

1

*Overview Articles*

∴



## 1.1 Introduction

### 1.1.1 Textual History of the Hebrew Bible

This introductory section deals with various general areas that introduce the discipline of textual criticism and that are not treated in the *Textual History of the Bible*, which focuses on texts: the nature of textual criticism (→ 1.1.1.1), textual theories, among which the search for an original text (→ 1.1.1.2), the nature of the textual evidence (→ 1.1.1.3), the development of the biblical text (→ 1.1.1.4), the scribal transmission of the biblical text (→ 1.1.1.5), and the evaluation of textual evidence (→ 1.1.1.6).

#### 1.1.1.1 Nature of Textual Criticism

The *Textual History of the Bible* requires some discussion of the nature of text-critical analysis. Textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible deals with the nature, origin, and development of all the witnesses of a composition or book. This analysis often involves an attempt to discover the original form of details in a composition, or even of large stretches of text, although what exactly constitutes an “original text” is subject to much debate (→ 1.1.1.2). In the course of such an inquiry, attempts are made to describe how the texts were copied, changed, and transmitted from one generation to the next. Those scholars who express a view on the originality of readings do so through evaluation of their comparative value. This comparison – the center of textual praxis – assesses the value of the readings included in the textual witnesses. In the view of several scholars, not all differences should be subjected to textual evaluation. They stress that (groups of) readings that were produced at the literary growth stage of the biblical books (literary or editorial variants) should not be subjected to textual evaluation, since they were not produced during the course of the transmission of the texts (→ 1.1.1.6). In contrast, others think that both types should be evaluated, since different literary forms coexisted side by side and the literary growth and the

transmission process at times overlapped, and because it is through textual criticism that many literary developments are discovered. Both groups acknowledge that the difficulty in differentiating readings of the two types complicates the textual evaluation to such an extent that some scholars tend to avoid textual evaluation altogether. Text-critical analysis is not restricted only to the traditional text of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, the so-called MT, but rather includes all forms of Scripture.

The Judean Desert scrolls (→ 1.2.2) contain more than 200 biblical manuscripts dated to ca. 250 B.C.E.–135 C.E., and they show that most of the books had reached near-final forms recognizable from our current Bibles, though they would still develop. For scholars who separate literary from textual criticism, the aims of textual criticism have not changed with this discovery of important new evidence in the Judean Desert, though the quantity and nature of the new evidence aids us in better understanding the sources known before 1947 as well as the cross-fertilization between textual criticism, literary criticism, and exegesis. For others, however, since the scrolls show that the text of the Hebrew Bible was pluriform and developing diachronically, the aims of textual criticism have expanded to include literary criticism, which is necessarily intertwined.

One of the practical results of the analysis of textual data is that it creates tools for the exegesis of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture. Exegetical activity is based on a text or texts and can only proceed if the nature of that text has been determined. By the same token, all other disciplines, such as the historical, geographical, and linguistic analysis of Scripture, also operate from a text base. In each case, the scholar has to define the text base for his exegesis, and by necessity this involves the analysis of all textual data. Too often, however, these disciplines are based mainly on MT because the extant text editions and commentaries focus on that version.

The aims and procedures of the textual criticism of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture are defined in various monographs (see bibliography below; Tov, \**TCHB*, 1 and Ulrich, \**DSS*, 114–15). Some of them stress that involvement in textual criticism is imperative. But, since many scholars focus on MT alone, examination of the full spectrum of sources for textual variants is now more than ever imperative.

*Differences between the textual witnesses.* The biblical text has been transmitted in many ancient and medieval sources that are known to us from modern editions in different languages: We possess fragments of leather and papyrus scrolls that are at least two thousand years old in Hebrew, Greek, and Aramaic, as well as manuscripts in Hebrew and other languages from the Middle Ages. These sources shed light on and witness to the biblical text, hence their name: “textual witnesses.” These textual witnesses all differ from one another to a greater or lesser extent. Since no textual source contains what could be called *the* biblical text, a serious involvement in biblical studies necessitates the study of all sources, which necessarily involves study of the differences between them. The analysis of these textual differences thus holds a central place in textual criticism.

It is not only the differences among the various textual witnesses that require involvement in textual criticism. Textual differences of a similar nature are reflected in the various attestations of a single textual tradition of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, namely MT, often described as the main textual tradition of Scripture. Such differences are visible in all attestations of MT, ancient and medieval, and even in its printed editions and modern translations since they are based on different sources.

Perhaps one would not have expected differences between the printed editions of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, for if a fully unified textual tradition had been possible at any one given period, it would certainly seem to have been after the invention of the printing press. However, such is not the case since all printed editions of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, which actually are editions of

MT, go back to different medieval manuscripts of that tradition, or combinations thereof, and therefore the editions also necessarily differ from one another. Moreover, these editions reflect not only the various medieval manuscripts, but also the personal views of their editors. Furthermore, several editions contain a certain number of printing errors (Tov, \**TCHB*, 8–9). Therefore, there is no single edition in existence that agrees in all its details with another one, except for photographically reproduced editions or editions presenting the same electronic (computer-encoded) text. Most editions even differ from one another in their subsequent printings, without informing the readers. It should be remembered that the number of differences between the various editions is very small. Moreover, all of them concern minimal, or even minute, details in the text, and most affect the meaning of the text in only a very limited way. The following are examples of the differences between the most frequently used editions of MT: sequence of the books, chapter division, layout of the text, verse division, differences in letters, words, vocalization, and accentuation, and notes of the Masorah.

*MT and the original Scripture text.* One of the postulates of biblical research is that many details in the text preserved in the various representatives (manuscripts, editions) of what is commonly called MT, do *not* reflect the “original text” of the biblical books.<sup>1</sup> Even though the concept of an “original text” necessarily remains vague (→ 1.1.1.2), differences between MT and the other textual witnesses will continue to be recognized. Scholars will constantly hesitate regarding the originality of the readings of either MT or one of the other sources. However, one thing is clear, it should not be postulated that MT better or more frequently reflects the original text of the biblical books than any other text. Furthermore, even were we to surmise that MT reflects the “original” form of Scripture, we

<sup>1</sup> This perception goes back to Cappellus, \**Critica Sacra*, 384–85. Also Eichhorn, \**Einleitung*, 1:278–83 described in detail why the “oldest manuscripts were not without mistakes” (title of the section).

would still have to decide *which* form of MT reflects this “original text,” since MT itself is represented by many witnesses that differ in small details (→ 1.2.2).

*Parallel versions within MT and the other textual sources.* The textual witnesses of the biblical books, including MT, contain several parallel versions of the same unit. Some of these reflect different formulations of the same psalm (Psalm 18 // 2 Samuel 22; Psalm 14 // Psalm 53), a genealogical list (Ezra 2 // Neh 7:6–72), segments of books (Jeremiah 52 // 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30; Isa 36:1–38:8 // 2 Kgs 18:13–20:11), and even large segments of a complete book, viz., Chronicles, large sections of which run parallel to the books of Samuel and Kings. Some of these parallel sources are based on ancient extra-biblical texts that already differed from one another before they were incorporated into the biblical books, and which additionally underwent changes after they were transmitted separately from one generation to the next. In some instances, textual differences between parallel sources in MT can easily be located, as in the textual units mentioned above. It is exactly these parallel biblical passages that prompted the development of textual criticism of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture in earlier centuries, because they necessitated the comparison of texts. See especially Kennicott and Owen.<sup>2</sup>

*Modern approach to textual criticism.* Since the discovery in 1947 of Hebrew and Aramaic texts in the Judean Desert dating from approximately 250 B.C.E. to 135 C.E., our knowledge about the Scripture text has increased greatly (→ 1.2.1.3.4; → 1.2.2). It should be remembered that until the time of those discoveries no early Hebrew and Aramaic Scripture texts were known, except for the liturgical Nash Papyrus (→ 2.2.5.2) that does not witness to the biblical text in the generally accepted sense of the word (→ 2.2.5.2). Therefore,

<sup>2</sup> B. Kennicott, *The State of the Printed Text of the Old Testament Considered: A Dissertation in Two Parts* (Oxford: The Theatre, 1753–1759), *Part the First compares I CHRON. XI with 2 SAM. V and XXIII* (1753); H. Owen, *Critica Sacra: Or a Short Introduction to Hebrew Criticism* (London: Bowyer and Nichols, 1774).

the research before 1947 was based on Hebrew–Aramaic texts that had been copied 1,200 years or more after the composition of the biblical books. At the same time, scholars also relied on manuscripts and early papyrus fragments of the ancient translations, especially of LXX and the Vulgate, which brought them much closer to the time of the composition of the biblical books. All these, however, are translations, and the reconstruction of their Hebrew–Aramaic sources will always remain uncertain (1.3). Therefore, the discovery in the Judean Desert of many Hebrew–Aramaic texts dating from two millennia ago has considerably advanced our knowledge of the early witnesses and the procedure of the copying and transmitting of texts.

This new knowledge has necessarily changed our understanding of the Scripture text and, accordingly, our approach to its scholarly investigation. The investigation of Hebrew Scripture can now be based safely on ancient Hebrew sources, fragmentary as they are.

Textual history of the Bible, however, also devotes an equal amount of attention to the sources that do not contribute much to the study of Hebrew Scripture, namely the secondary Scripture translations (→ 1.4), mainly made from LXX, itself a translation based on a Hebrew source.

The study of the biblical text was initiated as an auxiliary science to biblical exegesis. Therefore, the results of textual investigation have been taken into consideration in critical exegetical analysis, and that practice continues to be followed today. Textual criticism involves a distinctly practical aspect for biblical exegesis, which is emphasized in this article. Within this framework, the relevance of textual criticism to literary analysis, a topic that is usually not treated in handbooks such as this, is covered extensively in the textual history of the Bible (→ 1.1.1.4).

*Beginnings of critical inquiry into the Scripture text.* Interest in the text of Scripture began in the first centuries C.E. (→ 1.2.1.1) when learned church fathers compared the text of Jewish Scripture with its Greek versions (→ 1.2.1.1.2). In the third century, Origen prepared a six-column edition (hence its name:

Hexapla [six-column edition]) of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture (→ 1.3.1.2), which contained the Hebrew–Aramaic text, its transliteration into Greek characters, and four different Greek versions. Likewise, Jerome included various notes comparing words in the Hebrew text and their renderings in Greek and Latin translations in his commentaries (→ 1.3.5).

The critical investigation of the relation between the various textual witnesses began in the sixteenth century with the appearance of the Polyglot text editions (→ 1.2.1.3.1), which invited textual comparison because these editions presented the various witnesses in parallel columns. The first extensive textual treatises are those by Morinus, Cappellus, and Simon, stressing the importance of either MT or one or more of the other versions, usually colored by Catholic–Protestant polemics (→ 1.2.1.3.2).<sup>3</sup> The reader of Cappellus, *\*Critica Sacra* (1650) is amazed at the level of knowledge, acumen, and critical insight displayed by this scholar, foreshadowing all modern analyses.

After the middle of the seventeenth century (→ 1.2.1.3.2), a great many critical treatises appeared on the Scriptural text, though it should be recognized that philological analysis and theological discussion often went hand in hand in this and the following century. The three aforementioned studies, as well as many by Buxtorf, Glausius, Houbigant, Kennicott, Rosenmüller, and de Rossi, contributed much to the development of the critical approach to the biblical text.<sup>4</sup> The *\*Einleitung* of Eichhorn (1780–1823) stands out as a work of immense learning and sophistication in

the nineteenth century, which also had a major influence on subsequent generations.<sup>5</sup> Among the many names that may be mentioned from the nineteenth century (→ 1.2.1.3.2), see especially de Lagarde, Perles, Cornill, and Wellhausen, who displayed a remarkable insight into textual criticism. In many areas of textual criticism, it is often best to start with these older works, since an intuitive grasp of the issues underlying divergent texts is just as important in this art as information deriving from recently discovered data (e.g. the Qumran texts). Wellhausen, *\*Bücher Samuelis* and the introductions of König and Steuernagel exhibited this type of intuition.<sup>6</sup> However, the modern description of textual criticism differs significantly from earlier discussions as a result of the contribution of the newly discovered Qumran texts to almost every area of textual criticism (→ 1.1.1.2).

*Textual praxis.* The practicing of textual criticism (textual praxis) proceeds according to certain conventions. The textual praxis consists of the analysis of the textual data and their use in biblical exegesis and involves two sets of data: 1) the biblical text as found in Hebrew sources and reflected in the ancient translations; 2) the conjectural emendation of the biblical text invoked when neither the Hebrew manuscripts nor the ancient versions preserve satisfactory evidence. The first area may be called textual criticism proper, while the second is supplementary to it.

Textual criticism proper is subdivided into two stages: 1) collecting Hebrew readings and reconstructing them from the ancient versions; 2) evaluation of these readings (→ 1.1.1.6). This process involves all Hebrew and reconstructed details (readings) that differ from an accepted form of MT, viz., pluses, minuses, differences in letters, words, and the sequence of words, as well as differences in vo-

<sup>3</sup> Morinus, *\*Exerc.*; Cappellus, *\*Critica Sacra*; R. Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris: Éditions de Paris, 1680/Rotterdam: Leers, 1685; repr. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1973) = *A Critical History of the Old Testament* (London: Davis, 1682).

<sup>4</sup> J. Buxtorf, *Biblia Rabbinica* (Basel: Ludwig König, 1618–1619); Salomonis Glassii *Philologia Sacra his temporibus accommodata: Post primum volumen Dathii opera in lucem emissum nunc continuata et in novi plane operis formam redacta*, Vol. 2, Part 1: *Critica Sacra* (ed. G.L. Bauer, Leipzig: Sumtibus Weygandianis, 1795); A.F. Houbigant, *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros* (Frankfurt: Varrentrapp Filium & Wenner, 1777); Kennicott *\*1776–1780*; E.F.C. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der biblischen Kritik und Exegese*, Vol. 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1797); de Rossi, *\*1784–1788*.

<sup>5</sup> The works of these scholars have been described in detail by Barthélemy, *\*Critique textuelle 1992*, 1\*–63\*.

<sup>6</sup> E. König, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit Einschluss der Apokryphen und der Pseudepigraphen Alten Testaments* (Bonn: Weber, 1893); C. Steuernagel, *Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament mit einem Anhang über die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1912).

calization, word division, and sense divisions. MT (usually codex L = Leningrad B19<sup>A</sup>) is taken as the point of departure for describing textual variations because it has become the *textus receptus* (received text) of Hebrew Scripture, but this procedure does not imply an automatic preference for its contents, although it contains a very good text. In the course of this comparison, we ought to remember that most early sources of the biblical text have been lost. Thus, although readings in the ancient witnesses, e.g. LXX, are compared with MT, there may have been several intervening stages between that source and MT, but that complication does not invalidate the procedure itself. All details in manuscripts are considered readings, while readings differing from MT are named variants.<sup>7</sup>

As a rule, the collation of Hebrew variants from biblical manuscripts is relatively simple as long as scholars agree that a specific text is indeed a Scripture text. More complicated is the reconstruction of variant readings from the ancient translations (→ 1.3). The collecting of variants from quotations in non-biblical sources and the Scripture text as excerpted and rewritten in antiquity is equally complex.

After collecting variants from Hebrew and translated texts, scholars usually compare them with their counterparts in MT with the implication that reading *a* may be preferable to all other readings, also phrased as the assumption that all other readings may have derived from that reading. If a scribal development such as textual corruption of reading *a* to (an)other reading(s) is assumed, the aim of this comparison is to select the one reading that was presumably contained in the original form of the text (→ 1.1.1.6). Scholars who presuppose more than one original or determinative form would still follow this procedure when textual corruption is posited, necessitating the assumption of one original text at least in the case of genetic readings (→ 1.1.1.6). Due to the vicissitudes of the textual transmission in any given verse, MT may contain

an original reading in one detail, while the original reading for another detail may be contained in another source such as LXX.

