have this reading. The Greek OT tradition has the following witnesses which add εἰς διαθήκην γένους: S B-V-109-736-Qmg 22-48-51-231-763-620-147-90-130-311-36-93-96-46-86-233 87-91-309-490 198 39′ 403-613 449-770 538 544, the Coptic version, the Syrolucianic version, Eusebius (in the demonstratio evangelica and the Eclogae propheticae), Theodoret, Tyconius and Jerome.

124 The phrase ונתתיך לאור גויים לישועתי עד־咫 ska, as it reads in the MT, knows no differences of consequence in the Hebrew tradition. 1QIsaa has גואים as an equivalent for MT’s גוים, a mere case of orthography, and קצוי הארץ as equivalent for MT’s קצה הארץ (קצה ארץ in 1QIsa), which is unfortunately not completely extant in this verse). The difference between 1QIsaa’s plural and MT / 1QIsa’s singular is identified by Ulrich & Flint (2010b:171) as of text critical importance, but both words (i.e., קצה and קצה) – which Brown, Driver and Briggs (1906:892) indicate as two distinct words) convey the meaning “end” and σκηνατός and ultimum could be a viable translation for both. Of more interest is 1QIsaa’s plural form, but this plural has not found its place among Greek translations. The difference is, in any case, negligible (Meek 2008:26).

125 Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund (2008:261-262) questions the prominence given to the so-called “A-text” by Ziegler, but leaves open the possibility that this text could contain the Old Greek reading. In any case, Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund believe the author of Acts to have had as a Vorlage an Isaiah text reading like NA28’s Acts 13:47b. Similarly Haenchen (1954:160) and Jeska (2001:239, footnote 54) note the possibility that this reading was not found in the Vorlage of the author of Acts.

126 Another explanation for not amending the NT traditions’ texts is that, as was probably the case with the author of Acts, who may have purposefully omitted this reading even though it was present in his Vorlage, the reading does not fit the context of the quotation in Acts, which has the purpose of justifying Paul’s “turning from the γένος, the Jews, to the ἔθνη” (Barrett 1986:61).
Ropes (1926:128), Holtz (1968:32-33) and Delebecque (1986:296) are most likely correct to consider these changes in D05 in unison as an improvement made on stylistic grounds.

4.4.3. D05 TOY EINAI CE EIC CΩΘΠΙΑΝ EΩC ECXATOY THC ΓHC / d05 UT SINT IN SALUTEM USQUAE AD ULTIMUM TERRAE

The final part of the text of Acts 13:47 in D05 (TOY EINAI CE EIC CΩΘΠΙΑΝ EΩC ECXATOY THC ΓHC) reads the same as the bulk of the Greek NT manuscripts, which, in turn, read the same as almost all of the Greek OT witnesses. 127 The Latin NT tradition, however, is not homogenous. Most striking is the SINT of d05. No other witness in the Latin NT tradition agrees with d05 in this regard. Likewise, the witnesses to the Old Latin text of Isaiah 49:6 do not know the reading. As in the Latin NT tradition, the most common equivalent for d05’s SINT in the Old Latin OT tradition is sis. Some witnesses have sit, disagreeing with the SINT of d05 in grammar only with regard to number. 128 Although it is possible that a reading of sint could have changed into sit on account of an error of hearing, the opposite is not likely to have happened; consequently, the reading of SINT in d05 is not likely to have been derived from these Old Latin OT sources. Although it is conceivable that the SINT of d05 is meant to have as subject the “nations” (GENTIBUS) mentioned in the previous line, or that the plural was chosen to include both Paul and Barnabas, 129 the text following SINT in d05, IN SALUTEM, strains the Latin grammar to the breaking point. 130 The appositive TE, a singular, further counts against an interpretation of a change in number based on the quotation’s context in the Latin NT text.

---

127 Within the equivalent part of Isaiah 49:6, the only variants indicated in the LXXGött apparatus are three witnesses which do not have an equivalent for the CE of D05 (88 449-770) and one witness which has no equivalent for the EIC CΩΘΠΙΑΝ of D05 (565).

128 These witnesses are partly from the X group (BAR; HI ep 129 (Var); DO; CO 1,5 S (Var); (RES -R)) and one witness to the Vulgate text (τ 56*). The only other variant offered by the Old Latin OT tradition is esses, read by a part of the O group.

129 Less likely is that the plural form is based on an understanding of Acts 1:8, where the apostles are addressed.

130 It is worth noting that the difference between the TOY EINAI CE of D05 and the UT SINT of d05 is not indicated as a meaningful difference between the columns by Parker (1992:238). The versions of the Old Latin OT tradition reading sit (as mentioned above) do not have a grammatical difficulty, as they have no equivalent for the IN of d05 and have a nominative equivalent for SALUTEM.
A final point of interest in the Latin NT with regard to the present study lies with d05. Of all the Latin NT witnesses, only Codex Gigas reads the same as the ULTIMUM of d05. 131 This ULTIMUM is mirrored in merely one Old Latin group of Isaiah 49:6, the “European” group (E), but only partly. Moreover, these witnesses disagree with d05 in the rest of their text of Isaiah 49:6. 132 The situation is different with the text of Acts 1:8, which is identified as an allusion to Isaiah 49:6 in the loci citati vel allegati of NA28. In Acts 1:8, the bulk of the Latin NT tradition reads ultimum with d05. The text of Acts 1:8 in d05 which is a verbal equivalent to the final part of Isaiah 49:6 agrees completely with the final part of Acts 13:47, except for a matter of orthography, as has been pointed out in the discussion of Acts 1:8 under the section dealing with allusions to Isaiah 49:6 above. The final part of the text of Acts 13:47 in d05 may have been influenced by Acts 1:8; it is also possible that a translator of Acts was acquainted with the turn of phrase used in Acts 1:8 and translated Acts 13:47 accordingly. However, ultimum is a fair translation of the Greek NT tradition’s ἐσχάτου, and could have been made without recourse to the Latin NT tradition’s reading of Acts 1:8. The term could also have been a translation choice of the translator who made the first Latin translation in the d05 tradition, but unfortunately the occurrences of the term ἔσχατος is too scarce in the Acts narrative to draw any conclusions. 133 Accordingly, too much weight should not be afforded to the similarity of Acts 13:47 with Acts 1:8.

4.5. Conclusion 134

The text of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in D05 has not been indented. The quotation does not start a new paragraph, but the paragraph does end directly after the quotation. However, that the quotation heralds the end of the paragraph may be due to the fact that the quotation also ends the direct speech of Paul. To judge by other quotations (e.g. the quotations of

131 Cyprian, which in many cases agrees with the text of d05 – as can be seen in the discussion of the quotations from Isaiah above – has fines.
132 The witnesses in question are Philip the Presbyter (which reads posui te in lucem gentium, ut sis in salutem usque ad ultimum terrae); Magonus Sucatus Patricius cf 11 (in salutem usque ad ultimum terrae); and the Concilia Oecumenica 1,5 S (ecce dedi te in testamentum generis, in lumen gentium, ut sis salus usque ad ultimum terrae).
133 The term ἔσχατος occurs only in Acts 1:8, Acts 2:17 and Acts 13:47 in D05. In Acts 2:17, the term is not a geographical reference, but rather a reference to time, and this might have influenced the d05 translator to supply a different term (NOUISSIMIS).
134 See also the discussion of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in the introductory chapter of this study.
the Psalms in Acts of D05), this latter suggestion is more likely than the suggestion that the text of the quotation was indicated as an OT quotation by ending the paragraph after the quotation’s text. Rather, at the time of the production of D05, this quotation was not indicated as stemming from the OT at all.

There appears to be minimal to no influence from other allusions on the text of D05 in Acts 13:47. In fact, the text of Luke 2:30-32 (an allusion to Isaiah 49:6) and Acts 13:47 (a quotation of Isaiah 49:6) are even further apart than in the rest of the Greek NT tradition, as Luke 2:32 has no equivalent for ἐθνῶν in Luke 2:32. In the case of Acts 1:8 and Acts 13:47, the Latin text could have been kept the same intentionally (with reference especially to the ULTIMUM of both passages in d05), but the similarity could also be due to translation preference. In any case, there does not appear to be any meaningful changes to the text based on a perceived link between these two texts.

The introductory formula of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 has been altered in the D05 tradition. The ENTETAKEN found in D05 is a negligible difference with regard to OT awareness, but the lack of an equivalent for ἡμῖν in the D05 text could show a higher regard for the OT tradition than the NT tradition. However, this conclusion should be stated cautiously, as there are also other viable explanations for a possible omission of ἡμῖν in D05 (e.g. a simple desire to remove a discrepancy in numbers between Acts 13:46 and Acts 13:47 or an understanding of Jesus as the commissioned one, not Paul and Barnabas).

The text of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in D05 presents an interesting case. This text shows clear OT awareness in the addition of ἸΔΟΥ at the start of the quotation. Yet, at some stage in the D05 tradition, the text of the quotation has been altered to read ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ ΚΕ ΤΟΙϹ ΕΘΝΕϹΙΝ / LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS. This reading moves the D05 text from a reading more similar to the OT tradition than the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition to a position further away from the OT tradition than any other manuscript of the Greek NT tradition.
These alterations to the text in the D05 traditions have interesting implications for the interplay between text and layout in D05. Although other quotations from Isaiah are indented in D05, this quotation is not. Indeed, the physical layout of the manuscript shows no sign of OT awareness. If one assumes that the scribe was not responsible for the changes that have been made to the quotation in the D05 text, at least three stages of the D05 tradition, each with a different level of awareness of the OT tradition, can be discerned. In the first, ἰδοὺ was added, based on the reading of the Greek OT tradition.\(^{135}\) In the second, the text was revised – probably without knowledge of the text’s OT origin. In the third, the text was copied onto the manuscript, possibly still without knowledge of the text’s OT provenance.

