

“Old Testament Awareness” and the Textual Tradition of the Explicit Quotations of Isaiah in Codex Bezae’s Acts

Ronald H. van der Bergh
Pretoria

Abstract

This article investigates the textual history of the explicit quotations of Isaiah in the Acts of the Apostles of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (Acts 7:49-50; 13:34; 13:47) by introducing the concept of “Old Testament awareness.” This concept can be defined as the degree to which a NT tradition, at any stage of its transmission history, is aware of a quotation stemming from the OT. OT awareness can be identified in the *layout* of Codex Bezae (e.g., the indentation of text in the manuscript to indicate OT quotations), the *text* of quotations (e.g., readings that can be shown to be a subsequent change towards an OT tradition) and the *context* of the quoted text (e.g., the quotations’ introductory formulae). Through assessing the OT awareness of Codex Bezae’s explicit quotations of Isaiah, different stages in the transmission history of the text of these quotations in Codex Bezae’s Acts can be identified.

Keywords: OT quotations – OT awareness – textual criticism – Isaiah – manuscripts – Codex Bezae

1. Introduction

This article is concerned with the explicit quotations of Isaiah in the Acts of the Apostles as they are found in a single manuscript, Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D05).¹ The focus will be on the degree of “Old Testament awareness” shown by these explicit quotations in D05.

¹ The Greek column of Codex Bezae will be referred to as D05, while the Latin column will be referred to as d05 in the rest of this article. The designation D05 will also be used where reference is made to both the Greek and Latin columns.

The concept “OT awareness” can be defined as the degree to which the users of a NT textual tradition, at any stage of this tradition’s transmission history, are aware of the OT origin of the quotation. The present investigation will make use of three indicators of OT awareness, namely *layout*, *context*, and *text*. Under *layout* should be counted the physical attributes of a manuscript such as diplés or indentation. In D05, the only indicator of this kind is indentation.² The *context* is the text surrounding the explicit quotation under investigation; for reasons of space, this will be confined to the introductory formulae of the explicit quotations of Isaiah in the present article. Introductory formulae are the most salient indicators of OT awareness in the context of an explicit quotation, as an introductory formula can serve as a direct indication of the OT origin of the quotation. The *text* of a quotation can betray OT awareness on the part of a manuscript’s transmission history, especially when a variant reading peculiar to a NT manuscript or group of NT manuscripts can be shown to be later adaptation to the text of an OT tradition. 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 of the text of Acts being a quotation from the OT.³

The present article will investigate each of the three extant explicit quotations of Isaiah in the Acts of D05 (Isa 66:1-2 / Acts 7:49-50; Isa 55:3 / Acts 13:34; Isa 49:6 / Acts 13:47) with an eye to the three possible indicators of OT awareness (layout, introductory formula and text) in the order of their appearance in Acts. For each quotation, the text as it appears in D05 will precede the discussion. To facilitate reading, however, the text will not be presented in *scriptio continua*. After the discussion of each quotation, an evaluation of the interplay between the OT awareness of the layout, introductory formula and text of the quotation will follow. By paying close attention to this interplay, different stages in the transmission history of D05 will be identified.

It should be stated explicitly that the purpose of this article is not to treat every variant reading with respect to D05 in the Isaiah quotations. Only those variant readings in D05 that have relevance to the question at hand—in other words, which may show signs of OT awareness—will be discussed.

2 Cf. David C. Parker, *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992) 32. Parker notes the following indented quotations in Acts, all of which are quotations from the OT and stem from the Psalms or Isaiah: 1:20; 2:25-28; 2:34-35; 4:25-26; 7:49; 13:33; 13:34 and 13:35.

3 An obvious example of this kind of indicator of OT awareness is the text of Ps 2:8, which can be found after the text of Ps 2:7 in Acts 13:33 D05. The addition of Ps 2:8 was most likely prompted because the relevant part of the text of Acts 13:33 was known to be Ps 2:7.

1.1 *Text-critical Sources Used for this Article*

Variant readings for the Greek NT were gleaned from the collations made for the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM) by the *Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung* (INTF) in Münster.⁴ In some instances, manuscripts not used for the ECM but available in, e.g., Tischendorf's *Editio Octava Critica Maior*,⁵ have also been noted. For the Latin NT, the edition by Wordsworth and White⁶ was the main source. Unfortunately, the *Vetus Latina* edition of Acts is still in preparation. Ziegler's⁷ edition of the Old Greek text of Isaiah in the Göttingen series (LXXGött) 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 article. For the Latin OT traditions, the two-volume *Vetus Latina* edition of Isaiah prepared by Roger Gryson⁸ was used as a source. The *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ) fascicle of Isaiah is, unfortunately, 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 Judean desert, mostly gleaned from the *Discoveries in the Judean Desert* series, as this crucial evidence has not been incorporated in BHS.