The comparative evaluation of variants described in → 1.1.1.6 is necessarily subjective. This procedure is limited to readings created during the textual transmission, excluding those created during the literary growth of the book, even though they are included in textual witnesses. It remains difficult to decide to which readings textual analysis should be applied and which readings should be left without evaluation (→ 1.1.1.6). However, the latter type of procedure is novel in scholarship, and even if two scholars agree in principle that some variants should be left untouched by textual evaluation, they often disagree regarding the details.

Barthélemy, \**Critique textuelle 1982–2005*.

Barthélemy, \**Studies*.

Fischer, \**Text*.

Gentry, \**“Text.”*

Klein, \**Textual Criticism*.

McCarter, \**Textual Criticism*.

Mulder, \**Mikra*.

Talmon, \**“Old Testament Text.”*

Talmon, \**Text*.

Tov, \**TCHB*.

Trebolle Barrera, \**Jewish Bible*.

Wegner, P.D., *A Student's Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press Academic, 2006).

Würthwein, \**Text (English)*.

*Emanuel Tov*

### 1.1.1.2 Textual Theories

Ideally, the textual praxis and the description of the development of the biblical text are based on evidence relating to textual witnesses and their internal relation. However, too often, scholars take abstract assumptions and preconceived ideas unrelated to Scripture texts as their point of departure. This paragraph describes the textual theories that have been launched to describe the development of the biblical text.<sup>8</sup> These theories are of in-

<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, some scholars use the term “variants” in the same neutral way that the term “readings” is used here (e.g., \**DJD XXXII*, 2:89).

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed history of research on this issue, see also → 1.2.1.

terest to the historian, but with the exception of the discussion of the/an original text as discussed in → 1.1.1.2.2 and → 1.1.1.2.5 and that of the “variant literary editions” (→ 1.1.1.4), they contribute little to the understanding of the history of the biblical text or of the textual praxis. Nevertheless, the student of the biblical text needs to be aware of the issues involved.

Textual theories involve preconceived ideas with regard to the composition of the biblical books and their copying, and the assumption of an original text and the development of textual traditions have all been influenced by abstract presuppositions. This approach comes to light in the views of those scholars who describe the development of different texts in a similar way, even though each text probably developed according to different internal dynamics.

The reader will find only partial answers to the questions relating to the development of the biblical text in the following review, for scholars usually referred only to some aspects of the development of the text, even though they themselves often thought that their views pertained to all aspects. A posteriori, one could say that some opinions were correct for their time only, since the texts discovered in the Judean Desert, which completely altered the face of research, were not known at the time. Furthermore, many scholars described the history of the research schematically in terms of a thesis (usually: the views of de Lagarde), antithesis (usually: the views of Kahle), and occasionally, a synthesis. However, on closer examination of the details, such a schematic presentation is found to be untenable.

The following description pertains to the biblical text in its entirety and it should be remembered that MT is only one component of the complete picture. Scholars did not always make a clear distinction between these two levels, as can be seen, for example, from their approach to the view of Rosenmüller, which in fact pertains only to MT.

#### 1.1.1.2.1 Beginnings

The first theoretical statements about the development of the biblical text were by Eichhorn (1781

and later),<sup>9</sup> Glassius, *Philologia* (1795), and Rosenmüller, *Handbuch* (1797), 1:244.<sup>10</sup> Both Eichhorn and Rosenmüller dealt solely with the medieval manuscripts of MT, and not with the biblical text as a whole. On seeing that these manuscripts agree even in the minutest details, these scholars determined that all manuscripts of MT reflect one textual “recension,” which was different from the “recension” of LXX. This view remains valid even today, except that one should substitute *recension* with a term that is less committing, such as *group* or *family*. Beyond Eichhorn, Rosenmüller claimed that all Hebrew manuscripts derived from “one source.”

#### 1.1.1.2.2 De Lagarde’s Theory of One Original Text

In concise abstract terms, de Lagarde proposed that all manuscripts of MT derived from one source that served as the archetype of what he called the “recension” of MT (→ 1.2.1.3.2). The brief pertinent formulations of de Lagarde, *\*Anmerkungen*, though having great influence, did not break new ground since they continued the line of thought of Eichhorn and Rosenmüller. De Lagarde resorted principally to abstract reasoning with regard to textual development but also added a concrete argument pertaining to MT. In his opinion, the identical transmission of even small details, such as the extraordinary points in all manuscripts of MT (→ 1.5), proves that they were all copied from one source (the presumed *archetype* of MT). This claim was applied to the manuscripts of LXX, all of which, in his opinion, also derived from one archetype. Moreover, de Lagarde claimed that it was possible to reconstruct the original form of the biblical text from the reconstructed first copies (hyparchetypes) of MT and LXX. This original text was not described by

<sup>9</sup> Eichhorn, *\*Einleitung*, 129 (1st edition), and more clearly in the 2nd edition, 111, 113, 203.

<sup>10</sup> See n. 4. In modern research, Rosenmüller is often credited with the priority rights to this view, but B. Chiesa, “Appunti di storia della critica del testo dell’Antico Testamento ebraico,” *Hen* 12 (1990): 3–14 has shown that he was actually preceded by Eichhorn.

him; later it was depicted in general terms by Buhl, who claimed that it had authoritative status.<sup>11</sup>

This proposition became known as the *Urtext* theory of de Lagarde (see below). One should note that de Lagarde's statements were very succinct and that more than what he actually said was attributed to him, partly due to a confusion of his views with those of Rosenmüller and others, who ascribed all the manuscripts of MT to one recension.

De Lagarde's intuitive views have been accepted by many scholars; our argumentation in → 1.1.1.2.5 is also close to de Lagarde's views. Similarly, his view that the manuscripts of LXX derived from one source is generally accepted. Other scholars must have made similar remarks. However, it was the fame as well as the systematic thinking of de Lagarde, who formulated the first lucid formulations about the original text of the Bible, that caused later generations to link this view with his name.

A parallel line of thinking developed with regard to the concept of the originality or priority of *individual* readings. Cappellus, *\*Critica Sacra* (1650) was the first scholar to indicate that details in the versions, especially LXX, sometimes reflected the "autograph" of a biblical book better than MT. In 1653, Walton, *\*Polyglotta* asserted in the *Prolegomena* that only one of two alternative readings found in different manuscripts could be original. At that early stage of scholarship, the assessment of readings did not immediately create models of a systematic comparison of MT and LXX. Nevertheless, some isolated observations were made on this issue at a later stage. Thus, Eichhorn's influential *\*Einleitung* (1780–1783) spoke of the "original external shape of the books of the Old Testament" (title of vol. 1, ch. 2, § 1), but his analysis did not involve a discussion of the original text of the Bible as a whole. Likewise, Glassius, *Philologia* (1795), II.1.235 spoke explicitly about the "reconstruction of the text of the Old Testament such as existed before the

time of the Masoretes, that is, such as came from the hands of the authors." According to Glassius, not only inner-biblical parallels should be used in the reconstruction of this original text, but also the ancient versions.

#### 1.1.1.2.3 Kahle's Theory of Early Parallel Texts

After de Lagarde promulgated his theory on the existence of an original text of the biblical books, additional scholars expressed their view either for or against this suggestion. Several scholars questioned de Lagarde's assumption that a single copy once existed, named *Urtext* or *Urschrift* (→ 1.2.1.3.3).<sup>12</sup> Among them, Kahle<sup>13</sup> dealt with the original form of both the individual textual witnesses and the biblical text in its entirety. In his opinion, none of these textual witnesses were created in a single act, but rather through a process of editing and revising. Basing himself, on the one hand, on the internal differences between the medieval manuscripts of MT and, on the other hand, on the variants contained in the Cairo Genizah texts and the biblical quotations in the Talmud, Kahle stressed, against de Lagarde, the difficulty in assuming one original text for MT. Similarly, he claimed that LXX did not originate in a single act of translation, but rather that various translations were originally attempted; only at a later stage were they revised into the form now known to us through the uncial manuscripts of this translation. With regard to the Hebrew Bible in its entirety, Kahle did not reject the assumption of one original text, but emphasized that the textual sources known to us were created from an intermediary source that he originally (1915) named *Vulgärtext* ("vulgar" text), created to facilitate the reading, and later (1951) referred to in the plural as *Vulgärtexte*.<sup>14</sup> He described SP, LXX, and also MT as such texts.

<sup>11</sup> F. Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig: Akademische Buchhandlung [W. Faber], 1891); English translation: *Canon and Text of the Old Testament* (trans. J. MacPherson; The Foreign Theological Library; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1892).

<sup>12</sup> Geiger, *\*Urschrift*, and Wellhausen, *\*Bucher Samuelis*, 25 speak of an "Urschrift," while most other scholars speak of an "Urtext." Scholars continue to use these German terms since the first scholars to deal with this abstract question were Germans.

<sup>13</sup> Kahle, *\*"Untersuchungen"* (1915) and *Die hebräischen Handschriften aus der Höhle* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1951).

<sup>14</sup> In addition to Kahle 1915 and 1951, see also his *The Cairo*

According to Kahle, these texts developed from initial textual plurality into a unity, whereas de Lagarde had maintained that the unity preceded the textual plurality. Kahle's approach is in many aspects opposed to that of de Lagarde, but one cannot appropriately define the differences between them, since de Lagarde's exposition was very concise and the textual information on which Kahle based his opinions was not known at the time of de Lagarde.

The following points may be raised against Kahle:

- Kahle's claim that 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> was a "vulgar" text is unfounded.
- Even in Kahle's time there was no justification for his claim that MT was a text that had been edited at a later period; how much more so is this the case following the discovery at Qumran of many proto-Masoretic and MT-like texts from the third century B.C.E. onward, among which are those written in the paleo-Hebrew script that were apparently based on even more ancient texts (→ 2.2.1).
- Although MT, like any other text, contains deliberate changes, there is no reason to assume that it was created by textual revision.
- The texts from the Cairo Genizah, from which Kahle drew his theory of textual multiplicity, are late and do not pertain to the situation in the Second Temple period, much less the First Temple period.
- Those who accepted the rather extreme opinions of Kahle are few in number; see especially Gerleman and Sperber.<sup>15</sup> The latter scholar reduced the textual multiplicity to two principal traditions: northern (SP and LXX<sup>B</sup>) and southern (MT and LXX<sup>A</sup>). In his book *\*Grammar*, Sperber

collected internal differences both within the MT group (parallel texts, *Ketib–Qere*, etc.) and between certain manuscripts of LXX, as well as between MT on the one hand and SP and the transliterations in the Greek and Latin traditions on the other.

Various scholars accepted from Kahle's writings the concept of "vulgar" texts, albeit with certain changes.<sup>16</sup> The scribes of these "vulgar" texts (e.g. 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and SP) approached the biblical text in a free manner and inserted changes of various kinds, including orthography.

#### 1.1.1.2.4 Post-Qumran Theories<sup>17</sup>

The earlier discussions of the history of the biblical text were eclipsed and transformed by the data from the more than two hundred scriptural manuscripts from Qumran and neighboring sites since, for the first time, there was authentic Hebrew manuscript evidence from the Second Temple period, not just learned speculation. Cross and Skehan published in the mid-1950s major fragments of 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>q</sup>, and 4QSam<sup>a,b</sup>, showing startling agreements with SP and LXX against MT.<sup>18</sup> Albright then sparked the resumption of inquiry into the larger issue of textual history. Perhaps influenced by then-current New Testament textual criticism, which charted its textual history according to a theory of three local text traditions, Alexandrian, Western, and Caesarean, Albright quickly – by 1955 – sketched a theory of three local re-

<sup>16</sup> Nyberg, *\*"Problem"*; Gerleman (n. 14); Greenberg, *\*"Stabilization"* (1956); Lieberman, *\*Hellenism*, 20–27; and Kutscher, *\*Language*, 77–89 ("vernacular and model texts") posited in their descriptions the "careful" tradition of MT alongside "vulgar" texts.

<sup>17</sup> This subsection was written by Eugene Ulrich. Large parts of it are revised from Ulrich, "The Old Testament Text and Its Transmission," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible* and are used with permission of Cambridge University Press.

<sup>18</sup> P.W. Skehan, "Exodus in the Samaritan Recension from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955): 182–87; P.W. Skehan, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut 32) from Qumran," *BASOR* 136 (1954): 12–15; F.M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953): 15–26; F.M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955): 147–72.

*Geniza* (1st ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947; 2nd ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1959; German ed.: Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1962).

<sup>15</sup> G. Gerleman, *Synoptic Studies in the Old Testament* (Lund: Gleerup, 1948); A. Sperber, *Septuaginta-Probleme* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen 3; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1929); A. Sperber, "New Testament and Septuagint," *JBL* 59 (1940): 193–293.

censions for the Hebrew Bible: Babylonian, Palestinian, and Egyptian.<sup>19</sup>

During the following years, Cross greatly elaborated the theory of three local text types, represented by MT, SP, and LXX, which he explained as developing slowly during the Second Temple period in Palestine, Egypt, and a third locale, presumably Babylon.<sup>20</sup> He retreated from Albright's view of "recensions," since the developments were not so much according to set principles but were more incremental and unsystematic. He amassed a great number of textual readings to illustrate and support this theory and thus set the standards for serious empirical studies of the issue. For years, this theory stood alone and unchallenged, since it was based on a large array of readings in the scrolls, MT, SP, and LXX, and since it offered a persuasive explanation of the textual history.

Talmon, observing the high number of variants already in the earliest preserved texts, reinvigorated the classic contrast between the theories of de Lagarde and Kahle. In a sense, de Lagarde's thinking along the lines of a single *Urtext* that had developed in three recensions was later paralleled in Cross' theory of an original base text developing into three different forms in three different localities. But instead of a "one-to-three" model, Talmon saw the pattern rather as "many-to-three."<sup>21</sup> That is, in light of the great variation in early texts, he concluded that prior to the surviving manuscript evidence there were a number of forms of the texts; then, at the close of the Second Temple period, three main text forms, and only three, survived out of that earlier plethora. Partly from a sociological point of view, he noted that after the two Jewish revolts, only three groups survived and continued to copy their texts: the rabbinic Jews, the Samaritans, and the Christians; and each pre-

served the form of the Scriptures that they had inherited. Only these three groups survived, and therefore only the three socio-religious *Gruppen-texte* survived, while other forms disappeared with the groups that had held them sacred. Thus, just as Cross somewhat paralleled de Lagarde's thinking, Talmon paralleled Kahle's view of a spectrum of popular texts that were eventually supplanted by a single official text (one in each surviving community). Talmon also argued for erasing the established line between "higher criticism" and "lower criticism," because he saw the creative scribe functioning as a "minor partner" in the compositional process simultaneously with the transmission process.<sup>22</sup>

Tov and Ulrich continued to explore ways of envisioning the history of the biblical text in light of the complete publication of all the biblical scrolls. Tov's wide-ranging and detailed analyses of the Masoretic and Septuagint textual traditions offer the most comprehensive and detailed explanation of the state of the biblical text.<sup>23</sup> He correctly points out both that MT, SP (except for Exodus and Numbers), and LXX are to be regarded as simply *texts* and not recensions or text types, and that many of the Qumran manuscripts do not show consistent agreement with one or another of those three. Noting the difficulty in charting the patterns of variants in the manuscripts, he has called into question both Albright's use of the term "recension" and the neat text types and text families that Cross and others perceived. To be sure, some manuscripts still merit the term text type, that is, texts that consistently agree with one tradition in contrast to another. Thus, he classifies many Qumran manuscripts according to their alignment with MT, SP, or LXX. But he suggests that many of the texts are to be classified as "non-aligned," insofar as their patterns of agreement and disagreement shift in their allegiance with respect to MT, SP, or LXX, as well as displaying unique readings (see Table 1) below. In addition,

<sup>19</sup> W.F. Albright, "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible," *BASOR* 140 (1955): 27–33.

<sup>20</sup> F.M. Cross, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," in Cross–Talmon, \*QTHB\*, 306–20. See the detailed exposition of this theory in McCarter, \*Textual Criticism\*, 87–94.

<sup>21</sup> S. Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," in Cross–Talmon \*QTHB\*, 1–41 (40–41); and "The Textual Study of the Bible: A New Outlook," in Cross–Talmon, \*QTHB\*, 321–400.