The discussion above has also identified a previously unknown correction to the text of D05 in this quotation. However, there is no reason to suspect a different reading as the base of this correction; rather, the scribe made a mistake which was immediately corrected.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the explicit quotations from Isaiah in D05. The investigation has benefited from a much fuller array of text-critical witnesses, especially witnesses to the text of the Latin OT tradition. The investigation has shown that very few changes in the D05 tradition were made in order to adjust the D05 tradition’s text to the OT tradition.

The layout of the explicit quotations from Isaiah provides food for thought. Of the three explicit quotations extant in the text of D05, one has been partially indented (Acts 7:49-50), one has been completely indented (Acts 13:34 – including the introductory OTI of this quotation), and one has not been indented at all (Acts 13:47). The degree to which the quotations show OT awareness as evidenced by their indentation, partial indentation or lack of indentation does not entirely correspond to the degree to which changes in the text have been made towards OT traditions. This implies that another factor was at play in the decision to indent these passages in D05. One

\(^{135}\) This would also best explain the similarity of D05 with other manuscripts, such as E08, which read ἰδοὺ – the ἰδοὺ was probably added before D05 was changed in the rest of the sentence to disagree with these manuscripts. Of course, these manuscripts could have added ἰδοὺ based on the OT tradition independent from D05.
such a factor, if not the only one, is the introductory formulae to these texts. The two quotations that have been indented provide more distinct references to the OT tradition than that of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47. In the introductory formula of the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50, there is a reference to a “prophet”. Although not a clear indication of the quotation’s source, it could have pointed scribes to the OT tradition. The introductory formula of the quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34 does not clearly identify the source of the quotation, but the quotation is wedged between two quotations from the Psalms (Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 and Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35) and could have been interpreted as a quotation from the Psalms. The unindented quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47, however, has no clear reference to the OT in its introductory formula – in fact, the quotation is ascribed to the “Lord”.

The only variant reading in the D05 tradition with regard to the explicit Isaiah quotations worthy of mention here is the lack of an equivalent for ὑμῖν in D05 (and nobis in d05) in Acts 13:47. This change could indicate OT awareness in D05, if it originated from a desire to keep the OT text of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 intact. However, the variation could also have arisen through a different understanding of the meaning of the text (namely, that Jesus has been commissioned by Yahweh, rather than Paul and Barnabas by an ambiguous “Lord”).

The paragraphs in which explicit quotations from Isaiah are quoted seem to confirm the principle established in the investigation to the Psalms, namely, that the paragraphing system in D05 did not indicate OT quotations, but are based on other factors, and are probable in relation to the understanding of the narrative context.

The other allusions and quotations of the passages from Isaiah which are explicitly quoted in the text of Acts D05 show minimal influence on the text of the Isaiah quotations in Acts. In fact, in at least two instances, these allusions are much less likely to be recognised as allusions in the text of D05 and d05 as the manuscript stands today than in the most probable “initial” text. In D05, this can be seen in the lack of an equivalent for ἐθνῶν in the allusion to Isaiah 49:6 in Luke 2:32

136 See, however, the discussion of the introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35 in the chapter on the Psalms in the present study.
as opposed to the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47. In d05, an example of this would be the different terminology employed in the allusion to Isaiah 66:1-2 in Matthew 5:34-35a and the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50. The one instance where the text of a quotation (of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47) was seemingly kept intact in agreement with the text of an allusion (to Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 1:8) in d05 could also be due to the translation preference of the d05 translator.

As mentioned above, variant readings in the explicit quotations from Isaiah in D05 that betray influence from the OT are scarce. In fact, there can only be certainty in the case of two variant readings: that of ΠΟΙΟϹ ΤΟΠΟϹ in Acts 7:49 (where the rest of the Greek NT tradition has τίς τόπος) and ἩΔΟΥ in Acts 13:47 (where the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition has no equivalent for the term). Perhaps the ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ of Acts 7:50 should also be named under this category, but the reading is also found in a number of other Greek NT manuscripts, which makes direct dependence of the D05 tradition on the Greek OT tradition impossible to determine. The best explanation for these few and scattered adaptations to the Greek OT tradition is that these adaptations were made from memory. That is to say, no manuscript of the OT traditions has been consulted when these changes were made in the D05 tradition. This assumption is especially viable when, for example, the text of all the OT traditions of Isaiah 66:1-2 is compared to that of Acts 7:49-50 in D05 (and with the text of the Greek NT in general).

The investigation of the quotations of Isaiah in the Acts of D05 has shown that, at different stages of its transmission history, D05 shows different levels of awareness of the OT traditions. A good example is provided by the reading of ΠΟΙΟϹ in D05 in Acts 7:49, which stems from Isaiah 66:1. This passage has not been indented; consequently, the ἩΔΟΥ in D05 must have been added before the system of indentation was first used in D05 and also before the text immediately following ἩΔΟΥ was changed to ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ ΣΕ ΤΟΙϹ ΕΘΝΕϹΙΝ.

D05 may have been influenced by another Latin text than d05 (cf. the discussion of the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in D05). The text of d05 shows some similarities with the Old Latin texts of Isaiah. This could imply that these texts were known during the translation of the first text in the d05 tradition.
Chapter 5:
Conclusion

1. Introduction

This research venture was begun by asking the question: To what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text? After a thorough investigation of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, the Minor Prophets and Isaiah, enough evidence has been gathered to attempt to answer this question.

The outline of this chapter will loosely follow the methodology as set out in Chapter 1. The possible influence from other quotations and allusions in D05 of the passages quoted in the explicit quotations of the Psalms, the Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05 will first be discussed. The discussion will then turn towards the possible indicators of OT awareness in the layout of D05 – that is to say, the layout of the text of the explicit quotations from the OT as it appears on the manuscript itself. Following the discussion of the layout, conclusions with regard to the introductory formulae will be given. The focus will then turn to the possibility of OT awareness as evidenced by the text of D05 – especially in those instances where D05 has relevant variant readings (as measured against other Greek NT manuscripts). In conclusion, the relation between layout, introductory formulae and text of D05 will be considered. By drawing a conclusion on this relation between layout, introductory formulae and text of D05 – the three areas where OT awareness can possibly be seen – an answer will be supplied to the research question: To what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text?

---

1 See the discussion under the heading “The structure of the investigation”.
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2. Influence from other quotations and allusions in D05 on the explicit OT quotations in the Acts in D05

The influence from other quotations of and allusions to the same OT passage on the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05 is minimal. In fact, not one of the other quotations and allusions in D05 can unequivocally be shown to have influenced the text of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets or Isaiah in Acts in D05. In a few cases, scribes would have found a link between the two respective texts as they are found in D05 (and presumably the Vorlage of D05) even harder to perceive than in the rest of the Greek NT tradition.

An example of a situation where the two passages in D05 have grown further apart is the allusion to Isaiah 49:6 in Luke 2:32, where D05 has no equivalent for ἐθνῶν in Luke 2:32. The link between Luke 2:32, which contains the terms φῶς and ἐθνῶν in the greatest part of the Greek NT tradition, and Isaiah 49:6b (τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν) has become unrecognisable in D05 (where Luke 2:32 reads ΦΩϹ ΕΙϹ ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΟΞΑΝ). The same principle seems to be at work in d05, where the text of Matthew 5:34-35a, which alludes to Isaiah 66:1, employs different terminology than the quotation of Isaiah 66:1 in Acts 7:49-50 in d05.2

The investigation has also shown that the scribe of D05 did not consult previously written quotations or allusions in D05, or the Vorlagen of these quotations or allusions, before or during the process of copying the text of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah onto the pages of D05.3 However, in one case (the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35), it appears that the scribe may have remembered the text of previous occurrences of the quotation (Matthew 22:44, Luke 20:42 and Mark 12:36) and adjusted the text – whether intentionally or unintentionally – towards these other instances

2 Compare SEDIS and SUBPEDANEUM in Matthew 5:34-35a with THRONUS and SCAMILLUM in Acts 7:49a in d05.
3 This conclusion, that the scribe of D05 did not consult other texts while copying the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05, agrees with the conclusion reached by Parker (1992:119; cf. Tuckett 2003:71) about the manuscript as a whole. Parker sums up this position in stating that the D05 “scribe is a copyist, and not a reviser nor a creator nor a translator.” In a study on B03, a similar conclusion was reached by Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund (2008:262) with regard to the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47. As the text in B03 of these two manuscripts differ, Karrer, Schmid & Sigismund conclude that this disagreement between the two passages “bietet somit ein gewichtiges Indiz, dass zumindest bis zu den großen Handschriften des 4. Jh. der Druck gering war, Zitat und zitierten Text abzugleichen.”
where the quotation is quoted. The scribe could easily have remembered this text as it is quoted four times in D05. Moreover, in the Vorlagen of D05, the text of these quotations was arranged exactly as the text is arranged in Acts 2:34-35 in D05, making the text even easier to recognise. However, this possible recognition did not result in a homogenous text of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in the text of D05; rather, some spots of the quotation seem to be repeatedly changed (e.g., the ΕΙΠΕΝ – Matthew 22:44 and ΛΕΓΕΙ – Luke 20:42, Mark 12:36 and Acts 2:34-35; ΑΝ ΘΩ – Matthew 22:44, ΤΙΘΩ – Luke 20:43, ΘΩϹΩ – Mark 12:36, ΘΩ – Acts 2:35). Could these differences perhaps be on account of faulty memory? This is a possible theory, but should be stated with due caution.