2. Acts 7:49-50 / Isaiah 66:1-2

2.1 *The Text in D05 (Folio 442b; Folio 443a)*

ΩC O ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ ΛΕΓΕΙ	SICUT PROFETA DIXIT
Ο ΟΥΡΑΝΟΣ ΜΟΥ ΕCΤΙΝ ΘΡΟΝΟΣ	CAELUM EST MEUS THRONUS
Η ΔΕ ΓΗ ΎΠΟΠΟΔΙΟΝ ΤΩΝ ΠΟΔΩΝ ΜΟΥ	TERRA UERO SCAMILLUM PEDUM MEORUM
ΠΟΙΟΝ ΟΙΚΟΝ ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΗCΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ ΛΕΓΕΙ ΚC	QUALEM DOMUM AEDIFICATIS MIHI DICIT DÑS
Η ΠΟΙΟΣ ΤΟΠΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΚΑΤΑΠΑΥCΕΩC ΜΟΥ ΕCΤΙ	AUT QUIS LOCUS REQUENS MEA EST
ΟΥΧΙ Η ΧΕΙΡ ΜΟΥ ΕΠΟΙΗCΕΝ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ	NONNE MANUS MEA FECIT HAEC OMNIA

4 The INTF 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. The present author, of course, assumes responsibility for any misreadings of this data, which has been supplied to the author in a raw format.

5 Constantine Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit* (3 vols.; vol. 1; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869; vol. 2, 1872).

6 I. Wordsworth and H.I. White, *Nouum Testamentum domini nostri Iesu Christi latine secundum editionem sancti Hieronymi, Partis tertiae, Fascilus primus: Actus Apostolorum* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1905).

7 Joseph Ziegler, *Isaias* (LXXGött 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

8 Roger Gryson, *Esaias, Pars I* (VL 12; 2 vols.; vol. 1; Freiburg: Herder, 1987); *Pars II* (1993).

2.2 *Layout in D05*

The Greek text of this quotation has been indented by the space of about four to five letters (slightly more on the Latin side), but only up to the line ending on the phrase ΠΟΔΩΝ ΜΟΥ;⁹ after this line, the scribe reverted to beginning lines at the margin. There is thus no indication that the scribe of D05 was aware that the unindented text was part of the OT quotation.¹⁰

2.3 *Introductory Formula*

The introductory formula of the quotation of Isa 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 in Acts 7:48b (καθώς ὁ προφήτης λέγει) explicitly mentions the word “prophet.” This designation could probably have pointed scribes of the Greek NT tradition to the OT. D05 differs from the rest of the Greek NT tradition in only one respect: where the rest of the Greek NT tradition reads καθώς, D05 has ΩC. The use of ΩC in this phrase in D05 does not represent a meaningful change and could simply be due to a scribal error resulting in a synonymous reading, or a stylistic change in this part of the D05 Acts narrative.¹¹ The introductory formula of D05, therefore, does not show more or less OT awareness than the rest of the Greek NT tradition.

9 James Hardy Ropes (*The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. III: The Text of Acts* [London: Macmillan & Co., 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. Ropes's indentation may easily lead to the conclusion that the whole quotation was understood to be from the OT in the later stages of the D05 tradition.

10 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 probably did not influence the scribe to start writing the last part of this quotation from the margin instead of indenting it. When the scribe of D05 was occasionally not able to write all of the text on one line, the rest of the text was added on top or below the end of the line—an example of this appears in the Latin on the following page (Folio 444a, line 4).

11 A scribe in the D05 tradition could have unintentionally supplied ὡς in Acts 7:48b D05, 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 apart from Acts 7:48b, D05 is in agreement with NA²⁸ (cf. Acts 2:4; 2:22; 7:17; 7:42; 7:44; 11:29; 15:8; 15:14; 15:15; 22:3). In the very next verse after the quotation (Acts 7:51), however, D05 reads ΚΑΘΩC where the rest of the Greek NT tradition reads ὡς. Thus, the change could simply be due to a stylistic switch of this word in these two verses in the D05 tradition.

2.4 Text

2.4.1 D05 ΠΟΙΟC / d05 QUIS

The reading ΠΟΙΟC in D05 betrays OT awareness. This reading should best be measured against both phrases in Acts 7:49 in which an interrogative pronoun occurs, as noted in the table below:

Isaiah 66:1b (LXXGött)	Acts 7:49b (NA ²⁸)
ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι; ἢ ποῖος τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου;	ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι, λέγει κύριος, ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου;

The ΠΟΙΟC of D05 as equivalent for the rest of the Greek NT tradition's τίς is a singular reading.¹² The D05 reading is the reading found in LXXGött (ποῖος τόπος), and is strongly attested in the Greek OT tradition. There are only a few Greek OT manuscripts which have τις,¹³ and Ziegler¹⁴ points out that the τις in these manuscripts could be due to influence from Acts.¹⁵ Consequently,

12 James Donald Yoder ("The Language of the Greek Variants of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis" [Ph.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1958] 360) lists one other case where D05 reads a form of ποῖος against τίς in the Westcott and Hort text, namely Mark 4:30. However, the D05 reading in Mark 4:30 is supported by other texts, and there is considerable variation in the verse itself. The addition or substitution of ποῖος for other words, therefore, does not appear to be a characteristic of the D05 text.