<sup>22</sup> Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible," 381.

<sup>23</sup> Tov, \*TCHB\*; Tov, \*TCU\*; Tov, \*Greek-Hebrew Bible\*; and Tov, \*HB, GB, and Qumran\*.

Tov maintains the traditional distinction between the period of literary growth of a book and that of its textual transmission as important, with textual criticism pertaining only to the latter.<sup>24</sup>

Ulrich, in agreement with Talmon, sees that line between “higher criticism” and “lower criticism” as vanishing.<sup>25</sup> He interprets many instances provided by new evidence in the scrolls as revised literary editions of a previous form of a book, and thus sees the literary process still at work and frequently overlapping with scribal variants typically treated as part of textual criticism.<sup>26</sup> He perceives the accumulated literary results of source and redaction critics as one with the new manuscript evidence of revised literary editions; together they manifest, at early and late stages of the same process, the developmental nature of the biblical texts from their shadowy beginnings up to their abrupt arrest due to the two Jewish revolts and the Christian threat.

He envisions the successive revised editions as the deliberate activity of a series of creative scribes or authors. They are the result of traditions being handed on to new generations but creatively updated in light of changing religious, social, or historical developments that called for new, insightful relevance of the traditions. Moreover, he sees the pluriformity exhibited by the Qumran scrolls as consistent with the same fluidity of transmission observed among the different books of MT, SP, and LXX as well as quotations in rabbinic writings, the New Testament, and early authors such as Josephus. That is, the pluriformity and organic growth, seen in the pattern of successive revised literary editions, are characteristic of the biblical text throughout its history up to the second century C.E. There was no “final form” until the organic devel-

opment of the texts was halted due to extraneous circumstances.

*Critique of the Theories.* Cross' theory of local texts was foundational, both because its insightfulness stimulated scholars to start thinking about the old issues in new ways and work toward a gradual solution, and because it established the empirical model of presenting a large number of significant textual readings, keeping theories responsible to the new manuscript evidence.

The advantages of hindsight, however, as well as the results from the subsequent complete publication of the biblical manuscripts, brought to light several assumptions that appear to have been operative behind these theories. One assumption behind the local-text theory apparently was that there was an *Urtext*, originally a single pristine text that had developed into many forms through scribal activity and error. But rather than an *Urtext*, there appears to have been “a series of original texts” as each new edition was produced or, as Tov described it, “a series of subsequent authoritative texts.”<sup>27</sup>

A second assumption appears to have been that MT, SP, and LXX were text types, as opposed to simply texts, and that all or many of the books within each collection shared the same characteristics. Scholars have become increasingly aware that MT and LXX must be discussed not as a whole but book by book, and that they are not text types but simply more or less accurate copies of some edition or other for each book. Another assumption was that a single locality could tolerate only one single text form.

Difficulties with this last assumption eventually weakened the local-text theory as it became more and more clear that at Qumran, a single locality, a wide variety of quite diverse texts and text types existed side-by-side among a strongly Scripture-conscious group, and this situation lasted for about one and a half centuries. Moreover, though it is quite likely that texts developed differently in different localities, an explanation of how different localities specifically affected the development of

<sup>24</sup> Tov, \*TCHB\*, 2, 167, 324–46.

<sup>25</sup> See also G.J. Brooke, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Demise of the Distinction between Higher and Lower Criticism,” in G.J. Brooke, *Reading the Dead Sea Scrolls: Essays in Method* (SBLJL 39; Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 1–17.

<sup>26</sup> See, e.g., textual variants in 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> at Exod 10:21; 4QNum<sup>b</sup> at Num 11:35, 13:20, and 19:3; and 4QJudg<sup>a</sup> at Judg 6:13<sup>bis</sup>, where in each case a text of a later edition shows original readings versus an earlier edition showing secondary readings.

<sup>27</sup> Tov, \*TCHB\*, 167; cf. Ulrich, \*DSS\*, 13.

TABLE 1 *Classification by Textual Character*

<i>MT-like</i>	<i>Pre-Samaritan</i>	<i>Close to LXX</i>	<i>Non-aligned</i>
1QIsa <sup>b</sup>	4QpaleoExod <sup>m</sup>	4QJer <sup>b,d</sup>	1QIsa <sup>a</sup>
4QGen <sup>b</sup>	4QExod-Lev <sup>f</sup>	4QDeut <sup>g</sup>	4QPent <sup>c-e</sup>
4QJer <sup>a,c</sup>	4QNum <sup>b</sup>	4QSam <sup>a,b</sup>	4QJosh <sup>a</sup>
	4QPent <sup>a,b</sup>	11QPs <sup>a</sup> Ps 151	4QPss (many)

different text types did not emerge. In addition, the textual characterization of the three text forms is too general; 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup> (→ 7.2.1 and → 7.2.3), found at Qumran and often agreeing with LXX, contradicts the theory of LXX as a local Egyptian text; and LXX does not reflect any proven Egyptian characteristics.

Talmon's idea of the survival of three socio-religious *Gruppentexte* is and remains a helpful insight, even though the three do not seem to offer evidence of being denominationally chosen. That is, there are no sectarian variants characteristic of any of the groups,<sup>28</sup> and so there appears to be no causal relationship between the religious group and the collection of texts it inherited. There was no deliberate choice of one textual archetype as opposed to another, but rather each group apparently transmitted whichever form for each book that it happened to have. Again, these were not chosen text types, but simply exemplars of one available edition for each book. In contrast, Talmon's idea of earlier multiple pristine texts is not backed by evidence. Though there is clearly pluriformity in our earliest extant manuscripts, the window of visibility starts only ca. 250 B.C.E., not earlier, and analysis shows that all our texts, despite their variety, can be traced genetically back to a single text tradition earlier than the third century.

<sup>28</sup> Ulrich, "The Absence of 'Sectarian Variants' in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran," in *The Bible as Book*, 179–95; also Tov, *TCHB*, 110. Either the Samaritans' focus on Mount Gerizim or the change to "Mount Ebal" at Deut 27:4 and in Josh 8:30–35 in MT (or both) is sectarian; but note that the Samaritans used the non-sectarian expanded edition (similar to 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and 4QNum<sup>b</sup>) circulating in general Judaism at the time as their base text.

Tov's four-fold classification of the scrolls according to 1) Proto-Masoretic, 2) Pre-Samaritan, 3) the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek, or 4) non-aligned has a constructive function.<sup>29</sup> At the pedagogical level, the categories are quite helpful and offer a clear introductory view, since they quickly provide an easily understandable profile of a specific manuscript. This view may be illustrated by Table 1.<sup>30</sup>

Ulrich, noting from an epistemological perspective that one begins assessing new evidence according to previously learned categories, agrees that those categories are initially useful,<sup>31</sup> even if anachronistic. Then methodologically, he stresses that categories should eventually be scrutinized and reformulated in the most accurate terminology possible to describe the new data. At the close of the Second Temple period, MT, SP, and LXX were not identifiable text types; their texts for each book are simply more or less accurate copies of one edition or other than currently available. Accordingly, they lose their function as standard categories for classifying the biblical scrolls. Furthermore, because they are not text types or standard texts, they should not serve as standards against which other texts should be, or not be, "aligned."

<sup>29</sup> Lange, *Handbuch*, 16–20, generally follows Tov's approach, with minor differences, such as distinguishing "semi-masoretic and protomasoretic texts" in place of Tov's distinction between an inner and an outer circle of proto-Masoretic texts (→ 1.2.2). At a later stage, also Tov uses a terminology similar to that of Lange, viz., "MT-like" and "proto-Masoretic" (see his *TCHB*, 28).

<sup>30</sup> For explanation, see Tov, *TCHB*, 107–09; and Ulrich, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Scrolls," in Flint–VanderKam, *DSS*, 84–85.

<sup>31</sup> Ulrich, *DSSDCB*, 25–26.

TABLE 2 *Classification by Successive Editions*

<i>Edition</i>	<i>n + 1</i>	<i>n + 2</i>	<i>n + 3</i>	<i>n + 4</i>	<i>n + 5</i>
Clear evidence for successive editions of books					
Exodus	LXX 35–40	MT	4QExod <sup>m</sup>	SP	4QPent c (4QRP <sup>c</sup> )
Numbers	MT-LXX	4QNum <sup>b</sup>	4QPent?		
Joshua	4QJosh <sup>a</sup>	(SP)-LXX-MT	(MT?)		
Jeremiah	4QJer <sup>b</sup> -LXX	4QJer <sup>a</sup> -MT			
Psalms	MT-Mas <sup>b</sup>	11QPs <sup>a</sup> , 11QPs <sup>b</sup> , 4QPs <sup>e</sup>			
Partial evidence for variant editions of a book or section					
Judges	4QJudg <sup>a</sup>	MT-LXX			
Canticles	4QCant <sup>a</sup> -4QCant <sup>b</sup>	MT-LXX			
Partial evidence for variant editions of a book or section					
Genesis 5; 11	MT vs. LXX vs. SP				
Exodus 35–40	LXX	MT-SP			
1 Samuel 17–18	LXX	MT			
Ezekiel 36–39	OG(P967)-OL <sup>W</sup>	MT-LXX			
Daniel 4–6	MT vs. LXX				
Dan: LXX Additions	MT	LXX			

Rather, surveying many examples of development in the history of the texts, Ulrich proposes classification of manuscripts primarily according to their successive literary editions, earlier and later (see Table 2).<sup>32</sup> He sees four categories of variation that operate independently in manuscripts: 1) variant or successive literary editions of a book; 2) isolated insertions of whole verses; 3) individual textual variants; and 4) different orthographic or morphological forms. Since most variants en-

countered can be classified in one or another of the four categories above, he thinks that the history of the text should be charted in its primary lines according to the first level: successive editions of each book. While the major lines were developing according to variant editions, smaller lines were bifurcating as traditions developed. Influential leaders or scribes occasionally inserted large isolated comments. Meanwhile the inevitable panoply of familiar minor errors, additions, and alternate forms were affecting all texts in each of the branches. The orthographic practices apparently developed separately and had no relation to the various editions or textual variants.

Varying comparisons and critiques of Tov's and Ulrich's theories have emerged.<sup>33</sup> The challenge for

<sup>32</sup> An initial attempt at sketching the successive variant editions of biblical books might look like Table 2. In the schema, it is presumed that there was a number "n" of earlier editions of the books prior to the first edition preserved. The earliest edition preserved is listed as *n + 1*, the second edition as *n + 2*, the third *n + 3*, etc. For further explanation, see Ulrich in Flint–VanderKam, \*DSS\*, 84–85. For Joshua, it is not proposed that the Samaritans accepted the book, but that, in light of Deut 27:4, they would have considered Joshua's fulfillment of Moses' command to have occurred on Mount Gerizim. For discussion of Canticles manuscripts, see Ulrich, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and Jesus," in *Congress Volume Basel 2001* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 92; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 85–108, esp. 104–05 and n. 44.

<sup>33</sup> See especially R.S. Hendel, "Assessing the Text-Critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible after Qumran," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 281–302. Note also H. Debel, "Rewritten Bible, Variant Literary Editions and Original Text(s): Exploring the Implications of a Pluriform Outlook on the Scriptural Tradition," in *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting*

the near future will be to sift out the permanently useful insights of the pre-Qumran theories and those of Cross, Talmon, Tov, Ulrich, and scholars to come, to lay to rest the less useful, and to move the quest ineluctably forward toward an increasingly accurate view of the history of the biblical text.

#### 1.1.1.2.5 The Search for an Original Text

The search for an original text took place during all the stages of the critical inquiry of Hebrew Scripture, partly coinciding with the developments described in the previous paragraphs, and also overlapping with the views described there.

Before an interest in the early or original shape of the biblical text developed, the biblical text was considered to have existed originally in the same form as that known from the medieval MT, considered the *textus receptus*. However, with the development of critical analysis in the seventeenth century and the comparison of textual witnesses, a new approach was created, according to which one could “improve” MT by adopting some details from LXX or one of the other textual witnesses.

Critical scholars believe that the various textual witnesses of the Hebrew Bible go back to an original text, but this suggestion is not accepted by all, nor is it clear what is meant by an original text. Al-

though the assumption of an original text is commonly accepted in the study of classical texts and the New Testament, in the case of Hebrew Scripture there are other options.

The two main models suggested, that of: a) multiple pristine texts, and b) an original text or a series of determinative (original) texts, are analyzed below. Both models have been suggested with different variations, between which it is hard to decide on the basis of either internal evidence or external parallels. Internal evidence is lacking (the Dead Sea Scrolls are much later than the composition dates of the biblical books) and external parallels are probably irrelevant because each literature developed differently. One would therefore prefer to leave the solution of this problem to historians, but the issue of the original text has very *practical* aspects for exegetes. In our view, scholars should express an opinion on this issue that guides them in determining their approach to the differences among textual witnesses.

Those who adhere to the assumption of an original text (model *b* below) may try to reconstruct it, partially or fully, from these textual witnesses, while those who reject this view rarely resort to the search for an original text and sometimes renounce it altogether. We hasten to add that, in our view, the question of the original text of the biblical books cannot be resolved unequivocally, since there is no solid evidence to aid us in deciding in either direction. As a result, the textual praxis may never be described in a definitive way and each generation has to redefine the issues involved.

It is difficult to describe the views from which one has to choose at the beginning of our analysis, since they have not been clearly defined.<sup>34</sup> Those who adhere to the assumption of an original text (model *b*) should probably content themselves with a vague theoretical statement involving an opinion expressed on its repercussions. It is particularly important to know if a particular stage in

---

and *Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (eds. H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala, and M. Martilla; BZAW 419; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), 65–91; A. Lange, *\*Handbuch\**; A. Paul, *La Bible avant la Bible: La grande révélation des manuscrits de la mer Morte* (Paris: Cerf, 2005); D.A. Teeter, *Scribal Laws: Exegetical Variation in the Textual Transmission of Biblical Law in the Late Second Temple Period* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014); J.C. VanderKam and P. Flint, *The Meaning of the Scrolls: Their Significance for Understanding the Bible, Judaism, Jesus, and Christianity* (San Francisco: HarperSan Francisco, 2002), 140–47; P.D. Wegner, *A Student's Guide to Textual Criticism of the Bible* (Downers Grove: IVP Academic Press, 2006), 31, 67, 185; and A. Wolters, “The Text of the Old Testament,” in *The Face of Old Testament Studies: A Survey of Contemporary Approaches* (ed. D.W. Baker and B.T. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 31. Stephen B. Chapman gives a brief discussion, but mainly in relation to canon, in his thoughtful essay, “How the Biblical Canon Began: Working Models and Open Questions,” in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (eds. M. Finkelberg and G.G. Stroumsa; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 29–51, esp. 48–49.

---

<sup>34</sup> Apart from the views of de Lagarde and Kahle, others determined their positions on the basis of the evidence itself – as opposed to abstract arguments – but usually were not able to break free from the positions of the two mentioned scholars.

the development of the biblical book can be identified as the original text. In our view, the alternative assumption of multiple pristine texts (model *a* below) does not constitute a viable model that explains the development of the texts and the relation between the existing differences.

A discussion of the original Scripture text pertains not only to an analysis of the textual praxis, but also to our understanding of the development of the biblical books, including their literary history. Some scholars support one of these two basic positions, while others consciously refrain from holding a view.<sup>35</sup> Since the questions are very complex, this position is understandable. However, for the praxis of textual criticism, in our view, one of the two positions should be accepted. Almost all scholars are involved with the evaluation of textual variants, but often they may not be aware that this procedure actually requires the acceptance of the idea of an original text in some form. For those who claim that a certain reading is preferable to another one are actually presupposing an original text, since they claim that that reading better reflects the original composition from the point of view of the language, vocabulary, ideas, or meaning. The very use of such an argument is based on the perception of an original text, since otherwise two or more different readings could have been “equally original” thus negating the need to make a decision. Therefore, the authors and users of the *\*BH* series and the *\*HBCE*, and the authors of all critical commentaries by implication accept the idea of an original text. On the other hand, the authors and users of the *\*HUB* edition do not have to make a decision because that edition does not include value judgments. This understanding may be illustrated by an example, viz., the well-known variation in Gen 2:2 between the “seventh” (MT T<sup>o</sup> P<sup>s</sup>-J<sup>N</sup> V) and “sixth” day (SP LXX S). Those who claim that one of the two readings is preferable (e.g. *\*REB*: “sixth”) assume that that reading reflects or could reflect the original text. By claiming that either the reading of MT or the other one better reflects the

original composition, they leave no room for the model of multiple pristine readings as analyzed in model *a*) below.