3. Possible indicators of OT awareness in the layout of the explicit OT quotations in D05

The two factors that could possibly distinguish text from the surrounding text in the layout of D05 are indentation and paragraph markers. For each explicit quotation from the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah, these two factors were listed at the start of the discussion of the respective quotation.

Before drawing final conclusions about the relation between indentation, paragraph markers and OT awareness in D05, it will be helpful to summarise the findings of the present study, as will be done in the table below. The column marked “Starts new paragraph” identifies quotations that start a new paragraph in the text of D05, but for this column, the introductory formula was mostly reckoned as part of the quotation. In only one instance (Acts 2:17-21), the quotation itself starts a new paragraph, but the introductory formula is in the previous paragraph. This case is indicated as “YES” in the “Starts new paragraph” column with an explanatory note in the “Remarks” column. No introductory formula has been indented in D05, but in the indented quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34, the OTI of D05 (QUILA in d05) forms part of the indented text.

Parker (1992:95) notes that recourse to the Vorlage(n) of the D05 text is indispensable in trying to gauge the text-critical value of the manuscript’s variant readings. The present investigation has proven the worth of Parker’s assertion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Quotation from:</th>
<th>Indented</th>
<th>Starts new paragraph</th>
<th>Ends paragraph</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ps 68:26 (LXX)</td>
<td>YES / 3 lines</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ps 108:8 (LXX)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This quotation shares the introductory formula of the previous quotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:17-21</td>
<td>Joel 3:1-5 (LXX)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The introductory formula is not part of the same paragraph as the text of the quotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25-28</td>
<td>Ps 15:8-11 (LXX)</td>
<td>YES / 14 lines</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:34-35</td>
<td>Ps 109:1 (LXX)</td>
<td>YES / 4 lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES (?)</td>
<td>The paragraph is ended directly after this quotation in D05, but not in d05.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25-26</td>
<td>Ps 2:1-2 (LXX)</td>
<td>YES / 5 lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The new paragraph starting after this quotation is not clearly indicated on the Greek side, but the Latin is clear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:42-43</td>
<td>Amos 5:25-27 (LXX)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:49-50</td>
<td>Is 66:1s</td>
<td>YES / 2 lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The quotation is only indented partially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:33</td>
<td>Ps 2:7</td>
<td>YES / 7 lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:34</td>
<td>Is 55:3-4</td>
<td>YES / 2 lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The introductory ΟΤΙ is at the start of the first line of the quotation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>Ps 15:10 (LXX)</td>
<td>YES / 2 lines</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:41</td>
<td>Hab 1:5</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No (?)</td>
<td>Whether the quotation ends the paragraph will depend on whether ΚΑΙ ΕϹΕΙϹΑΝ is seen to be part of the quotation or not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:47</td>
<td>Is 49:6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16-18</td>
<td>Jer 12:15; Amos 9:11-12 (LXX)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The Amos quotation ends the paragraph.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be deduced from the table above, paragraphs in D05 do not indicate explicit OT quotations as such, or even indicate OT awareness. In only two cases, the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 and the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 in Acts 2:25-28, is a quotation indicated as its own paragraph. Between these two cases, however, is another difference: the introductory formula of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 is not part of the same paragraph as the rest of the quotation, while the introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 in Acts 2:25-28 is part of the same paragraph as the quotation.

Although a number of explicit quotations from the OT coincide with the start or end of a paragraph in D05, this can be attributed to other factors than OT awareness. Paragraphs in D05 are more likely to mark turns in the Acts narrative. This seems to be true for texts in direct speech which set out an argument (compare, for instance, the ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΚΡΙΗΛΕΙΤΑΙ of Acts 2:22 and the ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ of Acts 2:29, both of which start a new paragraph) as well as for texts in direct speech which present a narrative (e.g. paragraph following Acts 13:47). Further investigation is needed to more precisely determine the relation between paragraph and text in D05, an enterprise which falls outside the scope of the present study.

Indentations are not the same as paragraphs in D05. This can be seen in six examples from the explicit quotations of the OT in Acts. In these six quotations, the text of the quotation itself has been indented, and the text immediately following starts a new paragraph by way of ekthesis. Text following other explicit quotations in Acts in D05 is not indicated by ekthesis, and the conclusion can only be that these texts do not start new paragraphs.

Indentation in D05 is a clear sign of OT awareness. This presupposition has been stated at the outset of the present study (cf. Chapter 1). After a thorough investigation of both the layout and text of the explicit quotation in Acts in D05, this statement can only be confirmed. However, the investigation has also shown that this statement needs to be nuanced. In one case, the quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34, an introductory OTI at the start of the quotation forms part of the indented text. This same quotation has been altered rather extensively from its OT form by the author of Acts, and this recast form has been left intact

---

5 Please consult the table above. In all the quotations where the end of a paragraph is indicated, the text immediately following resumes with ekthesis. This is also true for d05, but in the case of the quotation of Psalm 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34-35 in d05, the following text is not indicated as a new paragraph. See the discussion of this text in the chapter on the explicit quotations of the Psalms in D05 in the present study.
in D05. In another case, that of the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50, only a part of the quoted text has been indented, although a part of the unindented text agrees with the Greek OT tradition. These two examples illustrate that indentation is a sign of OT awareness in D05, but that this OT awareness does not necessarily imply exact knowledge of the text of the Greek OT tradition. If this is the case, another factor could have functioned as a trigger for these indentations. The most likely possibility for such a trigger seems to be the introductory formulae of the explicit OT quotations in D05, to which this discussion will now turn.

4. Introductory formulae of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05

At first glance, the introductory formulae of the explicit OT quotations of the Psalms in Acts D05 seem to be the most viable reason why these quotations were indented. A key term pointing to the Psalms (“David”) or a direct reference to the Psalms can be found in all the introductory formulae of explicit quotations of the Psalms in D05, except for the introductory formula of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35. This key term or direct reference to the Psalms would evoke a clear sense of OT awareness for scribes in the D05 tradition. The OT origin of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35 could be established through reference to the Acts text itself, as Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) is quoted in Acts 2:25-28 with a reference to “David” in its introductory formula. Consequently, all the explicit quotations of the Psalms in Acts in D05 could have been identified as stemming from the OT through their introductory formula, without consultation of or familiarity with the Psalms.

The explicit quotations from Isaiah in Acts in D05 seem to support the theory that explicit quotations were indented based on their introductory formulae. The “prophet” of the introductory formula of the indented quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 could have provided an indication of this quotation’s OT provenance. The indented quotation of Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34 does not contain a direct reference to the OT, but its location

---

6 If the OT origin of the quotation of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35 in the D05 tradition has been determined through the reference to the quotation of Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25-28, no consultation of or familiarity with an OT text needs to be presupposed. This implies that the ΕΤΕΡΩϹ found in the introductory formula of Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35, which have been argued to show OT awareness in the chapter on the explicit quotations of the Psalms in the present study, could have originated without reference to an OT tradition.
between two quotations from the Psalms (Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 and Psalm 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35) could have prompted a scribe to indent its text as well. The text of the final explicit quotation of Isaiah in Acts D05, Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47, has not been indented. This quotation does not have a clear reference to the OT in its introductory formula, as the quotation is ascribed to “the Lord” (Ο Κ."C). In the case of Isaiah, then, a clear reference in the introductory formula seems to have led to indentation.7

The introductory formulae of the explicit quotations of the Minor Prophets in Acts in D05, however, add a slightly different perspective to the idea that clear referents in the introductory formulae resulted in indentation in D05. The introductory formulae of three of the four explicit quotations from the Minor Prophets in Acts in D05 contain clear referents to the “prophets”.8 The introductory formula of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in D05 presents a special case, as the “initial” text of this introductory formula is difficult to determine. The two most likely options are that the “initial” text ascribes the quotation as being said διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ or as being said διὰ τοῦ προφήτου (as in D05).9 If the text of D05 is the “initial” text, the degree of OT awareness elicited by the introductory formula would be less. This lesser degree of OT awareness, in any case, is the state of affairs in D05 and presumably its Vorlage. Nevertheless, the term “prophet” itself could have pointed scribes to the OT, and the introductory formula of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) thus had equal chances to evoke OT awareness than the rest of the explicit quotations from the Minor Prophets in D05. However, none of the explicit quotations from the Minor Prophets in Acts in D05 have been indented. As the quotations from the Minor Prophets in Acts in D05 all have the same marker of origin (“prophet(s”)”) in their introductory formulae than the indented quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in D05, and could arguably be even more of a hint of an OT origin for the quotation in question (cf. ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ in Acts 7:42), the introductory formula in itself is not the only reason for indentation in D05. Rather, it appears that the OT awareness elicited by the introductory...