13 Namely 26-86^{txt} 534; τίς is also found in the Epistle of Barnabas and in Cyprian.

14 Ziegler, *Isaias*, 364.

15 Traugott Holtz (*Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* [TUGAL 104; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968] 30; similarly Ernst Haenchen, "Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte," *ZTK* 51 [1954] 153-167, 159) 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 ("Schriftzitate," 159) further points out that through "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. See, however, C.K. Barrett ("Old Testament History According to Stephen and Paul," in *Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments: Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Heinrich Greeven* [ed. Wolfgang Schrage; BZAW 47; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 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. J.K. Elliott ("An Eclectic Textual Study

between the Greek OT tradition and the Greek NT tradition, there is one clear difference: In the Greek OT tradition, the interrogative pronoun agrees (both phrases have *ποῖος*), while the Greek NT tradition has, apart from D05, a disagreement (*ποῖος*—*τίς*). In this respect, the Greek OT tradition (and D05) stands closer to the Hebrew tradition, which employs *הַיֵּשׁוּב* in both phrases.

Influence from the Latin NT or Latin OT traditions must be ruled out as the reason for the use of *ποῖος* in both phrases on the Greek column of D05: the disagreement between the two pronouns in the rest of the Greek NT tradition is reflected in both the Latin NT and OT traditions. Even d05, differing from D05 in this respect, reflects this disagreement between the pronouns: *QUALEM DOMUM* (i.e., the pronoun *qualis, quale*) is read for the first occurrence of a pronoun, and *QUIS LOCUS* (i.e., the pronoun *quis, quid*) for the second. The only Latin NT manuscript that makes use of the same pronoun in both phrases of the Isaiah quotation is *h*, which reads *qualem domum* for the first pronoun and *qualis domus* for the second. NA²⁸ presents *h* as a witness along with the D05 reading (ΠΟΙΟC, where other Greek NT witnesses read *τίς*).¹⁶ However, *h* reads *domum . . . domus* where D05 has OIKON . . . ΤΟΠΙΟC. The reading in *h* is therefore likely an unintentional harmonisation to the preceding text by an inattentive scribe (that is to say, the scribe changed *quis locus* into *qualis domus* based on the *qualem domum* in the previous phrase), and should be discounted as a fellow NT witness to the reading of D05.¹⁷

There are three persuasive reasons why one should suspect influence of the Greek OT tradition (or perhaps the Hebrew tradition) on D05 with regard to

of the Book of Acts,” in *The Book of Acts as Church History: Text, Textual Traditions and Ancient Interpretations* [ed. Tobias Nicklas and Michael Tilly; BZNW 120; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 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, Martin Karrer, Ulrich Schmid, and Marcus Sigismund (“Das lukanische Doppelwerk als Zeuge für den LXX-Text des Jesaja-Buches,” in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in the Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* [ed. H. Ausloos, et al.; BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 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.

16 Barbara Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012) 402.

17 Holtz (*Untersuchungen*, 29) also points out the difference between d05 and *h*, but does not take the difference between the rest of the wording of D05 into account. Consequently, Holtz agrees (using the term “ebenso”) with the presentation of, in his case, the NA²⁵ apparatus.

ΠΟΙΟC: first, the agreement of ΠΟΙΟC with the Greek OT and Hebrew traditions; second, the singular nature of D05 with regard to both the Greek and Latin NT tradition; and third, 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.¹⁸ Accordingly, the appearance of ΠΟΙΟC in D05 evinces a clear sense of OT awareness in the transmission history of this manuscript.

2.4.2 D05 ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ / d05 HAEC OMNIA

A second relevant variant in the quotation of Isa 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 D05 is ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ, where most Greek NT manuscripts read ταῦτα πάντα (i.e., a different word order). D05 is not the only manuscript with the word order ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ. This word order is also found in such heavyweights as Codex Alexandrinus (A02) and Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (C04).¹⁹ This order of words, however, is only found in the Greek NT tradition, and not the Latin NT tradition.²⁰ In fact, there is a difference in word order even between D05 (ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ) and d05 (HAEC OMNIA). Influence on D05 with regard to ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ from another Greek NT tradition is therefore a distinct possibility, but not influence from a Latin NT tradition.