*Two models.* In our view, scholars involved in textual comparisons cannot afford themselves the “luxury” of not having an opinion on the original text of Hebrew Scripture.<sup>36</sup> Two models have been devised for the early written shape of Scripture, supported mainly by theoretical arguments (see the textual theories analyzed above) and less so by actual data:

- a) Multiple pristine texts.
- b) An original text or a series of determinative (original) texts.

While some scholars posit the existence of an original text of the biblical books from which all or most known texts derived, others reject this assumption. The latter approach can also be formulated positively as referring to the existence of pristine texts that apparently had equal status. There seems to be no room for an intermediary position between these two views, but the presumably differing development of the various biblical books may necessitate different hypotheses for different books.

a) *Multiple Pristine Texts.* The assumption of multiple pristine texts was developed as an alternative to the theory of an original text. However, scholars never formulated clearly the nature of these texts and their relation to the development stages of the biblical books. The assumption of pristine texts involves the further assumption that all/several early texts were of equal authority. The most detailed descriptions of this view are found *apud* Greenberg and Walters, both taking specific biblical units as their point of departure (Ezekiel, 1 Samuel 1).<sup>37</sup>

<sup>35</sup> E.g. Driver, *\*Introduction* (1898); Roberts, *\*OTTV* (1951); Brooke, “Demise.”

<sup>36</sup> In discussing the topic of the *Urtext*, scholars often confuse the question of the original text of the Bible with that of the original text of MT. However, MT is but one witness of the biblical text, and its original form was not identical to the original text of the Bible as a whole.

<sup>37</sup> Greenberg, *\*“Stabilization”* and S.D. Walters, “Hannah

- Kahle<sup>38</sup> suggested a multiplicity of pristine texts for the early stages of MT, LXX, and SP, and also for the biblical text as a whole. He described the various textual witnesses as parallel “vulgar texts.”
- Goshen-Gottstein claimed that if any two readings cannot be described as primary as opposed to secondary, or original as opposed to corrupt, both of them should be considered to be alternative and original readings.<sup>39</sup> Goshen-Gottstein drew an analogy between procedures in linguistic reconstruction and the establishing of the text of the Bible.
- Barthélemy posited a number of undefined “original texts” that lay beyond the sphere of textual criticism as he defined it.<sup>40</sup> However, he did not describe the relation between these early texts, which need to be analyzed by literary analysis.
- Three other scholars rejected the assumption of an original text on the basis of textual data. Basing himself upon the occurrence of synonymous readings as variants in textual witnesses, Talmon, *\*Text 2010* (1961) claimed that such pairs as יד // כף (both meaning “hand”), ארץ // אדמה (both meaning “land”) reflect components that are equally early and original. In his view, neither one should be preferred to the other. Likewise, Greenberg, basing himself upon a comparison of details in MT and LXX of Ezekiel, suggested that various details in both texts are equally valid in the context (“alternative messages, each with its own validity ... correlations between divergences within each version”).<sup>41</sup> In Greenberg’s view, these details are equally original. Similarly, Walters tried to show that in

1 Samuel 1 MT and LXX, reflect two parallel stories differing slightly from each other.<sup>42</sup>

*Reaction:* Although it cannot be denied that many readings are parallel, equally valid or appropriate in the context, the conclusion drawn from them by these scholars does not necessarily follow. Occasional readings, powerful as they may be, should not be invoked, since the evidence may be misleading. Even if one is unable to decide between two or more readings, the possibility that one of them was nevertheless original and that the other(s) was (were) secondary cannot be rejected. One’s inability to decide between different readings should not be confused with the question of the original form of the biblical text. The bottom line of this argumentation is that even synonymous variants need to be evaluated, necessarily with little success.

In addition to the arguments mentioned above, the following *general arguments* against the theory of different pristine texts should also be considered.

- The relation between the biblical composition and the presumed pristine parallel texts has not been addressed in the descriptions by the aforementioned scholars. Probably the proponents of this view support the idea of an undefined unit that could perhaps be called literary cycles, such as the Isaiah cycle or the Samuel cycle that were circulated in parallel and different formulations. While such a view is possible or likely at the level of oral transmission, written parallel transmission is difficult to envisage and, in any event, the preserved manuscripts do not support this idea.
- The majority of the differences between the textual witnesses, that is, omissions, additions, and changes, may be explained as *genetic* differences

and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1,” *JBL* 107 (1988): 385–412.

<sup>38</sup> Especially Kahle, *Handschriften* (1951).

<sup>39</sup> M.H. Goshen-Gottstein, “The History of the Bible-Text and Comparative Semitics,” *VT* 7 (1957): 195–201.

<sup>40</sup> Barthélemy, *\*Interim Report*, vi–vii.

<sup>41</sup> M. Greenberg, “The Use of the Ancient Versions for Interpreting the Hebrew Text: A Sampling from Ezekiel ii 1–iii 11,” in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977* (VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 131–48; the quotation is on p. 140.

<sup>42</sup> Walters, “Hannah and Anna.” These three views together with that of Goshen-Gottstein pertain to details in the theory of an original text, and therefore for those who accept these views they provide a form of guidance for the textual praxis even though they refer to a very small number of instances. For example, Hendel, *\*“Prologue,”* 346, accepts the notion of synonymous readings for the *\*HBCE* edition and therefore does not decide on the preference of one of a pair of such readings.

deriving from *linear* developments. This pertains also to the great majority of the large-scale differences that in our view were created in a linear way and not as parallel texts. We do not exclude the possibility that parallel texts existed, but such an assumption is not supported by evidence. Possible exceptions are the differences between MT and LXX in Proverbs (→ 12.3.1) and Exodus 35–40 (→ 2.1.4.2, 2.4.1.2),<sup>43</sup> but our inability to explain the relation between these texts should not be taken as proof of their parallel existence at one time.

- Models devised for other literary compositions should not be invoked, since each literature may have developed differently.<sup>44</sup>

In sum, there is no positive manuscript support for alternative pristine texts.

b) *An Original Text or a Series of Determinative (Original) Texts.* The hypothesis concerning the existence of an original text, accepted by most scholars, has been formulated in different ways. We disregard the *ipsissima verba* of the biblical authors and oral formulations of the biblical books since both are beyond our evidence. Rather, we focus on the written text or edition (or a number of consecutive editions) that contained the finished literary product (or one of its earlier stages) that stood at the beginning of the textual transmission process. This formulation gives a certain twist to the assumption of an original text as often described in the scholarly literature. Our definition does not refer to the original text in the usual sense of the word, since the copy described here as the final literary product could have been preceded by earlier literary crystallizations. Reconstructing elements

of this copy (or copies) is one of the aims of textual scholars, although the discussion is constantly plagued by the difficulty of defining the literary stages. There is no evidence for the existence of the model of an original text because of the late date of our manuscripts, even the ones from the Judean Desert (→ 1.2.2.2.3). The main arguments in favor of this assumption are as follows:

- In terms of logic and plausibility, the *simplest* assumption is that the writing or editing of the biblical books was completed at some stage, particularly so in the case of late books ascribed to a single author, such as Qohelet. At the end of this process, each biblical book was extant in the form of a single textual unit. The biblical books are literary creations; literary unity, and the mind, logic, and style of individual authors are often visible. These characteristics point to the assumption of a composition that was finalized.
- The improbability of the alternative theory of pristine texts forms an argument in favor of the original text.
- *Linear* development of the biblical books is a major element in our analysis of the early history of the biblical text. Most of the biblical books were not written by one person nor at one particular time, but rather over many generations (→ 1.1.1.2). This assumption applies especially to the books that underwent literary processes such as the Dtr revisions of Joshua–Kings and the different literary stages in the development of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Since the process of literary development was long, one needs to decide which, if any, of the final stages in the presumed literary development of the book should be considered determinative for textual criticism. This problem has become more acute in light of the preservation in textual witnesses of sections of early formulations that were circulated at the time.

A major complication for any theory is the assumption that the textual transmission was operative before the completion of the final literary stage as defined below. These earlier stages were not “drafts,”

<sup>43</sup> A solution for Exodus 35–40 is proposed by B. Bruning, “The Making of the Mishkan” (PhD diss.; University of Notre Dame, 2014).

<sup>44</sup> Kahle, *Handschriften* invoked the model of the Targumim. Other models that have been invoked are rabbinic literature and Second Temple prayers. For the latter, see J. Heineemann, *Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Ammora'im: Its Nature and Its Patterns* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1966), 29–51 [Hebr. with Eng. summ.].

but each literary stage was considered final and then released, in modern parlance. Literary activity continued all the time until the first century C.E.; it did not cease with the acceptance of the canonical status of the proto-Masoretic text (→ 1.2.2), since the Old Greek (→ 1.3.1.1), and some Qumran scrolls (→ 1.2.2) attest to early compositions that rewrote the proto-MT text or a similar text.

*Definition of the Original (Determinative) Text(s).*<sup>45</sup>

At the end of the composition process of a biblical book stood a text that was finished at a literary level and subsequently was considered authoritative, even if only by a limited group of people. Scribal activity preceding the completion of the literary composition is disregarded in the textual analysis, while literary activity preceding that stage is not. Indeed, earlier compositional stages that were intended to be disregarded by each subsequent literary reviser, could not be eradicated. This assumption is complicated since each of these compositional stages was accepted as authoritative when it was produced, as recognized by their preservation in some textual sources. In these cases, the textual evidence does not point to a single “original” text, but a series of subsequent authoritative texts produced by the same or different authors. Each of these stages may be considered a type of original text. As far as we know, no literary rewriting took place in types of simple transmission as evidenced in the case of some individual Psalms, allowing us to aim for a single “original” text. The assumption of parallel pristine texts provides a possible alternative model, but at present it is not supported by textual evidence.

The manuscripts of the finished composition that stood at the beginning of a process of copying and textual transmission, contained genetic variants created in a linear way. We suggest that textual criticism keeps in mind the original text as defined here or a series of determinative (original) texts. This formulation involves the understanding that the original text(s) remain(s) an evasive entity that cannot be reconstructed, although each

scribal error requires the determination of original/secondary status. This model reflects the understanding that some textual witnesses evidence vestiges of a chain of literary activity. The original text(s) as described here existed in a written unvocalized form. If ever found, that (those) text(s) would probably contain errors and inconsistencies.

Cross–Talmon, \*QHBT.

Hendel, R.S., “Assessing the Text-Critical Theories of the Hebrew Bible after Qumran,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 281–302.

Lange, \*Handbuch.

Talmon, \**Old Testament Text*.”

Tov, \*TCHB, 155–74.

Ulrich, E., “The Old Testament Text and Its Transmission,” in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to 600* (eds. J.C. Paget and J. Schaper; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 83–104.

Ulrich, E., “The Absence of ‘Sectarian Variants’ in the Jewish Scriptural Scrolls Found at Qumran,” in \**The Bible as Book*, 179–95.

Ulrich, \*DSS, 84–85.

*Emanuel Tov*

*Eugene Ulrich*

### 1.1.1.3 Nature of the Textual Evidence

Until approximately 250 B.C.E., there was no preserved written evidence of the text of the Hebrew Scriptures. The nature of the text was described in increasingly nuanced ways by the ancients and by the nineteenth- and twentieth-century literary, source, and redaction critics. The ancients, with little evidence, thought the books, in a form assumed to be close to a purified MT, were authored by the individuals whose names were attached to the books: Moses and the prophets. With the rise of literary-historical analysis, the books were seen as composite works compiled of several written “documents,” source texts assembled and organized by redactors, such as J, E, D, and P, the Deuteronomistic Historian, and those responsible for producing the multi-layered forms of the prophetic books. In the absence of textual evidence they based their learned speculation on historical,

<sup>45</sup> This definition is analyzed in Tov, \*TCHB, 167–69.

literary, and theological clues embedded in the preserved witnesses.

Beginning ca. 250 B.C.E., however, the scriptural texts found in the caves at Qumran and neighboring sites offered a wealth of manuscript evidence. The scrolls, found mainly in a fragmentary state, confirmed the trustworthiness of the complete texts that had survived in the medieval manuscripts, showing that they were preserved quite accurately from copies current in antiquity. For example, MT still shows agreement to a high degree with 1QIsa<sup>b</sup> and is virtually identical with 4QGen<sup>b</sup>; many of the expanded passages known from SP turned up already present in the Pentateuchal texts such as 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, used in common by Samaritans and Judeans; and the reputation of LXX rose significantly as a faithful translation of variant ancient Hebrew texts such as those found in 4QJer<sup>b,d</sup>, 4QDeut<sup>a</sup>, and 4QSam<sup>a,b</sup>. Equally important, however, a large number of the scrolls showed that they were not in consistent agreement with any of the three surviving traditions but showed unique forms. This evidence deposed MT, SP, and LXX from the earlier status they enjoyed as the three main “recensions” of the Hebrew Bible, and showed that those three were for each of the biblical books simply *texts* not text types or the “pure form” of the archetype.<sup>46</sup> They were each simply more or less accurate copies of one or other of the forms circulating in the Second Temple period. Given the agreement of some scrolls with one of the three later traditions but also the non-agreement of many others, some scholars assess the nature of the scrolls by categorizing them as MT-like texts, pre-Samaritan texts, texts close to the presumed Hebrew source of LXX, and non-aligned texts.<sup>47</sup> Others prefer to categorize them according to the succession of earliest preserved and subsequently revised editions (→ 1.1.1.2.4).<sup>48</sup>

The advantage of the former approach is that it is immediately clearer and pedagogically more

quickly accessible.<sup>49</sup> The advantage of the latter approach is that it is historically closer to the mentality of the ancients, since the ancients would not have known terms or entities such as MT and LXX, since MT and LXX were not “standard texts” to which other texts ought to be aligned, and since the nature of MT and LXX text changes from book to book.<sup>50</sup>

Analysis of the large number and wide array of variants in the scrolls and the modern texts reveals not chaos but four clear categories of those variants operating on independent levels: variant editions of books or large passages, isolated insertions of a verse or more, individual textual variants, and orthographic and morphological forms.

*Variant Editions.* By “variant editions” is meant two or more distinct forms of a book or large passage that differ from each other due to scribal design, exhibiting discernible, patterned, systematic features, presumably by a single person. Often one edition develops a previous form by adding certain types of material to speak meaningfully to new and diverse situations or for analogous purposes. The older tradition that was found to be meaningful in a previous context is revised for clarity or consistency, or re-theologized to address new historical, political, social, religious, or other situations.<sup>51</sup> For example, 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and 4QNum<sup>b</sup> present texts that are very close to MT and LXX but are expanded repeatedly. 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> inserts a sequence of explicit reports that Moses actually fulfilled the divine commands, whereas MT and LXX often leave the fulfillment tacitly assumed. 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup> and 4QNum<sup>b</sup> insert verses from parallel narratives in Deuteronomy that were not included in the MT-LXX form of Exodus and Numbers.

<sup>49</sup> E. Tov, “A Didactic Approach to the Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Celebrating the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Canadian Collection* (ed. P.W. Flint, J. Duhaime, and K.S. Baek; SBLEJL 30; Atlanta: SBL Press), 173–98, esp. 175.

<sup>50</sup> Ulrich, *DSSDCB*, 315.

<sup>51</sup> J.A. Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 22, refers to this as the “resignification” of the text.

<sup>46</sup> Tov *TCHB*, 158–60; Ulrich, *DSS*, 102–04.

<sup>47</sup> Tov, *TCHB*, 108–09.

<sup>48</sup> E. Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in Flint–VanderKam, *DSS*, 79–100, esp. 85; *DSSDCB*, 315.