7 This conclusion is similar to the findings of the investigation by Schmid (2010b; 2010c; 2010d) and Sigismund (2010a) of the diplés in A01, A02, B03 and C04, as summarised by Sigismund (2010b:149).
8 The three introductory formulae of quotations of the Minor Prophets which contain a clear referent to the “prophets” are the introductory formulae of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43 (ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ ΕΝ ΒΙΒΛΩ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ, Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41 (ΤΟ ΕΙΡΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΝ ΤΟΙϹ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΑΙϹ) and Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 (ΚΑΙ ΟΥΤΩϹ ΣΥΝΦΩΝΗϹΟΥϹΙΝ / ΟΙ ΛΟΓΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ ΚΑΘΩϹ ΓΕΓΡΑΠΤΑΙ)).
9 See the detailed discussion of this introductory formula in the chapter on the explicit quotations of the Minor Prophets in D05 in the present study.
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formula as well as a vague familiarity with the text of the quotation in its OT form is the most likely explanation for the indentation of the text of quotations from the OT in D05.10

5. OT awareness in the text of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05

The text of the explicit OT quotations Acts of D05 shows little awareness of the text of the Greek OT tradition. Certainly, no large scale revision to the text of any specific Greek OT tradition can be determined. Indeed, the general structure of the Greek NT tradition has been kept intact, in the face of quotations that widely differ in form from their general Greek OT counterparts (e.g. Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41; Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50; Isaiah 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34).11

Although a number of changes have been introduced in the D05 tradition to the text of the explicit quotations from the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah, not many of these changes have been prompted by the OT traditions. Some variant readings of D05 show alteration based on the context of the passage in the D05 narrative of Acts (e.g. the KN̄MOY in the text of the quotation from Psalm 15:8-11 (LXX) in Acts 2:25 in D05 and the lack of an equivalent for αἰμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ άτμίδα καπνοῦ in the quotation from Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21).12 The addition of Psalm 2:8 after the text of Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33 in D05 can also be labelled contextual. This addition shows OT awareness, of course, but the investigation has shown that this addition was not made in a random fashion. Rather, the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33 in D05 was made with a sensitivity towards the context of the quotation of this Psalm in the Acts narrative of D05. Similarly, the change of the D05 text to ΓΝΩϹΤΟΝ ΑΠ ΑΙΩΝΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΤΩ ΚΩ ΤΟ ΕΡΓΟΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ in Acts 15:18 shows

10 The cautious stance by Parker (1992:34), however, should be kept in mind: “One hardly dare postulate a scribe who had either very limited knowledge of Scripture, or a drastically reduced canon. It is impossible to form any conclusion as to why this practice occurs where it does.”

11 Compare the findings of Karrer & Schmid (2010:164) in the description of the Wuppertal research project on OT quotations in the NT and the history of the biblical text, who conclude that “direct relationships between the transmission of the New Testament and the Septuagint are rarer than is often assumed … “ The database of OT quotations in the NT compiled by the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal / Bethel as part of this research project was of great help in this investigation, especially in its primary stages. The database was consulted online at: http://sigismund.org/easyview/. After the completion of the project, the full database was moved to http://www.sigismund.org/easyview_v10/ [accessed 21 March 2013] in an easy to use format, or to https://sigismund.org/lxx-nt/login.php [accessed 21 March 2013] for a broader overview of the data.

12 This idea of changes based on context also extends to the introductory formulae of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05 (e.g. the lack of ὑμῖν in the introductory formula of the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in D05) or text surrounded by a quotation from the Psalms, Minor Prophets or Isaiah in D05 (e.g. (ΑΕΙΕΙ) Κ-setup in D05 in the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21).
OT awareness in leaving the quotation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 intact, but at the same time shows a sensitivity towards the context of the Acts narrative. This sensitivity, coupled with changes based on context, suggest that the leading factor in intentional changes to the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in the D05 tradition was not a desire to conform the text to the OT traditions, but rather a desire to better adapt the text to its context within the Acts narrative of the D05 tradition.

Sensitivity towards the context, however, was not the only factor at work in the alteration of the text of the explicit quotations from the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05. A handful of changes show clear adaptation towards the Greek and Latin OT traditions. In explicit quotations from the Minor Prophets in D05, only the lack of an equivalent for the second occurrence of ἔργον (or the lack of an equivalent for the second occurrence of opus in d05) in the quotation from Habakkuk 1:5 in Acts 13:41 in D05 can be named with certainty as adjustment towards an OT tradition. Perhaps the lack of an equivalent for καὶ προφητεύσουσιν (or the lack of an equivalent for et prophetabunt in d05) in Acts 2:18 in the quotation from Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in D05 and the EFFUNDAM SPĪM (SPIRITUM in Acts 2:18) which occurs in Acts 2:17 and Acts 2:18 in this same quotation could be listed under this category as well. In the explicit quotations from Isaiah in D05, there are only two alterations to the text of the D05 tradition which bear witness to subsequent influence from the Greek OT tradition. These two alterations are the ΠΟΙΟϹ ΤΟΠΟϹ in Acts 7:49 within the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in D05, and the addition of ΙΔΟΥ in the quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in D05. In the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50, the word order of ΠΙΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ in D05 should possibly count among this list of subsequent OT influence too. In the Psalms, there is not one variant reading that unequivocally attests to subsequent influence from the OT (excluding the addition of Psalm 2:8 in Acts 13:33). However, it should be noted that the text of the explicit quotations from the Psalms in Acts in D05 does not vary greatly from that of the text of these Psalms in the Greek OT tradition. Indeed, D05 shows a high fidelity to the text of the quotations of the Psalms in Acts.

These scattered and isolated changes towards the OT traditions make it unlikely that manuscripts of the Greek OT tradition were consulted when changes were made to the text of

13 See the detailed discussions of the quotation of Psalm 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 in D05 and the quotation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 in D05 in the chapters on the Psalms and Minor Prophets in the present study.
the explicit quotations of the Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05.14 (The evidence on the quotations from the Psalms in Acts in D05 is inconclusive.) Rather, most changes appear to have been made through memory (and sometimes faulty memory).

There appears to have been a general sense of OT consciousness in at least one change to the text of the D05 tradition, that of the ΕΠΙ [ΤΑ ΜΕΡΗ] ΒΑΒΥΛΩΝΟϹ of the quotation of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43. This alteration cannot be traced to the text of any OT tradition. Rather, the text of D05 attests to a general familiarity with the history of Israel as presented by the OT.15

Finally, a word should be said about the relation between D05 and d05 in the explicit quotations from the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05. The presupposition with which this study set out, as noted in Chapter 1, is that D05 and d05 stem from different traditions and that the one is not a translation of the other. During the investigation, nothing was discovered to challenge this theory. In fact, there are clues – although this should be stated tentatively – that could point to an influence of a Latin tradition other than d05 on the text of D05 (e.g. D05 ΜΟΥ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΘΡΟΝΟϹ vs. d05 EST MEUS THRONUS in Acts 7:49; or D05 ΠΟΙΗϹΕΙ vs. d05 FACIENS in Acts 15:17).

6. Relation between layout, introductory formulae and text of explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05

The relation between layout, introductory formulae and text of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05 is not entirely unambiguous. In the case of the explicit quotations of the Psalms in Acts in D05, one can perhaps claim a more rigid relation between these three elements. All these quotations have been indented, their introductory formulae generally show clear OT awareness and their text does not substantially deviate from the Greek OT tradition. The situation is different with the quotations from the Minor Prophets in Acts in D05. These quotations do not provide any hint in their layout of their OT origin. Although they provide pointers to the OT in their

---

14 Cf. the similar conclusion of the investigation of the diplês indicating explicit quotations of the OT in A01, A02, B03 and C04 Schmid (2010b; 2010c; 2010d) and Sigismund (2010a) of the diplês in A01, A02, B03 and C04 as summarised by Sigismund (2010b:151).
15 Perhaps a similar trend will emerge from a study of the summary of Israel’s history (Acts 7:2b-50) in Stephen’s speech as presented in D05.
introductory formulae, their text differs (in some cases markedly) from the text of the Greek OT tradition. In one case (the introductory formula of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21), the introductory formula itself may have been changed because of this discrepancy between the text of the D05 tradition and the Greek OT tradition.\textsuperscript{16} The explicit quotations from Isaiah in Acts in D05 provide yet another point of view. In these quotations, there appears to be a correlation between the introductory formulae and indentation – but the text of the D05 tradition does not seem to have played a large role in the decision to indent text.

One conclusion that can be drawn from the study of the interplay between layout, introductory formula and text in the explicit quotations from the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05 is that the text of the quotations of the D05 tradition is a layered text.\textsuperscript{17} That is to say, there were different stages in the transmission of the text of the D05 tradition which had different levels of OT awareness. The text was sometimes changed to conform to the Greek OT tradition, while other stages of the transmission showed a lesser desire to keep the two traditions in agreement. An example where this layered tradition can be seen has already been given in the introductory chapter of this study as an example of the research problem, that of ἸΔΟΥ and the ΦΩϹ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ ΚΕ ΤΟΙ ΕΘΝΕϹΙΝ of the unindented quotation of Isaiah 49:6 in Acts 13:47. The investigation has confirmed the tentative conclusion arrived at in Chapter 1, namely that the text of Acts 13:47 underwent more than one alteration in the D05 tradition. As a further clear example, the text of the quotation of Isaiah 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in D05 can be named. In this quotation, the “initial” text of Acts read τίς τόπος. This τίς τόπος was changed to ΠΟΙΟϹ ΤΟΠΟϹ in the D05 tradition to bring the text in line with the Greek OT tradition. This change probably occurred before the text of the D05 tradition was indented – as the line which starts this clear adaptation to the OT tradition has not been indented in D05.

7. Suggestions for further research

The present study has focused on the OT awareness in the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05 and the role this awareness played in the final

\textsuperscript{16} See the detailed discussion of the introductory formula of the quotation of Joel 3:1-5 (LXX) in Acts 2:17-21 in the chapter on the explicit quotations from the Minor Prophets in Acts in D05 in the present study.