Could the word order of D05 be due to influence from the OT traditions? Answering this question with regard to the OT traditions is not a matter of simply comparing the texts of the NT and OT traditions word for word.²¹ The NT, in both the Greek and Latin traditions, differs markedly from all known OT witnesses in this final phrase of the quotation of Isa 66:1-2. The Greek text illustrates this difference well, as can be seen in the following table (in which parallels have been underlined):

-
- 18 Holtz (*Untersuchungen*, 29; similarly Gerhard Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte, 1. Teil: Einleitung. Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-8,40* [HTKNT 5; Freiburg: Herder, 1980] 446 n. χ) comes to the same conclusion: D05 is “wohl eine Angleichung an eine LXX-Form.”
- 19 Other Greek NT manuscripts with the same word order as D05 are P⁷⁴ 08 025 69 319 365 398 2147 2298 2652 2805 and the lectionary manuscripts l23 and l156.
- 20 The Latin NT has only one witness with the word order of D05: e08, the Latin column of Codex Laudienensis. However, e08 appears to be a translation of the Greek column of the Codex (E08), as noted by David C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008) 289; Christopher M. Tuckett, “*Nomina Sacra* in Codex E,” *JTS* 57/2 (2006) 487-499, 488.
- 21 Cf. Holtz (*Untersuchungen*, 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.”

πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χεὶρ μου, καὶ ἔστιν οὐχὶ ἡ χεὶρ μου ἐποίησεν ταῦτα πάντα
 ἐμὰ πάντα ταῦτα

The text in question in D₀₅, ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ, occurs twice in the Greek OT tradition, both times with persuasive manuscript support in the order in which D₀₅ presents the text. The first occurrence, πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα, has a different word order than D₀₅ only in one part of the hexaplaric tradition²² and some Catena manuscripts.²³ 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 tradition,²⁴ some Catena manuscripts²⁵ and a small number of other witnesses.²⁶ The witnesses to the Latin OT tradition are divided with regard to word order, but a fair amount contains the word order of D₀₅.²⁷ The Hebrew tradition unvaryingly has the word order of D₀₅ (ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ). As the Greek OT, Latin OT and Hebrew traditions have a strong preference for the word order of D₀₅, influence from the OT is plausible.²⁸

Consequently, there are two possibilities with regard to the word order of D₀₅: influence from an OT tradition or influence from another Greek NT tradition (which was influenced, in turn, by an OT tradition). As D₀₅ already shows some degree of OT awareness with regard to the reading ΠΟΙΟC discussed above, it is likely that ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ also bespeaks OT awareness in the manuscript's transmission history and that these two changes occurred

22 Namely, 88 and the related Syrohexapla.

23 These manuscripts are 377-564-565.

24 Namely, 88, the Syrohexapla, 109-736,

25 Namely, 377-564-565 and the related 87.

26 Namely, 46 239-306 407 534 544. Eusebius, Athanasius and Theodoret also have this word order.

27 Cf. the varied evidence in Gryson, *Esaias II*, 1607-1613.

28 Jenny Read-Heimerdinger (*The Bezan Text of Acts: A Contribution of Discourse Analysis to Textual Criticism* [JSNTSup 236; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002] 98-99) refers to G.B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1870) 686: "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." Read-Heimerdinger notes that the meaning of the two words in D₀₅ is in distinction to B₀₃'s (and NA²⁸'s) order, which rather means "these things all taken together."

contemporaneously. It is worth noting that the whole quotation has not been changed to agree with the OT traditions (cf. the difference with regard to Isa 66:2), and it is possible that these two changes were made from memory rather than consultation of an OT manuscript.

2.5 *Evaluation*

The quotation of Isa 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49 D05 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 Isa 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. The situation is the opposite with regard to the text of this quotation as it is found in D05. 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 ΠΟΙΟC ΤΟΠΟC and has the word order ΠΑΝΤΑ ΤΑΥΤΑ in agreement with the Greek OT tradition). There is a marked difference between Acts 7:50 and Isa 66:2, but this difference is unlikely to be the reason for the quotation’s partial indentation. The last part of Acts 7:49 (which corresponds to Isa 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 ΠΟΙΟC ΤΟΠΟC). The reading ΠΟΙΟC ΤΟΠΟC, 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.

These observations offer a window into the transmission history of D05. At a stage earlier than the production of D05, someone (or perhaps more than one person at more than one stage) recognised the quotation of Isa 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 (as the whole quotation has not been changed towards the OT). Although the quotation was now even closer to the Greek OT tradition, the latest stage(s) of the D05 tradition did not view the whole quotation as stemming from the OT.

3. Acts 13:34 / Isaiah 55:3

3.1 *The Text in D05 (Folio 469b, Folio 470a)*

... ΟΥΤΩC ΕΙΡΗΚΕΝ

... *ITA DICIT*

ΟΤΙ ΔΩCΩ ΎΜΕΙΝ

QUIA DABO UOBIS

ΤΑ ΟCΙΑ ΔΑΥΕΙΔ ΤΑ ΠΙCΤΑ

SANCTA DAUID FIDELIA

3.2 *Layout in D05*

The whole quotation (including the conjunction OTI, which serves as introduction to the direct speech)²⁹ is indented by the space of about five letters in the Greek column and by the space of about four and a half letters in the Latin column. The text of this quotation was therefore perceived to stem from the OT.