The text forms in 4QpaleoExod<sup>m</sup>, 4QNum<sup>b</sup>, and some other scrolls proved to be later, revised editions of the texts as preserved in MT and LXX: that is, MT contains the *earlier* editions of books such as Exodus, Numbers, and arguably Psalms.<sup>52</sup> But compared with other scrolls, MT has the *later*, revised editions of Joshua and Jeremiah. From a different perspective, when MT is compared with the Old Greek, the Greek has earlier editions of Exodus 35–40, 1 Samuel 17–18, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, whereas MT has editions earlier than those of LXX for Daniel and Esther.

*Isolated Insertions.* Scribes would sometimes insert into a manuscript they were copying a major new thought comprising one or more verses that they thought pertinent to add. The insertions could be scribal notes, identifications, clarifications, or enrichments; oral comments customarily spoken by the community; passages with similar or contrasting ideas; expressions of a liturgical, pious, or apocalyptic nature; and so forth. Such insertions, though possibly originating in oral recitation of the book, were intentionally copied into the text. If the insertions are repeated several times and form part of a patterned series, they would qualify as a new edition; but if they are isolated and do not recur as part of a patterned series of similar insertions, they fall into this category.

MT shows nine such large isolated insertions in its text of Isaiah (→ 6.2.2), totaling fifteen verses, beyond the textual forms in the original 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> and LXX. Many of the insertions were later copied into the scroll, but they show no consistency: they are unrelated to each other in content and theme, and the various scripts betray that they were added by different scribes at different times. Thus, they are a series of isolated insertions, not a revised edition of the book of Isaiah. Similarly, 4QSam<sup>a</sup> (→ 5.3.1.2; → 5.3.3) contains at least nine such isolated insertions not in MT, while MT has two insertions not in the scroll. Finally, the short 4QJudg<sup>a</sup> (→ 4.2.1.2;

→ 4.2.3.2) shows an earlier text into which MT-LXX insert a report of a nameless prophet sent to accuse the Israelites of infidelity (Judg 6:7–10). There is, however, so little text that it cannot be decided whether the scroll contained a shorter edition of the entire book or just a shorter text of Judges 6 that did not include the MT-LXX insertion.

*Individual Variants.* The most commonly visible variants are simple, minor changes due to the scribes' errors, clarifications, or attempts at restoring a "correct" reading. These are the subject of most traditional textual-critical studies and books, which remain very helpful for text-critical analysis (→ 1.1.1.5.2.5; → 1.1.1.6).

*Orthography and Morphology* (→ 1.2.2.4.1.2). The composition and the transmission of the biblical texts span such a lengthy period that the language and the spelling practices show developmental differences, as is commonly seen in the growth of other literatures. Pre-exilic writing had little indication of the pronunciation of the text, and, since the lack of vocalization allowed ambiguity, the use of *matres lectionis* grew to aid in pronunciation and interpretation. Numerous examples of differences in *matres* can be adduced from the Hebrew Bible. Thus, for example, David's name, spelled דָּוִד "David" in Samuel, is spelled דָּוִיד in the later Chronicles; נָקִיא "innocent" occurs for נָקִי in Joel 4:19 and Jonah 1:14, as well as טְלָאִים "lambs" for טָלִים in Isa 40:11. But the evidence extends also to sources beyond Scripture, such as Jewish coins (with יהד vs. יהוד "Judah" and ירושלים הקדושה vs. ירושלים הקדושה "Jerusalem the holy one"), and the Egyptian Nash Papyrus (with לוּא "so"; see לוּא in Jer 7:28 and כּוּל "all" in MT<sup>l</sup>-Jer 33:8), among others. To aid in interpretation, the scribe of 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> inserted *van* in האַיִבוֹת (Isa 19:3) to ensure the meaning "spirits of the dead," not "fathers," and expanded in Isa 40:6 the ambiguous וְאָמַר to וְאָמַרְתָּ (first person "and I said"; vs. third person וְאָמַר "and he said," MT). Morphological forms that have no difference in meaning can also be included in this category. For example, anomalous forms in MT such as הֶ- are understandably represented by הֶ- in the scrolls.

<sup>52</sup> Some scholars would dispute the Psalms example, since they do not consider 11QPs<sup>a</sup> a scriptural manuscript. See Tov, *TCHB*, 321; Ulrich, *DSSDCB*, chapter 12.

The newly discovered textual evidence documented by the scrolls shows that in the spectrum of manuscripts that span almost four centuries (ca. 250 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.) all four of these categories of variation appear abundantly, operating independently. The manuscripts dating from the Middle Ages are, as Talmon had noted, simply copies of one or other of the collection of books their communities happened to have after the time of the two Jewish revolts.<sup>53</sup>

Cross–Talmon, \*QHBT.

Flint–VanderKam, \*DSS.

Tov, \*TCHB.

Ulrich, “The Old Testament Text and Its Transmission.”

Ulrich, \*DSSDCB.

#### 1.1.1.4 Development of the Biblical Text

The Hebrew Bible is an anthology of ancient Israel’s faith literature and has a highly complex textual history. Full understanding requires a review of the development of its many parts from the earliest shadowy beginnings to their completion as a canon, and from the collection in antiquity to the diverse forms surviving in extant manuscripts today. The many genres and the many representatives of those genres included in that anthology each have their differing stories of origins, development, and incorporation into final books. Their early histories are virtually all shrouded in darkness since there is no manuscript evidence that has survived to document the processes.

In the absence of direct evidence, literary, source, and form critics searched the biblical books for literary, historical, and theological clues in the texts and attempted to reconstruct major parts of that history, starting with individual laws, stories, songs, prayers, wisdom sayings, and others.<sup>54</sup> Many

of these individual elements would have been in oral form and gradually became grouped into larger complexes, enhancing their chances for continuing existence. Some of the resulting law codes, ancestral narratives, and collections of psalms or proverbs – found meaningful or useful in their original context – could also be experienced as meaningful or useful by new generations in new contexts and thus were preserved, handed on, and eventually granted a place in Israel’s literary heritage. These early traditions were not the product of “authors” but, as oral communal literature, were remembered, repeated, augmented, and reshaped by a succession of sages or tradents over the course of centuries.

The origins of the many passages that eventually came to form the biblical text are quite diverse and require the understanding of several factors: the weaving together of disparate sources, the borrowing and adaptation of foreign literature, and the dynamics of oral composition and transmission.

Biblical scholars over the past centuries have identified both ancient oral and written *sources* that biblical authors employed, as well as later *redactional layers* through which the biblical authors organized those sources and finalized the editions of the texts as we receive them.

As an example, some of the narratives now in the book of Genesis probably originated as separate stories about certain patriarchs or tribal leaders. Each story had a life in the preserved memory of the people for various reasons, but eventually a selection of them was assembled into a continuous narrative, attached to the names of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and unified in a dramatic sequence. Analogously, the Deuteronomistic History incorporated a wide selection of national and local, royal and prophetic, oral and written sources that were woven together into a lengthy theological history by one or more redactors who deserve the name of author.

<sup>53</sup> S. Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts,” in \*QHBT, 226–63 [263]; S. Talmon, “The Old Testament Text,” in \*QHBT, 1–41 [21]; Tov, \*TCHB, 179; E. Tov, “The Coincidental Textual Nature of the Collections of Ancient Scriptures,” *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSup 133; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 153–69; Ulrich, \*DSSDCB, 24–25.

<sup>54</sup> See, e.g., O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction*:

*The History of the Formation of the Old Testament* (trans. P.R. Ackroyd; New York: Harper and Row, 1965); Carr, \*Formation; and K. Schmid, *The Old Testament: A Literary History* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).

Just as the nation Israel came into existence amidst the established nations of the broader ancient Near East, so did its literature borrow from their rich literary treasures. Stories of cosmic origins, a great flood, and the early history of the human race, as well as wisdom traditions, hymns, and love songs, were appropriated and reshaped according to Israel's cultural and monotheistic concerns.

Eventually, the collections of sources stabilized into forms recognizable as early forms of the biblical books. Though they were committed to written form, they lived primarily in the oral memory of the scribes and the people.<sup>55</sup> Oral tradents and scribal copyists did their best to hand on the text as accurately as possible, but each inevitably introduced minor changes, whether errors, clarifications, or enrichments, and occasionally some influential leaders created new editions of a book in light of historical, social, political, religious, or other changes.

Many of the biblical books probably had reached recognizable form by the early Second Temple period, though they continued to develop in modest ways. By ca. 250 B.C.E., manuscript evidence begins to become available, due to the discovery of the library at Qumran and the finds at neighboring sites (→ 1.1.1.3). About a generation earlier, a translation (usually dated ca. 280 B.C.E.) of the Pentateuch was made into Greek, the language of the Jewish diaspora in Alexandria; this strongly attests to Judaism's broader recognition of the books of Moses as authoritative Scripture.

In confirmation, the scriptural Qumran scrolls indicate a strong emphasis on the Torah, as well as on Psalms, Isaiah, the Twelve Prophets, and Daniel, together with *Jubilees* (→ 11.8.2) and *1 Enoch* (→ 11.5), and many of these books are explicitly quoted as Scripture. All the books that are later included in the Tanakh, with the exception of Esther (→ 17.2), are minimally represented there, though

for many there is little indication that they were considered Scripture prior to the two Jewish revolts. With the destruction of the Jerusalem temple, the primary focus of the religion shifted from temple-centered worship to the books of the Scriptures, enhancing them as the unifying force for the communities scattered geographically through the Diaspora.

The scrolls demonstrate that the texts from the Middle Ages and later were accurately preserved from one of the available textual forms in antiquity. After the Second Jewish Revolt, the rabbinic Jews, the Samaritans, and the Christians each gathered a collection of the books they considered sacred. There seems to be no evidence that they compared differing textual forms and critically selected what they thought were the best; apparently each group simply continued to copy the exemplars that community happened to have.<sup>56</sup>

The Hebrew texts changed little between the second century C.E. and the Middle Ages but were copied carefully by generation after generation through the centuries (→ 1.2.2.4.3), eventually supplemented by the Masoretes' vocalization, cantillation, and the Masorah. The LXX texts also changed little, except for a few intentional efforts to improve the text. Since some of the Old Greek books had been translated from Hebrew texts different from MT, there were some major and many minor differences between the Old Greek and MT. Jewish scholars in the second century C.E., noticing those differences, produced recensions (systematic revisions) of the Old Greek (→ 1.3.1.2) to agree more closely with the rabbinic Hebrew lexically and syntactically. Similarly, Origen (185–253), hoping to reconstitute the original Greek text of “the Seventy” amid the plethora of Greek versions in his day, gathered the rabbinic text, a Greek transliteration of the Hebrew, his current version of LXX, and three of the Jewish recensions into a six-column work (the Hexapla; → 1.3.1.2.7).

<sup>55</sup> See R.E. Person, *The Deuteronomistic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 6; Atlanta: SBL, 2010); Carr, *Formation*; and van der Toorn, *Scribal Culture*.

<sup>56</sup> S. Talmon, “Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts,” in Cross–Talmon, *QHBT*, 263; Tov, *TCHB*, 179; and Ulrich, *DSSDCB*, 24–25. For another view, see → 1.2.2.4.2; → 1.2.2.4.3.

As the centuries progressed, the Hebrew texts were translated into Aramaic (Targumim; → 1.3.3), Syriac (Peshitta; → 1.3.4), Latin (Vulgate; → 1.3.5), and other languages. LXX was translated into Latin (→ 1.4.1) and eventually into Armenian (→ 1.4.7), Coptic (→ 1.4.2), Ethiopic (→ 1.4.3), Georgian (→ 1.4.8), Syriac (→ 1.4.4; → 1.4.5; → 1.4.6), and other languages. The originals and the translations continued to be reproduced as accurately as possible, and sometimes corrected, by copyists gifted with varying degrees of precision.

The Renaissance, with its appreciation of rediscovered classics in their original languages, sparked for Christians a revival of interest in the “original” Hebrew, which had long been mostly beyond the horizon of Christian scholarship.

Auwers, J.-M., and H.J. de Jonge (eds.), *The Biblical Canons* (BETL 163; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2002).

Carr, \**Formation*.

Eissfeldt, O., *The Old Testament: An Introduction: The History of the Formation of the Old Testament* (trans. P.R. Ackroyd; New York: Harper and Row, 1965).

McDonald, L.M., and J.A. Sanders (eds.), *The Canon Debate* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002).

Person, R.E., *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 6; Atlanta: SBL, 2010).

Schmid, K., *The Old Testament: A Literary History* (trans. L.M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).

Talmon, \**“Old Testament Text.”*

*Eugene Ulrich*

### 1.1.1.5 Scribal Transmission of the Biblical Text

#### 1.1.1.5.1 Background and Chronological Framework

The biblical text developed and changed much from the compositional stages until the Middle Ages, as can be seen from the many differences among the textual witnesses and the changes of script, layout, and content.

With the help of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we now understand many aspects of the copying and transmission that were not known previously. The following aspects of the copying and transmitting of the biblical text are treated in this section: writing

in scrolls; measures, content, and scope of scrolls; measures of columns, margins, and lines in scrolls; scribal practices pertaining to paragraphing, ruling, correcting, word division, use of final letters, scribal marks, stichographic arrangement, orthography, writing in different scripts; graphic similarity of letters and the ensuing confusions; types of errors and textual variants.

During the Second Temple period, sacred and non-sacred texts were written according to the same writing practices, and accordingly most of the rules for writing sacred texts that are prescribed for sacred texts in *Massekhet Soferim* and earlier rabbinic sources actually pertain to non-sacred texts as well. For example, *Sof.* 1.15 states that texts that deviate from the norm regarding the indication of open and closed sections cannot be used as sacred writings. However, this practice, which is basically a paragraphing system, was followed in most compositions written in the last five centuries B.C.E., biblical and non-biblical. Thus, the practice itself was not sacred, but rather the tradition of indicating a specific type of paragraphing in a given instance. Likewise, the practice of leaving larger bottom margins than top margins in scrolls (*Sof.* 2.5; *y. Meg.* 1.71d) was the norm in most texts, and not only in Torah scrolls. In other cases, criteria were instituted for regulating precision when copying scrolls, but these criteria were also in vogue for any well-written scroll from the Judean Desert; in the case of sacred scrolls, these criteria were formulated in such a way that the scrolls could not be used if they fell below a certain standard of precision: a scroll of Scripture in which a complete line was erased (*Sof.* 3.9), scrolls containing more than a certain number of mistakes (*Sof.* 3.10), scrolls with mixed medial and final letters (*Sof.* 2.20), or scrolls displaying letters written beyond the vertical left-hand margin (*Sof.* 2.3) could not be used for sacred purposes. Likewise, a general lack of distinction between sacred and non-sacred literary texts is recognizable in the following areas: handwriting, horizontal and vertical ruling, stitching of sheets, shape of columns, correction systems, scribal signs, length of scrolls, number of columns per sheet,

sizes of columns, margins, paragraphing, repair-stitching, patching, initial and final handle sheets, use of guide dots/strokes. Indeed, the scribe who wrote 1QS, 1QSa, and 1QSB also copied the biblical 4QSam<sup>c</sup> and inserted some supralinear corrections in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>.<sup>57</sup>

From this description, it follows that the *scribal approach* towards the writing of biblical and non-biblical literary works was identical and no more care was taken in writing biblical texts than non-biblical texts, not even in the case of the Torah. The only texts that were singled out for a careful approach were the paleo-Hebrew biblical scrolls and the MT scrolls from sites other than Qumran.

### 1.1.1.5.2 Copying the Biblical Text

#### 1.1.1.5.2.1 Materials, Shape, and Scope

During the First and Second Temple periods, texts were written on stone, clay tablets, wood, pottery, papyrus, metal (the silver rolls from Ketef Hinnom in the seventh or sixth century B.C.E.<sup>58</sup> (→ 2.2.5.3) and the Copper Scroll from Qumran for the Second Temple period), and skins (leather) prepared in various ways.