\textsuperscript{17} This layered nature of the text of the D05 tradition has been pointed out by, amongst others, by Parker (1992:96, 119), Tuckett (2003:71) and Gäbel (2011).
formation of the D05 text. In attempting to answer this question, a number of related questions – although not of direct pertinence to the question at hand – have been brought to the fore. It will be useful to offer an overview of these questions here as suggestions for further research.

First and foremost, the tradition of the explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in Acts in D05 begs investigation. In the introductory chapter of this study, it has been argued that these quotations present a different challenge than the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah to potential researchers. Nevertheless, it will be useful to analyse these quotations and compare this analysis to the findings of the present study to determine whether the same mechanics are at work in the explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in Acts in the D05 tradition than in explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah.

The present study has presupposed (as set out in Chapter 1) that the text of Acts and the Gospels stem from two different Vorlagen in the D05 tradition (as explained by Parker 1992:81-82). However, this presupposition does not obviate the need for comparison of the OT awareness and its influence in the two traditions (i.e. Acts of D05 and the Gospels of D05). Was the OT traditions perceived in the same way by the two branches of the D05 tradition? An answer to this question will have to be based on a careful study of the quotations of the OT in the Gospels similar to the present study’s investigation of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in Acts in D05.

The focus of the present study has been on the Greek text of D05. However, in a few instances, it has become clear that d05 shows affinities with the Old Latin text of the OT rather than with the later Latin NT tradition in explicit quotations from Isaiah. A closer investigation of the relation between the text of the explicit quotations of the OT in d05 (in both the Gospels and in Acts) and the Old Latin tradition of the OT may provide fruitful pointers in understanding d05 as a translation. Additionally, if it can be shown that the d05

---

18 See the addendum at the end of the present study for the text, layout and corrections of the explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in Acts in D05. Hopefully, this addendum could provide a springboard for a study on these explicit quotations as suggested here.

19 A study of the explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in Acts in D05 would most likely have to take into account the whole of Stephen’s speech (Acts 7:2b 50). The whole text of Stephen’s speech, being a summary of the history of Israel, is inextricably linked with the explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in Acts in D05. Only two of the ten explicit quotations from the Pentateuch in Acts in D05 occur outside of this speech (Deuteronomy 18:15-20 / Leviticus 23:29 in Acts 3:22-23 and Genesis 22:18 / Genesis 26:4 in Acts 3:25).
translator(s) were familiar with specific OT traditions, this could provide useful clues in understanding the provenance of d05 and perhaps the milieu in which the D05 tradition originated. Unfortunately, such a study is presently hampered by the lack of critical editions of the texts of many of the Old Latin texts.

A further question which has been touched on in the present study, but only in so far as it concerns the use of the explicit quotations of the OT in Acts in D05, is the relation between the text of D05 and the paragraphs into which this text has been divided. An investigation of this relation could provide clues as to how the community in which D05 (and most likely its Vorlage) originated understood and read the D05 tradition was understood.

8. Conclusion

In the present study, the concern was with the research question: *To what extent does the transmission history of Codex Bezae’s Greek text of Acts show awareness of the explicit quotations’ Old Testament origin and to what extent did this awareness play a role in the textual tradition up to the final formation of the manuscript’s text?* As the present chapter has shown, the answer to this question is multifaceted, but at least some final conclusions can be drawn.

The present study has proven beyond dispute that there was OT awareness and subsequent influence from OT traditions on the text of the D05 tradition. However, this OT awareness did not result in a large-scale revision of the text of the explicit quotations from the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05. Rather, in only a few cases were the text altered – perhaps even less than was previously supposed – to agree with the OT traditions. These alterations probably did not occur simultaneously. In fact, close scrutiny of the relation between text, layout and introductory formulae of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, Minor Prophets and Isaiah in D05 has revealed the layered nature of the D05 tradition. Lastly, it would seem, although such a statement can only be made cautiously and tentatively, that the scribes of the D05 tradition were more familiar with the Psalms and Isaiah than the Minor Prophets.

Work on understanding the D05 tradition should continue. Although the present study has provided an answer to a specific question on the relation between the D05 tradition and the OT traditions, there is still much to be done. One can only hope that further in-depth studies
of the text of the D05 tradition – and especially the text as it physically appears on D05 – will shed more light on this enigmatic tradition.
Addendum A: Explicit quotations in Acts in extant material from the Judaean desert

The following table lists all the extant manuscripts from the Judaean desert which contains text that overlaps with the text used in the explicit quotations in Acts. For the sake of completeness, quotations from the Pentateuch have been included in this list. Grey blocks in the table indicate text which is not extant in D05.

The table lists the volume of the Discoveries of the Judaean Desert series in which the text of the manuscript in question can be found. In some cases (e.g. Isaiah), there are also additional publications that can be consulted. These volumes have been listed with a “cf.” in brackets. The list relies mainly on the more extensive list drawn up by Ulrich (2002:203-228) in the index volume of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series, and the three separate lists (“Biblical Scrolls”, “Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha” and “Non-Biblical Scrolls”) in Vanderkam & Flint (2002:407-433).

Key:

{ } = Additional information; allusions
- = no extant witness in Qumran
[ ] = Text number, DJD volume

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Quotation from:</th>
<th>Extant material from the Judaean desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ps 68:26 (LXX)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Ps 108:8 (LXX)</td>
<td>4QPs\textsuperscript{c} [4Q87, DJD XVI]{marked with a “?” in the DJD index}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:25-28</td>
<td>Ps 15:8-11 (LXX)</td>
<td>4QPs\textsuperscript{c} [4Q85, DJD XVI]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:34-35</td>
<td>Ps 109:1 (LXX)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3:22-23 | Dt 18:15-20 / Lev 23:29 | 4QDeut\textsuperscript{t} [4Q33, DJD XIV]; 4QTest [4Q175 1.5-8, DJD V {non-Biblical ms}]
/ 11QpaleoLev\textsuperscript{a} [11Q1 (cf. Freedman & Mathews 1985)] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Quotation from:</th>
<th>Extant material from the Judaean desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:25</td>
<td>Gn 22:18; 26:4</td>
<td>-; -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:25-26</td>
<td>Ps 2:1-2</td>
<td>11QPs(^c) [11Q7, DJD XXIII]; 4QFlor [4Q174 3.18-19, DJD V {non-Biblical ms}]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:3</td>
<td>Gn 12:1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:6-7</td>
<td>Gn 15:13-14 / Ex 2:22</td>
<td>4Q464 frag. 3 2.3-4 [DJD XIX {non-Biblical ms}] / 4QpaleoGen-Exod(^l) [4Q11, DJD IX]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:27-28</td>
<td>Ex 2:14</td>
<td>4QExod(^b) [4Q13, DJD XII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:32(^*)</td>
<td>Ex 3:6.15s</td>
<td>-4QpaleoGen-Exod(^l) [4Q11, DJD IX], 4QGen-Exod(^a) [4Q1, DJD XII], 4QExod(^b) [4Q13, DJD XII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:33-34(^*)</td>
<td>Ex 3:5; Ex 3:7-8.10</td>
<td>-; 4QGen-Exod(^a) [4Q1, DJD XII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:35</td>
<td>Ex 2:14</td>
<td>4QExod(^b) [4Q13, DJD XII]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:37</td>
<td>Dt 18:15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>Ex 32:1.23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:42-43</td>
<td>Amos 5:25-27 (LXX)</td>
<td>CD 7.14-15 {non-Biblical ms}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:49-50</td>
<td>Is 66:1-2</td>
<td>1QIsa(^a) [1QIsa(^a), DJD XXXII (Cf. Parry &amp; Qimron 1999)]; 1QIsa(^b) [1Q8, DJD I (Cf. Sukenik 1954)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:32-33</td>
<td>Is 53:7</td>
<td>1QIsa(^a) [1QIsa(^a), DJD XXXII (Cf. Parry &amp; Qimron 1999)]; 1QIsa(^b) [1Q8, DJD I (Cf. Sukenik 1954)]; 4QIsa(^c) [4Q57, DJD XV]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:33</td>
<td>Ps 2:7-8</td>
<td>11QPs(^c) [11Q7, DJD XXIII]; 3QPs [3Q2, DJD III]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:34</td>
<td>Is 55:3-4</td>
<td>1QIsa(^a) [1QIsa(^a), DJD XXXII (Cf. Parry &amp; Qimron 1999)]; 4QIsa(^c) [4Q57, DJD XV]; 1QIsa(^b) [1Q8, DJD I (Cf. Sukenik 1954)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>Ps 15:10 (LXX)</td>
<td>4QPs(^c) [4Q85, DJD XVI] {VanderKam &amp; Flint do not list this verse, but indicates that the extant text ends at v9 - the only extant portion of Ps 15:10 (LXX) is three letters, all marked with big circles in the DJD XVI edition.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:41</td>
<td>Hab 1:5</td>
<td>MurXII [Mur 88, DJD II]; 8HevXIIgr [8Hev 1, DJD VIII]; 1QpHab 1.16-2.1 {non-Biblical ms}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Quotation from:</th>
<th>Extant material from the Judaean desert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13:47</td>
<td>Is 49:6</td>
<td>1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; [1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;, DJD XXXII, Parry-Qimron (Cf. Parry &amp; Qimron 1999)]; 1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; [1Q8, DJD I (Cf. Sukenik 1954)]; 4QIsa&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt; [4Q58, DJD XV]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:16-18</td>
<td>(Cf. Jer 12:15); Amos 9:11s (LXX); (Cf. Is 45:21)</td>
<td>(4QJer&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; [4Q70, DJD XV] {Jeremiah}); MurXII [Mur 88, DJD II]; CD 7.16 {non-Biblical ms}; 4QFlor [4Q174 3.12, DJD V {non-Biblical ms}]; (1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; [1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;, DJD XXXII (Cf. Parry &amp; Qimron 1999)]; 4QIsa&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt; [4Q56, DJD XV] {Isaiah})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23:5</td>
<td>Ex 22:27</td>
<td>4QpaleoExod&lt;sup&gt;m&lt;/sup&gt; [4Q22, DJD IX]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:26-27</td>
<td>Is 6:9-10</td>
<td>1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; [1QIsa&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;, DJD XXXII (Cf. Parry &amp; Qimron 1999)]; 4QIsa&lt;sup&gt;f&lt;/sup&gt; [4Q60, DJD XV]; 4Q162 3.7-8 [4QpIsa&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;, DJD V {non-Biblical ms}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Addendum B:
The text of the explicit quotations of the Pentateuch in Acts in D05

1. Introduction

For the sake of comparison and a complete overview, this addendum contains the text of the explicit quotations from the Pentateuch in the extant text of Acts in D05. The text has been subjected to the same procedure as the first steps for each quotation in the investigation of the explicit quotations of the Psalms, the Minor Prophets and Isaiah in their respective chapters.