3.3 *Introductory Formula*

The introductory formula to the quotation of Isa 55:3 in Acts 13:34 (OYTOC EIPHKEN / OTI) reads the same in D05 as in the rest of the Greek NT tradition.³⁰

3.4 *Text*

The Greek NT text of the quotation of Isa 55:3 in Acts 13:34 knows almost no variation in the whole Greek NT tradition.³¹ The Greek OT of Isa 55:3, however, differs markedly from the quotation in the Greek NT, as the following table, in which verbal agreements have been underlined, illustrates:

Isaiah 55:3b-4 (LXXGött)	Acts 13:34b (NA ²⁸)
καὶ διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον, τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ τὰ πιστά.	οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ τὰ πιστά.

The Greek OT tradition shows no notable text critical variation in Isa 55:3 with regard to the verbal agreements identified in the table above. The OT text therefore clearly underwent a number of changes before or when it was taken up in the NT.³² It is remarkable that there are no manuscripts in the Greek NT

29 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.

30 Apart from orthography, the only variant reading in the Greek NT tradition is the lack of an equivalent for ὅτι in 808.

31 In the case of D05, only two negligible orthographical differences stand out against the bulk of the NT manuscripts: Ὑμῖν has as an equivalent ὙΜΕΙΝ in D05 while Δαυιδ is spelled ΔΑΥΕΙΔ.

32 Holtz (*Untersuchungen*, 138-139) argues that the author of Acts found and used the quotation in an already changed form ("zurechtgemacht"), and such a scenario should not be discounted. See, however, Karrer, Schmid, and Sigismund ("Das lukanische Doppelwerk

tradition which have adjusted the text to fit with the Greek OT tradition, including Do5—even though the text was perceived and marked as a quotation.³³

3.5 Evaluation

The quotation of Isa 55:3 in Acts 13:34 in Do5 is not indicated as its own paragraph, but it is indented. This evinces a degree of OT awareness with regard to the quotation, but 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 Do5 as in the rest of the Greek NT tradition. This 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, as it is wedged between two quotations from that book.³⁴

The fact that there is no deviation from the rest of the NT tradition in this quotation in Do5 should not be ascribed to the Do5 tradition's identification of this text as an OT tradition. The OT traditions read markedly different than Do5 (and the rest of the Greek NT tradition), yet the Do5 text of Acts 13:34 have been indented. Furthermore, it should be noted that OTI, an introduction to direct speech that is not part of the OT text, has also been indented.³⁵ 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 respective OT traditions.

als Zeuge", 260-261), who cogently argue that the author of Acts is responsible for the changes.

33 The diplés in Codex Sinaiticus (S01) show that this text was likewise perceived to be an OT quotation in the S01 tradition. These diplés were most likely added during the production of S01 (Ulrich Schmid, "Diplés und Quellenangaben im Codex Sinaiticus," in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament: Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen* [ed. Martin Karrer, et al.; ANTF 43; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010] 87, 90-91).

34 Cf. Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 138-139; C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC 35; 2 vols.; vol. 1; Edinburg: T&T Clark, 1994) 648; Édouard Delebecque, *Les deux Actes des Apôtres* (EBib 6; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1986) 295; Jenny Read-Heimerdinger and Josep Rius-Camps, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition, Volume 3: Acts 13.1-18.23* (4 vols.; vol. 3; London: T&T Clark, 2007) 78.

35 The same is true for the *QUIA* in do5.

4. Acts 13:47 / Isaiah 49:6

4.1 *The Text in D05 (Folio 471b; Folio 472a)*

ΟΥΤΩΣ ΓΑΡ ΕΝΤΕΤΑΑΚΕΝ Ο Κ̅C

ITA ENIM MANDATUM DEDIT NOBIS D̅NS

ΙΔΟΥ ΦΩΣ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ ΣΕ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΘΝΕCΙΝ

ECCE LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS

ΤΟΥ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΣΕ ΕΙΣ ΩΤΗΡΙΑΝ ΕΩC ΕCΧΑΤΟΥ ΤΗC ΓΗC

UT SINT IN SALUTEM USQUAE AD ULTIMUM TERRAE

4.2 *Layout in D05*

Differently from the two previous quotations from Isaiah in the Acts narrative, the scribe of D05 has not indented this quotation, or treated it in any special way. In other words, there is no evidence of OT awareness in the layout of the manuscript with regard to Acts 13:47.³⁶

4.3 *Introductory Formula*

The only relevant difference in the introductory formula of the quotation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47 D05 is the lack of an equivalent for the personal pronoun ἡμῖν, which normally follows ἐντέταλται (ΕΝΤΕΤΑΑΚΕΝ in D05) in Acts 13:47.³⁷ Although a few manuscripts of the Greek NT tradition read these two words in a different order,³⁸ only D05 and the thirteenth century manuscript 378 do not contain an equivalent for ἡμῖν. The best explanation for a lack of ἡμῖν in D05 would be the difference in number that is created between this pronoun and the pronoun 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 Isa 49:6 in the plural, “to us” (ἡμῖν), while the quotation itself clearly refers to a singular “you” (σέ). This discrepancy in number was alleviated by the D05 tradition in removing ἡμῖν from

36 The following paragraph in D05 starts directly after the end of this quotation (ΚΑΙ ΑΚΟΥΟΝΤΑ / *ET CUM AUDIRENT*—Acts 13:48). The paragraph is indicated by ekthesis. However, as the quotation does not *start* a new paragraph, one can safely assume that the use of the paragraph system in the Acts of D05 does not indicate OT awareness.