The main materials used for the writing of the biblical books were papyrus and leather.<sup>59</sup> There is no direct evidence regarding the main writing material for long biblical texts used in ancient Israel before the period attested by the Judean Desert documents, when leather was by far the most frequently used. Both leather and papyrus were in use in Egypt at a very early period, but it is not impossible that leather was preferred in ancient Israel because it was more readily available than papyrus, which had to be imported from far-away Egypt. On the other hand, according to Haran,<sup>60</sup> a few allusions in Scripture suggest that papyrus served as the main writing material during

the First Temple period, even though no biblical papyrus texts have been preserved from that era and the Qumran corpus contains very few biblical papyrus copies.

While most of the Qumran scrolls were written on leather, some 15 percent were written on papyrus, probably meant for private use. Note also Papyrus Nash, which contains the Decalogue and was probably used for liturgical purposes (→ 2.2.5.2).

The writing of Scripture on papyrus was forbidden in rabbinic literature (*m. Meg.* 2.2 and *y. Meg.* 1.71d). It therefore stands to reason that the few Qumran biblical texts written on papyrus (4QpapIsa<sup>p</sup>, 6QpapDeut?, 6QpapKgs, 6QpapPs?, and 6QpapDan) did not derive from a milieu that was influenced by these instructions. The non-Masoretic status of the two larger papyri, 6QpapKgs and 6QpapDan, indicates that they did not derive from proto-rabbinic circles.

*Scrolls.* During the First and Second Temple periods, biblical compositions were written on scrolls made of leather or papyrus; see *b. Git.* 60a: “The Torah was transmitted <to Moses> scroll by scroll.” In biblical and rabbinic Hebrew, a scroll is named *מְגִלָּה* *megillah* “scroll” (e.g. Jer 36:28; Ezek 3:1), *מְגִלַּת סֵפֶר* *megillat sepher* “scroll of a book” (Jer 36:2, 4, 6; Ezek 2:9; Ps 40:8), or just *סֵפֶר* “scroll” (Isa 34:4).

While the physical aspects of the ancient scrolls are described in full in Tov, *\*Scribal Practices*, some aspects are described here briefly.

*Content and scope of scrolls.* The known texts from the Judean Desert contain only a single biblical book or part thereof, with the exception of ten Qumran copies of the Torah that contain two books and Mur 1, which probably contained Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers. The Minor Prophets were regarded as one book: 4QXII<sup>b</sup>g, MurXII, and 8HēvXII gr. For the dimensions of scrolls, sheets, columns, and margins, the number of sheets in a scroll and the number of columns in a sheet, see Tov, *\*Scribal Practices*, 79–104.

<sup>57</sup> See E. Ulrich, “4QSam<sup>c</sup>: A Fragmentary Manuscript of 2 Samuel 14–15 from the Scribe of the *Serek Hayyahad* (1QS),” *BASOR* 235 (1979): 1–25.

<sup>58</sup> See Tov, *\*TCHB*, 111.

<sup>59</sup> For the preparation of leather and papyrus, see Tov, *\*Scribal Practices*, 32–35.

<sup>60</sup> M. Haran, “Book-Scrolls in Israel in Pre-Exilic Times,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 161–73; M. Haran, “Book-Scrolls at the Beginning of

the Second Temple Period: The Transition from Papyrus to Skins,” *HUCA* 54 (1983): 111–22.

*Codices.* In medieval times, most biblical texts were written on a codex (plural: codices) of parchment, that is, any number of double-leaves that were inserted and stitched together as a book. Such a codex was named מצחף *mišḥap* used for reading in general.

*Liturgical and non-liturgical use.* From early times, a distinction was made between liturgical scrolls used in the public reading of Hebrew Scripture in places of worship, and non-liturgical or private texts. The custom of writing in codices is well evidenced for the post-Talmudic period, apparently not before 700 C.E. The codex was restricted to the non-liturgical use of the Bible, while liturgical scrolls continued to be used for religious purposes in the Middle Ages. These liturgical scrolls were written without vowels and accents, in accordance with the writing rules laid down in antiquity by the rabbis. Most of those rules are also reflected in the carefully written codices, while the latter texts were vocalized and accented and contained the complete Masoretic apparatus (→ 1.5).

#### 1.1.1.5.2.2 Writing Practices

The writing practices governing the copying of biblical books in scrolls and codices developed over many generations. One group of writing traditions is known from the Judean Desert scrolls, and a later one is reflected in Masoretic codices and the practices described in the Talmud and collected with additions in *Massekhet Sefer Torah*, from the early post-Talmudic period (eighth or ninth century), and with more details in *Massekhet Soferim*. *Massekhet Soferim* contains *halakhot*, “religious instructions,” pertaining to such matters as writing materials, the skin and its preparation, the scribes, the measurements of the sheets, columns, lines, and margins, the correction of errors, the writing of divine names, storage, and the reading of the books.

The following analysis concentrates on the early finds – principally from the Judean Desert – of all the witnesses of the biblical text, including proto-Masoretic texts:<sup>61</sup>

<sup>61</sup> See Tov, \*Scribal Practices\*, 131–235.

*Word Division.* The overwhelming majority of the Judean Desert texts (biblical and non-biblical) use one of two systems for separating words in Hebrew and Aramaic, employing either word-dividers of some kind (mainly dots) in texts written in the paleo-Hebrew script, or spacing between words in texts written in the square (Aramaic) script. The latter system is evidenced in Aramaic texts from the seventh century onwards until the time of the medieval Masoretic codices.

On the other hand, continuous writing (*scriptio continua*) or that with very few breaks, is attested only in some texts or groups of texts from the Judean Desert, probably in order to economize on space.

On the basis of this evidence, it seems likely that word division of some kind was also used in the first biblical texts.<sup>62</sup> However, other scholars claim that the first biblical texts were written without any word division. This assumption is supported by both Phoenician inscriptions, which do not contain word division, and many variants in biblical manuscripts that reflect differences in word division. However, the Qumran evidence shows that the spaces between words were not always indicated well, causing later generations of scribes to make wrong decisions on word division.

*Final and Non-final Letters.* No distinction was made between the final and non-final forms of any letters in the early Hebrew script, and presumably this was also the case in the first biblical scrolls written in the square script.

*Text Divisions.* The Bible text was subdivided with different, sometimes conflicting, systems in different periods in both oral tradition (small sense units: hemistichs and stichs in some poetry units, and verses in other poetry units and prose) and in written forms (large sense units [sections], psalms,

<sup>62</sup> So A.R. Millard, “‘Scriptio Continua’ in Early Hebrew: Ancient Practice or Modern Surmise?” *JSS* 15 (1970): 2–15; J. Naveh, “Word Division in West Semitic Writing,” *IEJ* 23 (1973): 206–08.

and books). In addition, the text of MT was subdivided into chapters.

*Division into Small Sense Units (Verses and Sticks).* Among all the Hebrew and Aramaic texts from antiquity and more particularly from the Judean Desert, the division into units smaller than section divisions (open and closed sections) is evidenced only in Hebrew Scripture.

The division into small sense units probably originated together with the public reading of Scripture. That reading needed to be punctuated at intervals smaller than open or closed sections for the sake of the reader and listeners and, at a later stage, also for the *meturgeman* (“translator” from Hebrew into Aramaic). Only the Torah and some additional segments of Scripture were read in public service, but the existence of versification in these books and segments must have influenced the creation of such a system in the remainder of the biblical books.

The scribes of the Hebrew–Aramaic biblical texts from the Judean Desert did not indicate small sense units (verses), not because such a procedure had yet to be developed, but because that practice was initially only oral. The beginning of verse divisions are visible only in early manuscripts of LXX and the Targum from the Judean Desert.

What exactly constituted a verse in prose sections has not been determined and further research is needed for the different Bible books. Not every verse contains a logical unit, and sometimes the delineation of a verse in MT is artificial.

Beyond the indication of the verse division, some poetical units in the Bible were written in different stichographic systems. Furthermore, the indication of small spaces after each hemistich (two to five words) in 1QIsa<sup>a</sup> in Isa 61:10–62:9 is unique.

*Division into Large Sense Units (Sections).* In the great majority of biblical and non-biblical texts from the Judean Desert, as in most Greek texts from the Hellenistic period, and in earlier Aramaic texts from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.E., the text was subdivided into meaningful units that

were separated from one another by means of spacing.

Prior to the discovery of the Qumran texts, this system was often wrongly considered to be characteristic of the transmission of MT, where the sections thus indicated were named *parashiyot*. The division into section units was often impressionistic, involving:

- a) a space extending from the last word in the text to the end of the line, indicating a major division (an open section in the Masoretic tradition);
- b) a space in the middle of the line (closed section in the Masoretic tradition), usually denoting a smaller segment than the one described in the division into small sense units (above).

*Division into Psalms.* In the analysis of the different types of spacing between poetical units, individual psalms comprise special entities in that they are smaller than books and larger than sections. Each psalm forms a separate unit, the beginning and end of which are usually clearly indicated in scrolls, not only in biblical psalms, but also in other poetical units from Qumran such as 1–4QHodayot. Four different methods for indicating the beginnings of psalms are recognized.

*Division into Books.* As a rule, each biblical book is contained in a separate scroll among the Judean Desert scrolls. In scrolls containing more than one biblical book, spaces were left between successive books.

*Stichographic Layout.* The tradition of writing poetic texts in a special layout in the medieval texts of MT was preceded by similar procedures in many of the Judean Desert texts.

*Correction of Errors.* Upon completing the copying, and often while still in the process, scribes often corrected errors. All the elements imposed on and changed in the base text of the Judean Desert scrolls *replace* that base text. No support has been found for the assumption that some of the added elements should be understood as variant readings

deriving from an external source, such as another manuscript of the same composition.

*Correcting Methods.* When a scribe or reader corrected or altered the text that he or a previous scribe had written, various techniques for indicating the corrections were used in the linear text or the interlinear space. Several techniques were employed for deleting letters and words, and most scribes used these systems interchangeably, although some preferred a specific practice: i) cancellation dots/strokes; ii) crossing out with a line; iii) parenthesis signs; iv) erasure; v) supralinear addition of a single letter or letters, a word or words replacing a linear word; vi) reshaping letters.

*Scribal Markings.* The texts from the Judean Desert, especially those from Qumran, contain various scribal markings, some of which recur often in biblical as well as non-biblical texts.

*Writing of Divine Names.* The divine names were written in a special way in many Hebrew Qumran texts. These practices reflect reverence for the divine names, considered so sacred that they were not to be written with regular characters lest an error be made or lest they be erased by mistake: a) Paleo-Hebrew characters in texts written in the square script, mainly in non-biblical texts; b) four dots (named *Tetrapuncta*) in texts written in the square script represent the Tetragrammaton, mainly in non-biblical texts; c) a dicolon (:) followed by a space is systematically placed before the Tetragrammaton (written in the square script) in 4QRP<sup>b</sup> (4Q364).

*Breaking up of Words.* Words are often broken up at the end of a line (split between lines) in the early Hebrew script, and likewise in biblical scrolls written in the paleo-Hebrew script.

#### 1.1.1.5.2.3 Scripts

Paleography, the discipline that deals with the development of writing, pertains to many aspects of the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, in particular to the following two:

On the basis of external sources, especially those bearing dates such as coins and inscriptions, it is possible to describe the development of written documents including that of the biblical texts, and to date such texts as those found in the Judean Desert, according to some scholars, with relatively great accuracy. For example, according to Cross,<sup>63</sup> the Qumran texts written in the square script can be divided into three main periods: i) 250–150 B.C.E. (archaic script); ii) 150–30 B.C.E. (Hasmonean script); iii) 30 B.C.E.–70 C.E. (Herodian script).

An examination of similarly shaped letters makes the interchanges of similar letters, such as those found in all witnesses of the biblical text, more understandable.

*Change of Script.* Over the generations, the biblical books were written in two different scripts, at first in the early Hebrew script and later in the square script, which developed from the Aramaic script. The late books were apparently written directly in this script.

#### 1.1.1.5.2.4 Orthography

Orthography (spelling) is the realization in writing of the spoken word and, accordingly, many words may be represented in different spellings. Indeed, most languages have used different spellings at different periods or in concurrent dialects without any difference in meaning. For example, many English words are spelled differently in Great Britain (e.g. *favour*, *specialise*) and in the United States (*favor*, *specialize*). Similarly, in Hebrew, there is no difference in meaning between לֹא and לוֹא (both meaning “no”), nor between שומרים and שמרים (both meaning “guardians”).

The orthography of the Hebrew language, in common with that of most other languages, passed through various phases, in particular, in the ever-increasing use of *matres lectionis* (the vowel letters אֵהוּי), which were added to the consonantal framework to facilitate the reading.

<sup>63</sup> Cross, \*Development.

*Different Orthographic Practices in the Biblical Texts.* Since there are no preserved biblical texts dating from periods earlier than the third century B.C.E., early stages of the orthography of the biblical books are not evidenced; for the purposes of this discussion, the silver rolls from Ketef Hinnom are disregarded, since they do not contain a biblical text proper. The description of the spelling systems thus starts with the third century B.C.E., although earlier stages may be reconstructed on the basis of parallels in Hebrew and external sources.

Over the course of many generations, the orthography of the biblical books passed through various phases, since these books or parts of them (early poems) were first written down at a stage when the orthography was still very defective. With each successive transcription, the orthography of the biblical books was adapted either fully or partially to the system that was currently in practice in that period (→ 1.2.2.4.1.2).

The major groups of orthography practices, starting with the most defective texts, are:

- 4QSam<sup>b</sup> (→ 5.3.1.3) is the most defective biblical text known, and therefore reflects the typologically earliest-known biblical source (ca. 250 B.C.E.).
- MT as represented by the proto-Masoretic texts from the Judean Desert, especially from sites other than Qumran (→ 1.2.2).
- Medieval representatives of SP.
- Pre-Samaritan texts from the Judean Desert.
- The very full orthography of the texts written in the Qumran scribal practice.

#### 1.1.1.5.2.5 Textual Transmission

In the First and Second Temple periods, scribal practices or schools are likely to have existed, that is, groups of scribes who copied scrolls, consistently or not, according to certain conventions. The term “scribal school” implies an organizational structure that may not have existed in those early days, for which “scribal practice” may be a more appropriate term. Five groups stand out for antiquity and the Middle Ages.

- The Qumran scribal practice.
- The scribes producing the paleo-Hebrew scrolls.
- The proto-Masoretic texts were probably also copied by a separate scribal school.
- The medieval scribes of MT.
- The medieval scribes of SP.

*Textual Transmission.* The differences between the textual witnesses came about as a result of copying and transmitting the text, and were created, consciously or not, by scribes, always inconsistently. Large differences between the textual witnesses, presumably created during the course of the literary development of the books, are analyzed in paragraph → 1.1.1.2.

It has become customary to compare all textual evidence with MT, but the centrality of MT in the textual procedure does not imply that we take a position regarding its priority.

The processes of textual transmission are exemplified from the various strata of the biblical text:

- parallel texts within MT reflecting early textual variations;
- internal differences within the MT-group among medieval manuscripts and between the *Ketib* and *Qere* forms;
- differences between MT and ancient Hebrew sources (SP, Judean Desert texts); differences between MT and the reconstructed *Vorlage* of an ancient version.

In the course of copying ancient scrolls, scribes created new readings of two main types. The first group of readings was created as a result of the textual transmission itself; such readings are unavoidable in the copying of all texts, and above all, of ancient texts. The majority of them reflect various types of corruptions; these variants are named genetic. The readings of the second group were created intentionally, not as a natural consequence of the copying processes. The classification is tentative, since often one cannot be certain about intentions in the analysis of readings.