2.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Latin Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΟΤΙ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ ΥΜΕΙΝ ΑΝΑΣΤΗΣΕΙ ΚЄ Ο ΘЄ ΥΜΩΤ</td>
<td>QUIA PROPHETAM UOBIS SUSTITUIT DNS DS UESTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΗΜΩΝ</td>
<td>DE FRATRIBUS UESTRIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΩϹ ΕΜΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΚΟΥΣΕϹΘΑΙ</td>
<td>TAMQUAM ME IPSUM AUDIETIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΚΑΤΑ ΠΙΝΑΚΑ ΟϹΑ ΑΝ ΛΛΗϹΗ ΠΙΡΟϹ ΎΜΑϹ</td>
<td>SECUNDUM OMNIA QUAECUMQ LOCUTUS FUERIT AD UOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕϹΤΑΙ ΔΕ ΠΙΑϹΑ ΨΥΧΗ ΗΤΙϹ ΑΝ ΜΗ ΑΚΟΥϹΗ</td>
<td>ERIT AUTEM OMNIS ANIMA QUAECUM Q NON AUDIERIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΤΟΥ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΟΥ ΕΚΕΙΝΟΥ ΕΞΟΛΕΘΡΕΥϹΗϹΕΤΑΙ</td>
<td>PROPHETAM ILLUM DISPERIBIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΛΑΟΥ ...</td>
<td>DE POPULO ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of the quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15-20 (and Leviticus 23:29) in Acts 3:22-23 D05 is on Folio 425b and Folio 426b. Acts 3:22 D05 starts with a M which is written slightly larger and extended a little bit more than halfway into the margin; it is clearly the start of a new paragraph, which includes the introductory formula to the quotation (ΜΩΫϹΗϹ ΜΕΝ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΠΙΡΟϹ ΠΙΤΕΡΑϹ ΗΜΩ). The end of the quotation is not clearly indicated. In fact, after the quotation proper stops, the line simply continues with ΚΑΙ ΠΙΝΑΚΕΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤÆΙ ΑΠΙΟ ΣΑΜΟΥΗΑ. However, the line is rather long, and the last few letters (ΙΙΟ ΣΑΜΟΥΗΑ) have been written in a slightly smaller script as the scribe anticipated the end of...
the line. [Could it have been a very short line and a line of “normal” length in the tradition which the scribe then decided to fit on one line?] The next paragraph only starts at Acts 3:25 (ὙΜΕΙϹ ΕϹΤΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ). The text of the quotation is not indented in D05.

2.1.2. Corrections in D05

The scribe of D05 made an in scribendo correction to the word ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ in the first line of the quotation. After writing ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗϹ, he immediately erased the C, drew a N on top of it and continued writing.¹ There is also a correction to D05’s ΕΜΟΥ on the second line of Folio 426b. Here, the ΟΥ has been partially erased by rubbing and an E has been drawn over the O. The left half of the O now functions as part of the new E.²

2.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15-20 (and Leviticus 23:29) can be found on Folio 426a and Folio 427a. As with the Greek, the introductory formula of the quotation starts a new paragraph, with a slightly larger M placed in the margin. No indication is given of the end of the quoted text, as the last line of the quoted text simply continues with ET OMNIS PROPHETAE A SAMUEL. The next paragraph starts at Acts 3:25 (UOS ESTIS FILII PROPHEΤARUM). In d05, the quotation is also not indented.³

2.1.4. Corrections in d05

The U of SUSCITAUIT has been changed into a B by adding the top curve and extending the left leg of the U upwards. According to Scrivener (1864:441), this has been done by corrector G.

¹ So too Scrivener (1864:441), who notes: “σ ελοτ συν προφητην μ. m.”
² This has been done, according to Scrivener (1864:441), by corrector B.
³ The two lines containing QUÆCUMQ` are the longest lines in the quotation. Both lines end on letters which have been drawn slightly smaller (AD UOS and AUDIERIT). The abbreviations of QUÆCUMQUE (by shortening and placing a medial point) can thus be explained on the grounds of the scribe’s consideration of space.

3.1. The physical text of D05

| ΚΑΙ ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου ηὐναγορῆσον | ET IN SEMINE TUA BENEDICETUR |
| Πασαὶ αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς | OMNIS PATRIAE TERRAE |

3.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The text of the quotation of Genesis 22:18 or 26:4 in Acts 3:25 D05 is on Folio 426b, the same folio on which the quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15-20 (Leviticus 23:29) in Acts 3:22-23 appears. Acts 3:25 starts a new paragraph in the text of D05 (ὙΜΕΙϹ ΕϹΤΑΙ ΥΙΟΙ ΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΦΗΤΩΝ). The text of the quotation is not indented, but the quotation starts on its own line. The quotation also ends on its own line, even though this line is relatively short, while the scribe had to resort to writing the final word (ΑΥΤΟΥ) of the next line (ὙΜΕΙϹ ΠΡΩΤΟΝ ΘΑ ΑΝΑϹΤΗϹΑϹ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΙΔΑ ΑΥΤΟΥ) in a smaller script. The following paragraph starts a considerable amount of text further on, at Acts 4:5 (ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΑΥΡΙΟΝ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ).

3.1.2. Corrections in D05

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Genesis 22:18 or 26:4 in Acts 3:25 D05.

3.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The quotation of Genesis 22:18 or 26:4 in Acts 3:25 d05 occurs on Folio 427a. Acts 3:25 starts with a slightly larger U written in the margin. As with the Greek, there is no indication of the quotation being recognized as such, except for the quotation starting and ending on its own lines. The next paragraph starts at Acts 4:5 (CONTIGIT AUTEM IN CRASTINUM DIEM).
3.1.4. Corrections in d05

In the text of the quotation of Genesis 22:18 or 26:4 in d05’s Acts 3:25, there is only one correction. Above the ET of BENEDICETUR, an N has been drawn. This was done by corrector G, according to Scrivener (1864:441).

4. Acts 7:3 / Genesis 12:1

4.1. The physical text of D05

| ΕΞΗΛΘΕ ΑΠΟ ΤΗ ΚΑΙ ΤΗ ΦΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΗ ΥΝΕΓΙΑ ΦΟ | EXI DE TERRA TUA ET A COGNATIONE TUA |
| ΚΑΙ ΔΕΥΠΟ ΕΙ ΕΙϹ ΤΗΝ ΓΗΝ ΗΝ ΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΔΕΥΡΟ ΕΙ | ET UENI IN TERRA QUAMCUMQ TIBI MONSTRAUERO |

4.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

Acts 7:3 D05, containing the quotation from Genesis 12:1, can be found on Folio 437b. The text of the quotation is not indented, and the paragraph in which the quotation can be found starts in the previous verse (Acts 7:2), at the beginning of Stephen’s speech (ΑΝΔΡΕϹ ΑΔΕΛΦΗ (sic – corrected secunda manu to ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ) ΚΑΙ ΠΑΤΕΡΕϹ ΑΚΟΥϹΑΤΕ). The next indication of a paragraph is directly after this quotation at the start of Acts 7:4 (ΤΟΤΕ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΕΞΕΛΘΟΝ ΕΚ ΓΗϹ ΧΑΛΔΑΙΩΝ).

4.1.2. Corrections in D05

There are a number of corrections to the quotation of Genesis 12:1 in Acts 7:3 D05. An original ΕΞΗΛΘΕ has been corrected to ΕΞΕΛΘΕ by partial erasure of the right side of the H and an E drawn on top of it. At the same time the following word, ΑΠΟ, was changed to ΕΚ by erasing

---

4 The first line of the quotation is rather long. The final letters of this line, CCOY, have been written in a markedly smaller script. The final Y is slanting to the right, giving the impression that the writing curved downward as the scribe was nearing the end of the line.
ΑΠΟ and drawing EK over it.\(^5\) The EI after ΔΕΥΠΟ has been rubbed out; it is not clear whether this was done at the same time as the other two corrections.\(^6\)

### 4.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The quotation of Genesis 12:1 in Acts 7:3 d05 can be found on Folio 438a. As in the Greek, there is no indication that the text is a quotation, except that the quotation begins and ends on its own lines, even though the final line of the quotation is quite long.\(^7\) The next paragraph starts immediately after the quotation with the \(T\) of Acts 7:4’s \(TUNC\ \text{ABRAHAM EXIBIT DE TERRA CHALDEORUM}\) written slightly larger and extending completely into the margin.