37 The only other difference between D05 and the majority of manuscripts in the Greek NT tradition is the ΕΝΤΕΤΑΑΚΕΝ of D05, which is read as ἐντέταλται by most Greek NT manuscripts. While ΕΝΤΕΤΑΑΚΕΝ is active, ἐντέταλται is in the middle form—the latter being the most common Greek usage. Delebecque (*Les deux Actes*, 275) suggests that the reading of ΕΝΤΕΤΑΑΚΕΝ 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, “Language of the Greek Variants,” 406.

38 The order ἡμῖν ἐντέταλται 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 ἐντέταλται is read by 2718.

the text. There are two possible grounds for the omission of ἡμῶν 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. The second reason could be that the σέ occurs twice, and that it was easier to remove one word than change two. However, this second reason seems less likely. Consequently, this change in the introductory formula of the quotation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47 D05 likely betrays OT awareness in the D05 transmission history.

4.4 Text

The text of this quotation in D05 differs markedly from the Greek OT tradition and the rest of the Greek NT tradition. For the sake of comparison, the following table contains the text of Acts 13:47b in D05, NA²⁸ (which reads the same as B03), and Isa 49:6 in LXXGött.

Acts 13:47b (D05)	ἸΔΟΥ ΦΩΣ ΤΕΘΕΙΚΑ ΣΕ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΘΝΕΣΙΝ ΤΟΥ ΕΙΝΑΙ ΣΕ ΕΙΣ ΚΩΤΗΡΙΑΝ ΕΩΣ ΕΧΑΤΟΥΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ
Acts 13:47b NA ²⁸ (= B03)	τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς
Isaiah 49:6 (LXXGött)	ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς

4.4.1 D05 ἸΔΟΥ / d05 ECCE

The reading ἸΔΟΥ in D05 at the start of the quotation of Isa 49:6, for which most Greek NT manuscripts do not have an equivalent,³⁹ is not unique. However, the number of Greek NT manuscripts with this reading is not large, and out of this group, D05 is definitely the earliest witness.⁴⁰ In the Latin NT

39 Most likely, the initial text of Acts 13:47 did not contain an equivalent for the ἸΔΟΥ of D05. In fact, scholarly discussion has centred on why the author of Acts did *not* insert an ἰδοὺ at this point. For summaries and suggestions of this debate, see Gert Jacobus Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* (CBET 12; Kampen: Pharos Kok, 1995) 199; Dietrich Rusam, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas* (BZNW 112; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003) 414.

40 Other Greek NT manuscripts which have an equivalent for the ἸΔΟΥ of D05 are E08 104 1175 1735 1838 1884. To this list should be added 23, according to Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Vol. 2, 119. Tischendorf is followed by Ropes, *Text of Acts*, 128.

tradition, only eo8 and Cyprian support the *ECCE* of D05. The situation is quite different with regard to Greek OT manuscripts, where an ἰδοῦ occurs without fail. The Latin OT tradition is not unanimous, but reads an *ecce* for the largest part of the tradition.⁴¹ Conversely, no extant witness to the Hebrew tradition has an equivalent for the ἸΔΟΥ of D05. The most likely explanation for this ἸΔΟΥ is therefore influence from the Greek OT tradition, although influence from a Latin OT tradition is also a possibility.⁴² This is a clear instance of OT awareness.

4.4.2 D05 ΦΩC TEΘEIKΑ CE TOIC EΘNECIN / d05 *LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS*⁴³

In both the Greek and Latin NT traditions the ΦΩC TEΘEIKΑ CE TOIC EΘNECIN of D05 and the *LUMEN POSUI TE SUPER GENTIBUS* of d05 stand out. Not only is the word order of D05 unique, but no other Greek manuscript supports the dative form of TOIC EΘNECIN. In the Latin NT tradition, the word

41 This includes 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 of Isaiah too.

42 The D05 tradition was possibly reminded of the OT reading by the ἰδοῦ present in the text of Acts 13:46b (ἰδοῦ σπρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη). In D05, the ἸΔΟΥ of Acts 13:46 occurs at the start of the line two lines before the text quoted from Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47. An error of sight—the scribe starting the new line with ἸΔΟΥ, and then continuing with the rest of the text of the Isa 49:6 quotation—is unlikely, since there is a whole line of text between the two occurrences of ἸΔΟΥ, and the phrases following each instance of ἸΔΟΥ differs to such an extent that they would not have been confused.