*Differences Created in the Course of the Textual Transmission.* In the course of the copying, scribes created variation in a) minuses, b) pluses, c) interchanges, and d) sequence differences. In addition, scribes changed the layout of the texts and embedded their interpretations in the sense divisions inserted in the text (e). In Tov, \*TCHB, 221–62, the following groups of interchanges are exemplified:

- a) Minuses
  - Random omissions
  - Haplography
- b) Pluses
  - Dittography
  - Doublets
- c) Interchanges
  - Interchange of similar letters
    - Graphic similarity
      - i) Graphic similarity between letters in the early Hebrew script
      - ii) Similarity between letters in the square script
      - iii) Ligatures
      - iv) Metathesis
    - Phonological similarity
      - Different conceptions of word division
      - Orthography: differences involving *matres lectionis*
      - Orthography: quiescent *ʾaleph*
      - Variations involving the use of final letters
      - Vocalization (reading)
      - Complex variants
      - Abbreviations?
- d) Sequence differences
- e) Scribal interpretations

*Variant Readings Reflecting Content Changes.* The changes belonging to the above-mentioned groups resulted from the copying process and many of them reflect scribal mistakes. The creation of those readings was an unavoidable result of scribal activity. While most of the changes were unintentional, some were intentional. Some scribes took the liberty of altering the content of the text in both large and small details. The following types of changes are recognized, with a certain degree of overlap: a)

exegetical changes; b) linguistic–stylistic changes; c) insertion of synonymous readings; d) harmonizations; e) additions to the body of the text.

The presentation of the details in the textual transmission reflects our understanding of the development of the biblical text in its early stages. In our analysis, a distinction is made between a) authors–scribes together with editors–scribes, and b) copyists–scribes. The hyphenation of these terms shows how difficult it is to differentiate between the stages. Authors and editors created the books during the first stages of their existence, but they were also active as scribes who wrote their own thoughts and copied from earlier works, while some of them must have dictated their works to others (e.g. Jeremiah 36). Scribes–copyists gave further shape to the books in transmitting the finished compositions while also inserting occasional changes.

a) *Exegetical Changes.* Ancient scribes took the liberty of inserting various changes (omissions, additions, changes in content), for at the beginning of the transmission of the biblical text, intervention such as that reflected in these changes was considered acceptable. These changes were inserted into all texts, and therefore found their way into the proto-Masoretic texts, the Hebrew *Vorlage* of several ancient translations, and SP. By means of a subjective comparison of texts, it is possible to identify some deliberate changes.

Few of these changes were pervasive and encompassing, since copyists–scribes would not change the text to any great extent. According to our understanding, the larger changes that are found in the textual witnesses should be ascribed to the earlier stage of the literary development of the biblical books (→ 1.1.1.2).

i) *Contextual Changes.* Many of the changes introduced by scribes cannot be ascribed to any of the external influences described in the paragraphs below. They probably derived from the context, reflecting the scribes' wishes to adapt the texts to their own understanding or to an exegetical tradition known to them.

ii) *Theological Changes*. Many of the exegetical changes in manuscripts lie within the religious realm, and therefore in modern discussions they are usually termed theological. Although such changes are recognized in most biblical books, they do not appear with the same frequency in all books or in all textual witnesses. Their inconsistent occurrence in the manuscripts is one of their distinguishing features, while some conglomerations of theological intervention are recognizable.

Some types of small theological changes in MT are found among the *Qere* readings and the exegetical “corrections of the Scribes” (→ 1.5). Similar tendencies are seen in the ancient versions, reflecting their *Vorlagen* and the translators’ activities. Large theological changes are ascribed to the earlier authors–scribes, and small theological changes were inserted by copyists–scribes. The former, usually not mentioned in text-critical analyses, reflect differences between layers in the process of literary growth.

*Small Theological Changes*. Although all scholars accept the assumption of theological intervention in textual witnesses, their frequency remains a matter of dispute. From the scholarly literature one often gets the impression that ancient scribes frequently inserted theological alterations. However, the number of such changes is probably smaller than usually assumed, since most scholars provide the same examples for a phenomenon they consider widespread.<sup>64</sup> The fact that the Masorah explicitly mentions the – probably exegetical – corrections of the Scribes (→ 1.5), which constitute a generally accepted phenomenon in the transmission of MT, has influenced scholars to assume many more such instances.

While some deliberate changes do not follow any specific pattern, in other cases certain tendencies are recognized. Many of these changes pertain to areas that were sensitive for generations of early scribes, who, as all readers of the Bible, had their own ideas about many aspects of religion:

- Sundry contextual theological alterations
- Anti-polytheistic alterations
- Euphemistic alterations
- “Nomistic” alterations
- Conglomerations of theological alterations in MT-Sam

b) Linguistic–stylistic changes

c) Insertion of synonymous readings

d) Harmonizations

e) Explanatory and exegetical additions to the body of the text, mainly 1) glosses, and 2) exegetical additions (interpolations)

f) Midrash-like changes and additions.

Andersen–Forbes, \**Spelling*.

Barr, \**Variable Spellings*.

Cross, \**“Development.”*

Delitzsch, \**Lese- und Schreibfehler*.

Millard, A.R., “‘Scriptio Continua’ in Early Hebrew: Ancient Practice or Modern Surmise?” *JSS* 15 (1970): 2–15.

Naveh, J., “Word Division in West Semitic Writing,” *IEJ* 23 (1973): 206–08.

Naveh, J., *Early History of the Alphabet: An Introduction to West Semitic Epigraphy and Palaeography* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1987).

Oesch, \**Petucha*.

Sperber, \**Grammar*.

Tov, \**Scribal Practices*.

Tov, \**TCHB*, 191–262.

#### 1.1.1.6 Evaluation of Textual Evidence

The textual praxis includes the description of the textual witnesses and the collecting of readings included in these witnesses; readings differing from MT are usually named “variants” (→ 1.1.1). Most scholars state that their intention is to choose the one reading from among the variants that was most likely to have been contained in the original text, or the reading from which their existence can be explained. Scholars who, for a variety of reasons,<sup>65</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Note also that many of the examples of theological changes given by Geiger, \**Urschrift* are emendations.

<sup>65</sup> E.g. Brooke, “Demise.”

are opposed to the search for original readings will nevertheless have to be involved in some form of evaluation process, since they agree that all ancient sources, including MT, contain corrupt readings. Readings that were created at the literary growth stage of the book (→ 1.1.1.4), when different determinative versions of that book existed, are, in our view, excluded from textual evaluation.

Biblical scholars make frequent use of textual guidelines for evaluation, even though it is questionable whether any fixed or objective criteria exist. A critical review of these rules results in a rather negative view of their validity and practicality. We suggest that common sense should be the scholar's main guide when attempting to locate the contextually most appropriate reading. At the same time, abstract rules are sometimes also helpful.<sup>66</sup>

Since the seventeenth century,<sup>67</sup> guidelines have been described for the textual analysis of Hebrew Scripture, initially for the "correction" of MT, for example, in the seventeenth century by Walton, *\*Prolegomena*, in the eighteenth century by Houbigant and Glassius,<sup>68</sup> in the nineteenth century by de Rossi, Porter, Davidson, de Wette, Loisy, Kennedy, Smith, and Thenius,<sup>69</sup> and in the twen-

tieth century by Steuernagel, Coppens, Bentzen, Noth, Archer, Payne, Klein, Thompson, Barth-Steck, Deist, Würthwein, Barthélemy, Hayes, and several others.<sup>70</sup>

Some scholars realized the limitations of employing textual guidelines. However, other scholars believe that the application of intrinsically correct rules forms the key to an objective evaluation.

Rules that are necessarily abstract can be made more acceptable and seemingly objective by the use of tangible examples. However, the fact that these rules are usually presented without illustrating examples seems to indicate that scholars did not wish to commit themselves by offering examples. Since most examples may be explained by alternative means, it is difficult to present examples that unequivocally prove the correctness of any rule.

<sup>66</sup> See Tov, *\*TCHB*, 269–82 in great detail.

<sup>67</sup> The earliest list of guidelines suggested for the comparison of readings in the Hebrew Bible is that of Walton, *\*Polyglotta* in 1653–1657, republished by F. Wrangham, *Briani Waltoni s.T.P. in Biblia Polyglotta Prolegomena*, vols. 1–11 (Cambridge: Joannes Smith, 1828), 1.332–36. Other rules for the correction of MT or for the detection of errors were suggested by Cappellus, *\*Critica Sacra* (1650), 299–314 and J. Le Clerc (Clericus), *Ars Critica* (Amsterdam: Gallet, 1697), xvi. In this area, students of Hebrew Scripture have usually followed the lead of other disciplines, especially classical and New Testament scholarship. For example, Cappellus, the author of the first full-scale critical analysis of the text and versions of Hebrew Scripture, quoted extensively from H. Estienne's textual treatment of Cicero: *In Marci Tullii Ciceronis quamplurimos locos castigationes* (Paris, 1577), vi–xii.

<sup>68</sup> Houbigant: see n. 5 (1777), cxvi–cxxiv; Glassius, *\*Philologia* (1795), 454–58.

<sup>69</sup> G.B. de Rossi, *Introduzione alla sacra scrittura che comprende le prenozioni piu importanti ai testi originali e alle loro verioni* (Parma: Stamperia Ducale, 1817), 99–100; J.S. Porter, *Principles of Textual Criticism: With Their Application to the Old and New Testaments* (London: Simms & M'Intyre, 1848);

S. Davidson, *A Treatise on Biblical Criticism: Exhibiting a Systematic View of That Science* (Boston: Gould & Lincoln, 1853 = Edinburgh: Black, 1854), 382–87; W.M.L. de Wette, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (8th ed.; Berlin: Reimer, 1869), 233–40; A.F. Loisy, *Histoire critique du texte et des versions de la Bible* (2 vols.; Amiens: Imprimerie Générale Rousseau-Leroy, 1892), 1:239–50; J. Kennedy, *An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the Old Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1928), 189–231; H.P. Smith, *Samuel* (1CC; New York: Scribner, 1899; repr. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969); O. Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels erklärt* (ed. M. Löhr; 3rd ed.; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1898), xc–xcii.

<sup>70</sup> Steuernagel, *\*Einleitung* (1912), 72–73; J. Coppens, "La critique du texte hébreu de l'Ancien Testament," *Bib* 25 (1944): 9–49; A. Bentzen, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (2 vols; 7th ed.; Copenhagen: Gad, 1967), 1:94–98; M. Noth, *The Old Testament World* (trans. V.I. Gruhn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966), 358–63; G.L. Archer, *A Survey of Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody, 1964), 50–53; D.F. Payne, "Old Testament Textual Criticism: Its Principles and Practice Apropos of Recent English Versions," *TynBul* 25 (1974): 99–112; Klein, *\*Textual Criticism*, 69–75; J.A. Thompson, "Textual Criticism, Old Testament," *IDBSup*, 888–91; H. Barth and O.H. Steck, *Exegese des Alten Testaments: Leitfaden der Methodik: Ein Arbeitsbuch für Proseminare, Seminare und Vorlesungen* (13th ed.; Neukirchen/Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993), 37–44; F.E. Deist, *Towards the Text of the Old Testament* (Pretoria: D.R. Church Booksellers, 1978; 2nd ed., 1981), 243–47; Würthwein, *\*Text*, 130–32; Würthwein, *\*Text (English)*, 118–19; Barthélemy, *\*Interim Report*, v–xxxii; J.H. Hayes, *An Introduction to Old Testament Study* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979), 80–81.

We now turn to the criteria suggested in the literature. A distinction is often made between external and internal criteria (considerations) relating to the evaluation of readings. External criteria pertain to the document in which the reading is found, whereas internal criteria have a bearing on the intrinsic value of the reading itself. The frequent reference to external considerations derives from New Testament textual criticism, where these criteria were used as textual guidelines from the seventeenth century onward. The following external criteria have been brought to bear on the evaluation of readings in the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture. They are presented here together with our evaluation of their validity.

#### 1) External Criteria

a) *Unequal Status of Textual Sources*. In the words of Klein, "A variant that occurs in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Samaritan Pentateuch, or LXX will probably be given more attention than if it appears in a Targum or in one of the daughter translations of the LXX."<sup>71</sup>

By similar reasoning, readings in certain Qumran texts and in SP are often regarded as inferior because these texts contain many secondary readings. However, all arguments based on the unequal status of texts are questionable. In principle, all ancient readings have an equal status, without relation to the text or translation in which they are found. Although there is certainly some statistical validity for the preference of certain textual witnesses over others, this judgment should not influence the evaluation of individual readings. Statistical information is irrelevant when data are evaluated.

b) *Preference for MT*. Many scholars make statements such as "all other things being equal, the reading of MT should be preferred." Readings of MT are often preferable to those found in other texts, but this statistical information should not influence decisions in individual instances, because the exceptions to this situation are not pre-

dictable. When judgments are involved, statistical information should be considered less relevant, although it certainly influences scholars unconsciously. Furthermore, MT is no more reliable than LXX or certain Qumran texts. The application of this rule reflects an inappropriate preference for MT.

c) *Broad Attestation*. It is often claimed that the trustworthiness of a reading is directly related to the broadness of its attestation. Sometimes, a scholar will stress the wide geographical distribution or, at other times, a narrow one.

However, reliance on a broad attestation of textual evidence is neither profitable in the case of medieval Hebrew manuscripts nor in that of the ancient versions, for it could have been created by a historical coincidence. Long ago it was recognized that *manuscripta ponderantur, non numerantur* "manuscripts are to be considered for their worth and not reckoned according to their number." The same argument may be used in regard to the ancient versions.

d) *Age of Textual Witnesses*. Older witnesses are often presented as being preferable to more recent ones, because the older one is likely to have been less exposed to textual corruption than the younger one.

Reliance on the age of documents is seemingly desirable, because the closer the document is to the time of the original text (the autograph), the more likely it is to have preserved the wording of that text. However, some copyists preserved their source better than others. For example, the circles that transmitted MT have left the biblical text virtually unchanged for some two thousand years since the time of the proto-Masoretic texts from the Judean Desert, whereas many Qumran scrolls changed the orthography, morphology, and content of the text. Thus, 1QIsa<sup>a</sup>, dating to the first century B.C.E., is further removed from the original text of Isaiah than a Masoretic manuscript written in the tenth century C.E.

In addition to the above-mentioned external criteria, the geographical provenance of readings

<sup>71</sup> Klein, \*Textual Criticism\*, 74.

is sometimes used as a criterion for originality, usually in connection with other criteria.

## 2) Internal Criteria

The above discussion has shown that external criteria are usually not valid in the case of Hebrew Scripture. We now turn to the bearing of internal criteria on the intrinsic value and content of the readings. The following are the most frequently used:

a) *Lectio Difficilior Praeferenda/Praevalet/Praestat*. This rule (“the more difficult reading is to be preferred”) has been phrased in different ways. When textual variation is encountered, one of the readings is sometimes termed the “difficult” reading, and the other(s), the “easy” reading(s), with the implication that the former has a preferable (original) status. This rule is logical, as some “difficult” readings were indeed replaced by scribes with simpler (easier) ones.

Although the basic validity of this rule cannot be denied, many scholars recognized that the rule is problematic and impractical since it fails to take into consideration simple scribal errors. By definition, a scribal error often creates a *lectio difficilior*. If there were a consensus with regard to the recognition of these scribal errors, the rule would be more practical, but since it is often unclear whether or not a given reading reflects a scribal error, the rule of the *lectio difficilior* cannot be applied effectively.

Moreover, in many instances, this rule has been applied so subjectively that it can hardly be called a textual rule. For what appears to be a linguistically or contextually difficult reading to one scholar may not necessarily be difficult to another. Furthermore, two readings may often be equally difficult and two others may be equally easy.

b) *Lectio Brevior (Brevis) Potior*. The logic behind this rule (“the shorter reading is to be preferred”) is that ancient scribes were more prone to add details than to omit them.

The two aforementioned rules of the *lectio difficilior* and *lectio brevior* can be applied to only a small percentage of the readings that need to be evaluated. Yet, they are the main rules mentioned in handbooks on textual criticism and methodological discussions, and only a few additional rules have been suggested, among them: c) *Assimilation to Parallel Passages (Harmonization)*, and d) *Interpretive Modification* (certain ancient editors, scribes, or translators may have thought that the underlying text should be changed or amplified to conform to certain views, primarily theological. Or they may have wished the text to state explicitly a meaning that was not completely clear).