### 4.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Genesis 12:1 in Acts 7:3 d05.


#### 5.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTI ECTAI TO SPIERMA AYTOY PAPOKION</th>
<th>QUA ERIT SEMEN EIJUS PEREGRINUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EN ITH ALLOTRIA KAI DOYLAOCYCIN AYTOUC</td>
<td>IN TERRA ALIENA ET IN SERUITUTE REDIGENT EOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAI KAKOCYCIN ETH Y</td>
<td>ET MALE TRACTABUNT ANNIS CCCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAI TO EINOC Omega AN DOYLAEOYCIN</td>
<td>ET GENTEM CUI SERUIERINT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPINOW ETH EIPEN O ΘC</td>
<td>IUDICAUO EGO DICIT DNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAI META TAYTA EZELAEYCOTAI</td>
<td>ET POSTEA XIBUNT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^5\) According to Scrivener (1864:442), both these corrections were done by corrector H.

\(^6\) Scrivener (1864:442) attributes the correction of EI to an anonymous second hand.

\(^7\) The final four letters (UERO) of the last line of the text of d05’s quotation of Genesis 12:1 in Acts 7:3 is written in a slightly smaller script and gives the impression that the scribe’s writing was curving slightly downwards when he neared the end of the line.
5.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The text of the quotation of Genesis 15:13-14 (Exodus 2:22) in Acts 7:6-7 can be found at the bottom of Folio 437b and the top of Folio 438b in D05. The quotation is not indented, but it does start on its own line. Both the end of the quotation from Genesis 15:13-14 and the phrase probably taken from Exodus 3:12 end on their own line. The quotation form part of the paragraph started at Acts 7:4 (ΤΟΤΕ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΕΞΕΛΘΩΝ ΕΚ ΓΗϹ ΧΑΛΔΑΙΩΝ) and the following paragraph starts at Acts 7:12 (ΑΚΟΥϹΑϹ ΟΥΝ ἸΑΚΩΒ ΟΝΤΑ ΚΕΙΤΙΑ ΕΝ ΑΕΓΥΠΤΩ).

5.1.2. Corrections in D05

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Genesis 15:13-14 (Exodus 2:22) in Acts 7:6-7 D05.

5.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

Folio 438a contains the first two lines of the quotation of Genesis 15:13-14 (Exodus 2:22) in Acts 7:6-7 d05, while Folio 439a contains the rest of the quotation’s text. The quotation’s text is not indented, but it does start on its own line, and both the quotation from Genesis 15:13-14 and the text probably taken from Exodus 3:12 end on their own lines. The paragraph markers for this portion of text are the same in d05 as in D05; i.e., Acts 7:4 (ΤΥΝΚ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ ΕΞΙΒΙΤ ΔΕ ΤΕΡΡΑ ΧΑΛΔΕΟΡΟΜ) and Acts 7:12 (ΚΥΜ ΑΥΔΙΣΣΕΤ ΥΕΡΟ ΙΑΚΩΒ ΕΣΕ ΦΡΟΜΕΝΤΑ ΙΝ ΑΕΓΥΠΤΟ) both start new paragraphs.

5.1.4. Corrections in d05

The text of the quotation of Genesis 15:13-14 (Exodus 2:22) in Acts 7:6-7 has no corrections in d05.

6.1. The physical text of D05

The Greek text of Acts 7:27-28 with the quotation from Exodus 2:14 can be found on Folio 440b in D05. The quotation is not indented, but the text of the quotation (excluding the introductory formula), starts a new paragraph. The quotation ends on its own line, but the next paragraph only starts in the middle of Acts 7:31 (Ο ΚΤΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΛΕΙΓΩΝ).

6.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The Greek text of Acts 7:27-28 with the quotation from Exodus 2:14 can be found on Folio 440b in D05. The quotation is not indented, but the text of the quotation (excluding the introductory formula), starts a new paragraph. The quotation ends on its own line, but the next paragraph only starts in the middle of Acts 7:31 (Ο ΚΤΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΛΕΙΓΩΝ).

6.1.2. Corrections in D05

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:27-28 D05.

6.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

Folio 441a contains the text of the quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:27-28 d05. The text of the quotation is not indented and the paragraph markers follow the same pattern as that of D05; i.e., the text of the quotation starts a new paragraph by ekthesis and the following paragraph starts at Acts 7:31’s "DΝΣ ΑΙΤ ΑΙΔ ΕΜ ΑΙΤ ΑΙΣΕΝ."
6.1.4. Corrections in d05

Scrivener (1864:442) notes that, in d05’s Acts 7:27, a $U$ has been written partly beneath the $E$ in *IUDICEM*. However, close inspection of the photographs published by the Cambridge Library pictures shows that the original intended letter is more likely to have been an $I$. In d05, the letter $U$ has a distinct oblique line towards the upper side of the page. Furthermore, the left line of the $U$ is rounded. Compare, for instance, the correction in Acts 7:27 to the $U$ in the resulting *IUDICEM* or to the $U$’s in *CONSTITUIT* and *SUPER* in Acts 7:27. In contrast, an $I$ is sometimes written with a slight curving stroke to the left of the $I$, and the length of the line before the correction to $E$ in *IUDICEM* fits best with the length of an $I$ (as opposed to other letters with a vertical stroke). The scribe therefore wrote *IUDICI*, immediately saw his mistake, and corrected the $I$ to an $E$ by drawing over it.

There are no other corrections to the text of the quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:27-28 d05.


7.1. The physical text of D05

| ΕΓΩ Ο ΘϹ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ ΣΟΥ | EGO SUM DS PATRUM TUORUM |
| Ο ΘϹ ΑΒΡΑΑΜ· ΚΑΙ ΘϹ ΆΙΑΚ· ΚΑΙ ΘϹ ΙΑΚΩΒ | DS ABRAHAM ET DS ISAC ET DS IACOB |

7.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The quotation of Exodus 3:6 (Exodus 3:15-16) in Acts 7:32 D05 occurs on Folio 440b, the same folio as the quotations of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:27-28 and Exodus 3:5,7-8 in Acts 7:33-34. None of these quotations are indented. The quotation itself is not indicated as a new paragraph, but the paragraph starts at the introductory formula of the quotation (Ο ΚϹ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ ΑΕΓΩΝ, as the text reads in D05). The quotation ends on its own line; this is also the end of the paragraph, as the next paragraph starts with the introductory formula of the quotation of Exodus 3:5,7-8 in
Acts 7:33-34 (ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΦΩΝΗ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ). Taken together with its introductory formula, then, the quotation is its own paragraph in D05.

7.1.2. Corrections in D05

There are no corrections to the quotation of Exodus 3:6 (Exodus 3:15-16) in Acts 7:32 D05.

7.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin of the quotation in Acts 7:32 d05 of Exodus 3:6 (Exodus 3:15-16) can be found on Folio 441a. The quotation is not indented, but forms a paragraph if taken with its introductory formula. That is to say, the following paragraph starts directly after the quotation, at 7:33’s ET FACTA (sic – corrected secunda manu to FACTUS) EST UOX AD EUM (as the text reads in d05).

7.1.4. Corrections in d05

No corrections are to be found in the text of the quotation of Exodus 3:6 (Exodus 3:15-16) in the text of Acts 7:32 d05.


8.1. The physical text of D05

| ΛΥϹ[ΟΝ] ΤΟ ΎΠΟΔΗΜΑ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ ΣΟΥ | SOLVE CALCIAMENTUM PEDUM TUORUM |
| O ΓΑΡ ΤΟΙΟΟϹ ΟΥ ΕΣΤΙ ΚΑΙ ΑΓΙΑ ΕϹΤΙΝ | LOCUS ENIM IN QUO STAS TERRA SANTA EST |
| ΚΑΙ ΙΔΩΝ ΓΑΡ ΙΔΟΝ | INTUITUS ENIM UIDI |
| ΘΝ ΚΑΚΩϹΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΛΑΟΥ ΤΟΥ ΕΝ ΕΓΥΠΤΩ | MULCATIONEM POPULI QUI EST IN AEGYPTO |
| ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ ΣΤΕΝΑΓΜΟΥ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΚΗΚΟΑ | ET GEMITUS EIUS AUDIUI |
| ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΕΒΗΝ ΕΞΕΛΕϹΘΑΙ ΑΥΤΟϹ | ET DESCENDI ERIPERE EOS |
| ΚΑΙ ΝΥΝ ΔΕΥΡΟ ΑΠΟϹΤΕΙΑΔΩ ΣΕ ΕΙϹ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΝ | ET NUNC UENI MITTAM TE IN AEGYPTUM |
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8.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The quotation of Exodus 3:5,7-8 in Acts 7:33-34 D05 is on the same folio, 440b, as the quotations of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:27-28 and Exodus 3:6 (Exodus 3:15-16) in Acts 7:32. The quotation is not indented, but the introductory formula of this quotation (ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΦΩΝΗ ΠΙΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ, as the beginning of Acts 7:33 reads in D05) starts a new paragraph. The quotation’s last line is at the end of the page, and the following paragraph starts at Acts 7:37 on the next Greek folio (ΟΥΤΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΜΩΫϹΗϹ Ο ΕΙΠΑϹ ΤΟΙϹ ΥΙΟΙϹ ΙϹΡΑΗΛ).