43 Richard I. Pervo (*Acts: A Commentary* [Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008] 343 n. 117) remarks that “[p]erhaps because of the tradition that viewed Jesus as the servant, the D-Text . . . reads οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν ἡ γραφή ἰδοῦ φῶς τέθεικά σε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (“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 M.-É. Boismard and A. Lamouille (*Les Actes des deux Apôtres 1: Introduction—Textes* [EBib 12; Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1990]) 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 itself (i.e., without the revised introduction) exactly as Boismard’s text. By his argument, Pervo would seriously have to consider the text of D05 as original. Pervo’s criterion of difference from the Greek OT, however, is not sufficient to explain the unique nature of the D05 text.

order of d_{05} is supported by some Latin NT witnesses (most notably Cyprian),⁴⁴ but there exist a number of differences between these texts and d_{05} .⁴⁵ The text of d_{05} , like D_{05} , therefore also seems to be unique.

In the Greek OT tradition, there are no witnesses with the word order of the $\Phi\Omega\text{C TE}\Theta\text{EIK}\text{A CE}$ of D_{05} or the dative $\text{TOIC E}\Theta\text{NECIN}$. Similarly, with regard to the Old Latin text of Isa 49:6, all witnesses disagree with the word order of *LUMEN POSUITE SUPER GENTIBUS* of d_{05} . Furthermore, in most witnesses to the Greek and Latin OT traditions, the phrase $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta\nu \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (or

44 Cyprian attests to *lucem* where d_{05} has *LUMEN*, and *inter gentes* where d_{05} has *SUPER GENTIBUS*. Lucien Cerfaux (“Citations scripturaires et tradition textuelle dans le Livre des Actes,” in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l’occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire* [ed. L. Cerfaux and J. Dupont; Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950] 46) places great emphasis on the similarities between D_{05} , d_{05} 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 D_{05} text in what amounts to be a reshuffled LXX. This source lies behind the “initial” text and Cyprian, according to Cerfaux. B_{03} (and witnesses reading the same) is evidence of a move back to the LXX, while at the same time removing the ἰδοῦ . Cerfaux’s reasoning, however, is flawed on multiple accounts. For one thing, Cyprian clearly has connections with the “Western” tradition—and with d_{05} —as is evidenced in many other cases. Furthermore, why would the B_{03} tradition change the reading back to the LXX, but remove the ἰδοῦ (cf. Haenchen, “Schriftzitate,” 160)? Haenchen (“Schriftzitate,” 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 D_{05} tradition has preserved the original reading in better Greek. Haenchen is of the opinion that something else happened to the D_{05} tradition: basing his argument partly on the $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ of Acts against the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha$ 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 B_{03} / NA^{28}). This was changed into better Greek, “wobei man das zu der pathetischen Wortstellung passende ἰδοῦ 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, *Septuagint Quotations*, 199), as the difference between these texts lies only in one word ($\tau\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\iota\kappa\alpha$ / $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha$)—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 D_{05} were made by the same hand and at the same stage. In any event, the overwhelming amount of witnesses to the B_{03} reading makes Cerfaux’s position highly unlikely.

45 Together with d_{05} , the Latin manuscripts D, Θ and Codex Gigas (as well as Cyprian and Augustine) do not have an *in* preceding their respective equivalents for *lumen*; however, D and Θ have *in gentibus* where d_{05} has *SUPER GENTIBUS*.

its various equivalents in Latin) is read after $\sigma\epsilon$ in Isa 49:6.⁴⁶ Ziegler opted not to include this phrase in the LXXGött critical text, as there is no equivalent for $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta\nu$ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in any known Hebrew witness—and he is probably correct in identifying this phrase as a harmonisation to Isa 42:6, which has a motif similar to Isa 49:6.⁴⁷ However, even though the majority of OT witnesses contain the phrase, no Greek or Latin NT manuscript has an equivalent of $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta\nu$ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ added to its text. This reluctance to change the NT tradition(s)'s text may be due to a disregard for the OT traditions altogether rather than a high regard for the Hebrew tradition.⁴⁸ In D05, at any rate, the text is even further removed from the Hebrew tradition, as D05 has a different word order and a dative (TOIC EΘNECIN) where the most literal translation of a Hebrew text would have a preposition with a noun followed by a genitive (as translation for the two words in the status constructus, לְאֹרֶגְרִים). The changes in the D05 text, then, are not on account of any OT tradition and show no OT awareness. Rather, as Ropes,⁴⁹ Holtz⁵⁰ and Delebecque⁵¹ suspect, the changes in the D05 text appear to be an improvement made on stylistic grounds.