8.1.2. Corrections in D05

Certain parts of the original text of this quotation have become illegible. The first word of the quotation seems to have been ΛΥϹΟΝ: It is so listed by Parker (1992:152). Scrivener (1864:442) is somewhat more cautious, ending the entry in his Adnotationes with a question mark.9 D05’s ΟΥ has been corrected to ΕΦΩ by rubbing out the right part of Ο and drawing the E’s horizontal lines on top of it, by drawing a half circle from the one side of the top part of the Y to the other and extending the line in the middle upwards, and by writing a small Ω on top of the line between the Y and E.10 The ΚΑΙ and ΓΑΡ of ΚΑΙ ΙΔΩΝ ΓΑΡ ΙΔΟΝ have been rubbed out (but the outlines of these letters are still visible). Between ΛΑΟΥ and ΤΟΥ, an abbreviation for μου (an Μ with a smaller Ο on top of it) has been added on top of the line, and the same hand has changed the E in ΕΓΥΠΤΩ to ΑΙ by writing these two letters above the E (without crossing out or erasing the E).11

8.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation of Exodus 3:5,7-8 in Acts 7:33-34 d05 is on Folio 441a. The quotation is not indented, but together with its introductory formula (ET FACTUS (sic –

9 Scrivener (1864:442) states: “αι pro on in λυσον D?: o perii omnino” It is not clear whether Scrivener meant to ask with the question mark whether corrector D made this correction (cf. Parker (1992:152), who does attribute this correction to corrector D) or whether he was unsure about the original text’s N; his transcription of the manuscript, in any case, reads “λυσ v”, i.e., without an O but with the N (cf. Scrivener 1864:352). See the discussion of the text below.
10 This has been, according to Scrivener (1864:442), by corrector B.
11 Both these corrections have been made by corrector E, according to Scrivener (1864:442).
corrected *secunda manu* to *FACTUS*) *ES UOX AD EUM*, as it reads in d05), the quotation starts a new paragraph. The following paragraph, as in the Greek text, is at Acts 7:37 on the next page (*HIC EST MOYSES QUI DIXIT FILIIS ISTRAHEL*).

8.1.4. *Corrections in d05*

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Exodus 3:5,7-8 in Acts 7:33-34 d05.


9.1. The physical text of D05

9.1.1. *Indentation and paragraph markers in D05*

The quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:35 D05 can be found on Folio 441b. The text of the quotation has not been indented, and the paragraph in which it is found starts on the previous Greek folio, with the introductory formula of the quotation of Exodus 3:5,7-8 in Acts 7:33-34 (*ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΦΩΝΗ ΠΡΟϹ ΑΥΤΟΝ*, as it reads in D05). The following paragraph starts a few verses further on, at the introductory formula of Acts 7:37 (*ΟΥΤΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΜΩΫϹΗϹ Ο ΕΙΠΑϹ ΤΟΙϹ ΥΙΟΙϹ ΙϹΡΑΗΛ*). The quotation is fitted to one line in the text of D05, which resulted in the scribe writing the final few letters (*CTHN ΕΦ ΗΜΩ*) in a slightly smaller script, and writing HM as a ligature.12

9.1.2. *Corrections in D05*

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:35 D05.13

12 The right vertical line of the H has become the left vertical line of the M.

13 Scrivener (1864:442) remarks that there is a “*punctum supra τ secund[um] p[rima] m[anu], forsan casu*.” Whether by accident or not, the dot does not seem to point out anything in particular, and may be disregarded.
9.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The Latin text of the quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:35 d05 is found on Folio 442a. As with the Greek, there is no indentation of this quotation, and the paragraph in which the quotation is found starts at Acts 7:33-34 (ET FACTUS (sic – corrected secunda manu to FACTUS) ES UOX AD EUM, as the text reads in d05), while the following paragraph starts at Acts 7:37 (HIC EST MOYES QUI DIXIT FILIIS ISTRABLEL). As in D05, the line is rather long and the last few letters (ICEM SUPER NOS) have been written in smaller script.

9.1.4. Corrections in d05

No corrections are present in the text of the quotation of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:35 d05.

10. Acts 7:37 / Deuteronomy 18:15

10.1. The physical text of D05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΝ ΎΜΕΙΝ ΑΝΑΚΤΗΣΕΙ Ο ΘŒ</th>
<th>PROPHETAM UOUS SUSCITAVIT ÒS</th>
<th>ΞΕΙ Ο ΘŒ ΞΕΙ Ο ΘŒ ΞΕΙ ΞΕΙ ΞΕΙ</th>
<th>DE FRATRIBUS UESTRIS TAMQUAM ME·</th>
<th>ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΚΟΥ[Ϲ]ΕϹΘΕ</th>
<th>IPSUM AUDIETIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ ΎΜΩΝ ΩϹΕΙ ΕΜΕ</td>
<td>PROPHETAM UOUS SUSCITAVIT ÒS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΑΥΤΟΥ ΑΚΟΥ[Ϲ]ΕϹΘΕ</td>
<td>DE FRATRIBUS UESTRIS TAMQUAM ME·</td>
<td>IPSUM AUDIETIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The text of the quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15 in Acts 7:37 D05 is on Folio 441b. The quotation has not been indented. A new paragraph starts at the introductory formula of this quotation (ΟΥΤΟϹ ΕϹΤΙΝ ΜΩΫϹΗϹ Ο ΕΙΠΑϹ ΤΟΙϹ ΥΙΟΙϹ ΙϹΡΑΗΛ), and the following paragraph starts at Acts 7:40 (ΕΙΠΑΝΤΕϹ ΤΩ ΑΑΡΩΝ ΠΟΙΗϹΟΝ ΗΜΕΙΝ ΘΕΟΥϹ), the introductory formula and the first part of the quotation from Exodus 32:1 or Exodus 32:23.
10.1.2. Corrections in D05

The EI of ΩCEI has been rubbed out, but not completely. An original AKOYECΘE has been corrected to AKOYCECΘE by a C drawn between Y and C on top of the line. Scrivener (1864:442) hesitantly attributes this correction to a later hand (corrector A), but leaves open the possibility of the correction being made by the scribe of D05. He refers the reader to the correction made by corrector A on the last line of Folio 439b, where an OY has been written on top of the line to bring the text in agreement with the Latin. Parker (1992:297), however, remarks that “the σ is more like p.m. – note the thickening before the initial stroke.” One is inclined, with the necessary caution, of course, to follow Parker in this regard and include the C in the original text of D05.14

10.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The text of the quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15 in Acts 7:37 d05 is on Folio 442a. The text is not indented, and the paragraph markers follow that of the Greek text, that is to say, the introductory formula of this quotation (HIC EST MOYES QUI DIXIT FILII ISTRAHEL) starts the paragraph and the next paragraph is at the start of Acts 7:40 (DICENTES AD AARON FAC NOBIS DĒO).

10.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are no corrections to the text of the quotation of Deuteronomy 18:15 in Acts 7:37 d05.

---

14 Cf. also the K added on the first line of Folio 421b (in Acts 2:25, a quotation from Psalm 15:8 (LXX)), which was ostensibly made by scribe of D05 and has been treated as such in this study.

11.1. The physical text of D05

| … ΠΟΙΗϹΟΝ ΗΜΕΙΝ ΘΕΟΥϹ | … FAC NOBIS ĐEÓ |
| ΟΙ ΠΡΟΠΟΡΕΥϹΟΝΤΑΙ ΗΜΩΝ | QUI PRAECEDANT NOS |
| Ο ΓΑΡ ΜΩΫϹΗϹ ΟΥΤΟϹ | MOYSES ENIM HIC |
| ΟϹ ΕΞΗΓΑΓΕΝ ΗΜΑϹ ΕΚ ΓΗϹ ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΥ | QUI EDUXIT NOS DE TERRA AEGYPTI |
| ΟΥΚ ΟΙΔΑΜΕΝ ΤΙ ΓΕΓΟΝΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ | NESCIMUS QUID CONTEGERIT EI |

11.1.1. Indentation and paragraph markers in D05

The final quotation from the Pentateuch in D05, the quotation of either Exodus 32:1 or Exodus 32:23 in Acts 7:40, can be found on Folio 441b, the same folio as the quotations of Exodus 2:14 in Acts 7:35 and Deuteronomy 18:15 in Acts 7:37. The quotation is not indented, but the introductory formula of this quotation (ΕΙΠΑΝΤΕϹ ΤΩ ΑΑΡΩΝ) starts a new paragraph. However, the text of the quotation continues on the same line after the introductory formula. The quotation does end on its own line. The next paragraph marker is two Greek folios further on, at the start of Acts 7:54 (ΑКОΥϹΑΝΤΕϹ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΔΙΕΠΡΙΟΝΤΟ).

11.1.2. Corrections in D05

The text of the quotation of Exodus 32:1 or Exodus 32:23 in Acts 7:40 has not been corrected in D05.

11.1.3. Indentation and paragraph markers in d05

The text of the quotation of Exodus 32:1 or Exodus 32:23 in Acts 7:40 d05 is on Folio 442a. The text is not indented, and the text of the quotation starts on the same line as its introductory formula (DICENTES AD AARON). The introductory formula also starts a new paragraph, while the next paragraph marker is found at Acts 7:54 (AUDIENTES AUTEM EUM DISCRUCIABANTUR).
11.1.4. Corrections in d05

There are no corrections to the quotation of Exodus 32:1 or Exodus 32:23 in Acts 7:40 d05.
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