4.5 Evaluation

The text of the quotation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47 in D05 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 $\text{ΦΩC TEΘΕΙΚΑ CE TOIC EΘNECIN}$ / *LUMEN POSUIT SUPER GENTIBUS*. This reading moves the D05 text further away from the OT tradition than any other

46 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 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\lambda\alpha\kappa\eta\nu$ $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$: \aleph B-V-109-736-Q^{ms} 22-48-51-231-763-620-147-90-130-311-36-93-96-46-86^c-233 87-91-309-490 198 239-306 403-613 449-770 538 544, the Coptic version, the SyroLucianic version, Eusebius (in *Demonstratio evangelica* and *Eclogae propheticae*), Theodoret, Tyconius and Jerome.

47 Ziegler, *Isaias*, 305; cf. Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 33; James A. Meek, *The Gentile Mission in Old Testament Citations in Acts* (Library of New Testament Studies 385; London: T&T Clark, 2008) 26-27.

48 Cf. Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 32-33. 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 $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, the Jews, to the $\xi\theta\nu\eta$ " (Barrett, "Old Testament History," 61).

49 Ropes, *Text of Acts*, 128.

50 Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 32-33.

51 Delebecque, *Les deux Actes*, 296.

manuscript of the Greek NT tradition. These changes have generally been viewed by scholars as happening simultaneously. For instance, in his admirable study on the “short” (i.e., a text similar to Codex Vaticanus (B03)) and “long” (i.e., D05) texts of Acts, Delebecque comments on the quotation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47 D05, drawing the following conclusion:⁵²

En 13, 47 le texte court emploie un hébraïsme qui est dans le Septante, *Isaïe* 49, 6, τέθεικά σε εις φῶς ἐθνῶν, « je t’ai établi comme lumière des païens ». L’auteur de D, en supprimant la préposition εις, 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 ἰδοῦ, « vois », que le texte court avait supprimé.⁵³

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—if if Delebecque’s assumption that the same person was responsible for adding ἸΔΟΥ 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 transmission of the D05 tradition first recognised Acts 13:47b as a quotation from Isa 49:6 and added ἰδοῦ, while the remainder of the changes to the D05 tradition were 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 Acts D05, the quotation of Isa 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 stages in the D05 tradition. Indeed, 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, ἰδοῦ was added, based on the

52 Compare the similar statement made by Ropes (*Text of Acts*, 128): “[T]he ‘Western’ text altered the form by adding ἰδοῦ (LXX; not Hebrew), by improving the barbarous εις φῶς ἐθνῶν to φῶς τοῖς ἐθνεσιν, and by giving φῶς a more prominent position.”

53 Delebecque, *Les deux Actes*, 211; cf. Ropes, *Text of Acts*, 128; Theodor Zahn, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas, Zweite Hälfte: Kap. 13-28* (Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 5; ed. Theodor Zahn; 2 vols.; vol. 2; Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1927) 452 n. 3; Holtz, *Untersuchungen*, 32-33; Delebecque, *Les deux Actes*, 296.

reading of the Greek OT tradition. This would also best explain the similarity of D05 with other manuscripts, such as E08, which read ἰδοῦ: the ἰδοῦ was probably added before D05 was changed in the rest of the sentence to disagree with these manuscripts.⁵⁴ In the second stage, 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.

Perhaps one other stage can be identified for this explicit quotation through the lack of an equivalent for *in* in the D05 text. The lack of an equivalent for ἡμῖν is likely due to a higher regard for the OT tradition than the NT tradition. However, as the text of the latter part of the quotation has been left intact, it is difficult to determine at what stage this change (i.e., the omission of ἡμῖν) took place.

5. Conclusion

The present article has shown how the criterion of OT awareness can provide insight into the textual tradition of NT manuscripts. Perhaps the most enlightening aspect of the use of OT awareness (in its various aspects of layout, context and text) is the identification of different stages in the transmission history of explicit quotations (Acts 7:49-50 D05 and Acts 13:34 D05). The layout of the explicit quotations from Isaiah further 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), 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 than mere OT awareness was at play in the decision to indent these passages in D05. One 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 Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47. In the introductory formula of the quotation of Isa 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 Isa 55:3-4 in Acts 13:34 does not clearly identify the source of the quotation, but the

54 Of course, these manuscripts could have added ἰδοῦ based on the OT tradition independent from D05, but the shared reading favours an early addition of ἰδοῦ.

quotation is wedged between two quotations from the Psalms (Ps 2:7-8 in Acts 13:33 and Ps 15:10 (LXX) in Acts 13:35) and could have been interpreted as a quotation from the Psalms. The unindented quotation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47, on the other hand, has no clear reference to the OT in its introductory formula—in fact, the quotation is ascribed to the “Lord.”

The conclusions reached by this article have shown how the careful study of layout, context and text in a single manuscript can further our understanding of how ancient Christian communities understood, used, and applied their (physical) texts. Further study along these lines will, hopefully, help to fill in even more of these gaps in our understanding of the growth of the NT (and OT) text(s).