These rules, summarized by Barthélemy, *\*Interim Report*, Payne, “*Old Testament Textual Criticism*,” and Schenker, “*General Introduction*,” among others, represent the traditional approach to textual guidelines. The following faults are to be found with these guidelines:

- The logic underlying certain rules is questionable (*lectio difficilior*, *lectio brevior*);
- The application of abstract rules does not make the evaluation of readings objective;
- Textual rules can be applied to only a small fraction of the readings that need to be evaluated;
- Textual rules are limited to internal criteria. No commonly accepted or valid external rules exist in the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture.

These criticisms pertain only to the application of textual rules. We do not imply that such rules are incorrect or should be abandoned, but rather that they should be used sparingly and with full recognition of their subjective nature. For the evaluation of the scribal transmission of some witnesses, such as LXX and the Peshitta, external rules can be helpful. However, the employment of such rules is very limited for the comparison of Hebrew variants and for the comparison of such variants with reconstructed variants from the ancient translations. Furthermore, even if there are objective aspects to the rules, the very selection of a particular rule is subjective. For example, a given reading can be characterized as a *lectio difficilior*, a transcription

error, or as an exegetical element. Each of these evaluative options leads to a different conclusion.

This assertion leads to some *general reflections* on the nature of textual evaluation and the use of guidelines within that framework. The quintessence of textual evaluation is the selection from the different transmitted readings of the one that is the most appropriate to its context. Within this selection process, the concept of the “context” is taken in a broad sense, as referring to the language, style, and content of both the immediate context and of the literary unit in which the reading is found. This procedure necessarily allows the scholar great liberty but, at the same time, burdens him with the task of negotiating his way through a labyrinth of data and considerations. Since the context is taken in a wide sense, scholars have to refer to data and arguments bearing on different aspects of the text, and hence to different disciplines: the language and vocabulary of literary units and of Scripture as a whole, the exegesis of verses, chapters, and books, and the general content and ideas of a given unit or book. In addition to these, the scholar must be aware of the intricacies of textual transmission and, in particular, the types of errors made in the course of that process.

It has sometimes been said that one ought to regard as original the reading that explains the origin of the other readings in the most natural way, or the reading from which all others developed. This formulation is acceptable, but it can hardly be considered a practical guideline for the textual critic in the manner in which it has been presented, for it is general to the point of being almost superfluous. Among other things, it refers to the choice of original readings as opposed to scribal errors, interpolations, deliberate alterations, and omissions. It also refers to unusual yet original linguistic forms as opposed to corrected ones and, conversely, to linguistically correct forms as opposed to corrupt ones.

The upshot of this analysis, then, is that to a large extent textual evaluation cannot be bound by any fixed rules. It is an *art* in the full sense of the word, a faculty that can be developed, guided by intuition based on wide experience. It is the art of defin-

ing the problems and finding arguments for and against the originality of readings. The formulation and weighing of these arguments are very central to textual criticism. Often scholars offer arguments that cannot be compared at all, such as the style of a given literary unit, its language, the morphology of biblical Hebrew, and the logical or smooth flow of a given text. Within this subjective evaluation, there is room for more than one view. The view that presents the most convincing arguments is probably the best. However, many arguments have differing impacts on scholars and often no decision is possible, such as, for example, between synonymous readings, between long and short texts, or between two equally good readings in the context. These difficulties do not render the textual evaluation procedure questionable, for such is the nature of the undertaking.

Therefore, it is the choice of the most contextually appropriate reading that is the main task of the textual critic. This procedure is as subjective as can be. *Common sense*, rather than textual theories, is the main guide, although abstract rules are sometimes also helpful. In modern times, scholars are often reluctant to admit the subjective nature of textual evaluation, and, as a consequence, an attempt is often made, consciously or unconsciously, to create an artificial level of objectivity by the frequent application of abstract rules.

Albrektson, B., “Difficilior Lectio Probabilior,” in *Text, Translation, Theology: Selected Essays on the Hebrew Bible* (SOTSMS; Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), 73–86.

Barthélemy, \**Interim Report*.

Tov, \**TCHEB*, 269–82.

*Emanuel Tov*

### 1.1.2 Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible

The two articles under this heading are dedicated only to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin canons of the Bible and engage only with the Jewish Bible and the Christian Old Testament. The New Testament and its deuterocanonical texts are beyond the scope of *THB 1*. The canonical histories of secondary biblical translations, such as Ethiopic or Arabic as well as

the deuterocanonical books of the Christian Old Testament will be addressed in → 11.1.1.

### 1.1.2.1 The History of the Jewish Canon

The Jewish canon is known today as a collection of twenty-four holy books structured in three parts: Torah (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), Prophets (Joshua, Judges, 1–2 Samuel, 1–2 Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Minor Prophets), and Writings (Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Qohelet, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra–Nehemiah, 1–2 Chronicles). Its contents and structure developed over many centuries if not more than a millennium.

#### 1.1.2.1.1 Terminology<sup>1</sup>

The earliest preserved reference to the Greek word *κανών* “canon” designating an exclusive list of holy Scriptures is Athanasius’ thirty-ninth Easter letter from the year 367 C.E. (§ 7; → 1.1.2.2.6.2). Athanasius drew in his canon rhetoric already on earlier terminology as demonstrated by the 59th canon of the synod of Laodicea (ca. 360 C.E.) which employs the words “canonical” (*κανονικά*) and “uncanonical books” (*ἀκανόνιστα βιβλία*). The term *κανών* “canon” remained important in Christian thought and during the Reformation became a means of creating conceptual boundaries between Protestants and Catholics, as documented in Andreas Bodenstein Karlstadt’s essay *De Canonicis Scripturis Libellus* from 1520. In origin, the term “canon” as a designation of a closed list of books is thus Christian. Meaning originally a rod or measuring device, the term has a Semitic background. In Aramaic and Punic, *qnh* designates a “reed,” and the Hebrew קנה bears a similar meaning (see also Accadian *qanû[m]* and Ugaritic *qn*). Since the time of Athanasius, closure remains “the sole discriminator of canon in contradistinction to list or catalogue.”<sup>2</sup> In 1768,

<sup>1</sup> For my terminological distinctions, see also A. Lange, “Canon/Canonization,” in *Vocabulary for the Study of Religion* (3 vols.; eds. R.A. Segal and K. van Stuckrad; Leiden: Brill, 2015), 1:200–204.

<sup>2</sup> Smith, “Canons, Catalogues and Classics,” 306; cf. Smith, “Sacred Persistence,” 52.

Ruhnken<sup>3</sup> introduced the term canon into a wider scholarly discourse. In the first scholarly study of Greek rhetoric, he described the lists of ten Greek orators by Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus of Samothrace at the library of Alexandria as *canones*.<sup>4</sup> Thus, already, Ruhnken’s study indicates that the Jewish canon is predated in the Greco-Roman and ancient Near Eastern worlds by various kinds of literary canons.<sup>5</sup>

Despite its Christian origins, the term canon is today applied to collections of sacred scriptures in Judaism, Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, and other religions. Beyond the area of religion, the word “canon” describes also literary, musical, legal, scholarly, artistic, and other canons. This universal application of the term canon is not without problems. A good example is the use of the term “canon” by Müller at the beginnings of the comparative study of religion.<sup>6</sup> When Müller asks “What was the doctrine of the founders and their immediate disciples, and what were the afterthoughts and, generally, the corruptions of later ages,” he leaves little doubt about the Christian (Protestant) background of his terminology.<sup>7</sup>

Müller’s statement indicates that the Christian background of canonical terminology provokes Christianizing misconceptions in its application to

<sup>3</sup> D. Ruhnken, “Historia Critica Oratorum Graecorum,” in D. Ruhnken, *P. Rutilii Lupi De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo* (Leiden: Luchtmans, 1768), xciv–xcv.

<sup>4</sup> See R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 207; J. Gorak, “Canons and Canon Formation,” in *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism*, Vol. 4: *The Eighteenth Century* (eds. H.B. Nisbet and C. Rawson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 560–84 (560–61).

<sup>5</sup> See S.N. Shupak, “‘Canon’ and ‘Canonization’ in Ancient Egypt,” *BO* 58 (2001): 535–47; V.A. Hurowitz, “Canon and Canonization in Mesopotamia,” in *Proceedings of the Twelfth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem, July 29–August 5, 1997: Division A: The Bible and Its World* (ed. R. Margolin; Jerusalem: World Congress of Jewish Studies, 1999), 1\*–12\*; Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 203–08.

<sup>6</sup> F.M. Müller, *Introduction to the Science of Religion: Four Lectures Delivered at the Royal Institution: With Two Essays on False Analogies, and the Philosophy of Mythology* (London: Longmans, 1873), 25–36.

<sup>7</sup> Müller, *Introduction*, 26.

non-Christian holy books. Terminological distinction is therefore of key importance in the study of the history of the Jewish canon in order to avoid misleading implications. For this purpose, Sheppard distinguishes between Canon 1, focusing on “internal signs of elevated status,” and Canon 2, focusing on the “precise boundary, limits or measure of what, from some preunderstood standard belongs or falls outside of a specific ‘canon.’”<sup>8</sup> Folkert writes instead of texts belonging to the two categories Canon I and Canon II. The texts in the Canon I category derive their authority from other, mostly ritual, forms of religious activity by which they are carried. Canon II texts are independently and distinctively present within a religious tradition and provide religious authority as carriers of ritual iconolatry and ritualist piety.<sup>9</sup>

Engaging with the ideas of Sheppard and Folkert, Smith points to the intrinsic and extrinsic aspects of canonicity.<sup>10</sup> Intrinsic aspects are claims to authority made by a text itself, as in inspiration or revelation. Extrinsic aspects are the secondary attribution of canonical authority to a text as inspired, revealed, or ancient. The extrinsic category includes the decisions of church councils and synods or similar institutions but is not restricted to them.

A further important terminological distinction was introduced by Ulrich, who discerns between authoritative texts, Scripture, canon, and canonical process with regard to the extrinsic category of canonicity.<sup>11</sup> Authoritative texts are texts that a religious or secular community agrees hold authority over its members. Scripture refers to texts that are regarded as holy by a religious community and

that have authority in faith or practice. Canon designates an exclusive list of books with supreme authority for a community. Canonical processes designate the way in which authoritative literature develops into a canon.

The above terminologies do not exclude but complement one another. An example is the correlation of the textual and canonical histories of the Bible. For its textual history, only the extrinsic aspect of the Bible's canonical history is of importance, because the canonical and textual histories of a book or book collection impact one another only in cases when such a book or book collection is already granted authority by an extrinsic entity. In the history of the Jewish canon, this happened only in a relatively late stage of the canonical process, i.e., when a first canon was compiled in the late first century B.C.E. The rabbinic evidence illustrates that biblical books can simultaneously fit Folkert's categories of Canon I and Canon II. The rabbinic debates over which books “defile the hands” concern the liturgical qualification of biblical books (→ 1.1.2.1.4; Canon I). But rabbinic literature documents also – e.g., in the canonical list of *b. B. Bat.* 14–15b – a canonical authority of the Hebrew Bible that is not only independent of any religious authority, ritual or otherwise, but authorizes Halakhic rulings (Canon II).

#### 1.1.2.1.2 History of Research

The textual history of the Bible was first connected with its canonical history when Geiger, Strack, Kittel, Kahle, and others suggested that the textual standardization of the biblical text coincided with the closure of the Jewish canon (→ 1.2.2.4.2). Until well into the second half of the twentieth century, the canonical history of the Hebrew Bible was predominantly reconstructed based on the three-step model introduced by Graetz, Buhl, Wildeboer, and Ryle.<sup>12</sup> Although developed by both Jewish and Christian scholars at the end of the nineteenth

<sup>8</sup> G.T. Sheppard, “Canon,” *ER* 3:62–69 (64).

<sup>9</sup> K.W. Folkert, “The ‘Canons’ of ‘Scripture,’” in *Rethinking Scripture: Essays from a Comparative Perspective* (ed. M. LeVering; Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989), 170–79 (172–73).

<sup>10</sup> Smith, “Canons, Catalogues and Classics,” 298.

<sup>11</sup> E. Ulrich, “The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible,” in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East Presented to Shemaryahu Talmon* (eds. M. Fishbane et al.; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 267–91; E. Ulrich, “Canon,” *\*EDSS* 1:117–20 (117); Ulrich, *\*DSSDCB*, 265–79.

<sup>12</sup> Graetz, *Kohelet*, 147–73; Graetz, “Der Abschluss des Kanons des Alten Testaments,” 281–98; Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments*; Ryle, *The Canon of the Old Testament*; Wildeboer, *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament*.

century, the three-step model illustrates the danger of Christianizing interpretations provoked by canonical rhetoric. Graetz, Buhl, Wildeboer, and Ryle argued that a council at Yavneh determined the shape and size of the *Ketuvim* collection, that Ben Sira 44–50 attests to the canonization of the *Nevi'im* collection at the end of the third century B.C.E., and that the *Torah* was canonized at the time of Ezra. The misrepresentation of the rabbinic academy at Yavneh as a council was most likely provoked by the Christian concept of canonization by way of church councils.<sup>13</sup> Lewis, Leiman, Schäfer, and Stemberger<sup>14</sup> demonstrated that rabbinic texts do not speak of an authoritative council at Yavneh but of ongoing discussions in an academy. But not only the closing of the Bible's collection of writings at Yavneh is put in doubt. That CD 16:1–5 refers to the book of *Jubilees* in the context of returning to the Torah of Moses, gives reason to doubt that the Torah was a closed part of the canon even around the year 100 B.C.E. The description of David's psalm writing in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> XXVI:11 as an act of prophecy and the designation of Daniel as a prophetic book in 4QMidrEschat<sup>a</sup> 1V:3 (בספר דניאל הנביא) "in the book of Daniel the prophet" point to a similar openness for the section of the Prophets in the second and first centuries B.C.E.

Several alternate models have been developed in recent decades. The vast literature on the canonical history of the Hebrew Bible can only be addressed here by way of a few selected examples. Sundberg<sup>15</sup> agreed with the three-step model regarding the Torah and the Prophets, but thinks that the Writings section of the canon was still in flux before and after the academy of Yavneh. Judaism

and Christianity both would have drawn from a pool of additional holy books beyond the Torah and the Prophets. Out of these additional holy books, early Christianity created a wider selection than rabbinic Judaism; hence, the existence of a Hebrew and a Greek canon. Sundberg's careful reconstruction remains the most thorough study to date but needs to be redone in light of the evidence provided by the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Leiman, Beckwith, and van der Kooij argue that the canon was closed by Judah Maccabee in the shape of today's Jewish canon after the Hellenistic religious reforms. When Judah Maccabee reassembled the Jewish Scriptures after the rededication of the Jerusalem Temple in 164 B.C.E. in order to rebuild the temple library, he would have created the biblical canon.<sup>16</sup> What remains problematic with this hypothesis is that it cannot explain the openness of the canon in later Jewish literature and misinterprets the library building of Judah Maccabee as evidence for the creation of a canon.<sup>17</sup>

Another approach is the suggestion of group-specific canons by Steck, Carr, Fabry, and Assmann.<sup>18</sup> According to this approach, the Samaritans as well as the Sadducees (cf. Josephus Flavius,

<sup>16</sup> Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture*; Beckwith, *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church*; Beckwith, "Formation of the Hebrew Bible"; van der Kooij, "The Canonization of Ancient Books Kept in the Temple of Jerusalem"; van der Kooij, "Canonization of Ancient Hebrew Books and Hasmonean Politics."

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Lange, "2 Maccabees 2:13–15: Library or Canon."

<sup>18</sup> O.H. Steck, "Der Kanon des hebräischen Alten Testaments: Historische Materialien für eine ökumenische Perspektive," in *Vernunft des Glaubens: Wissenschaftliche Theologie und kirchliche Lehre* (eds. J. Rohls and G. Wenz; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988), 231–52; D.M. Carr, "Canonization in the Context of Community: An Outline of the Formation of the Tanakh and the Christian Bible," in *A Gift in Due Season: Essays and Scripture and Community in Honor of James A. Sanders* (eds. R.D. Weis and D.M. Carr; JSOTSup 225; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 22–64; H.-J. Fabry, "Die Qumrantexte und das biblische Kanonproblem," in *Recht und Ethos im Alten Testament: Gestalt und Wirkung* (eds. S. Beyler et al.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner Verlag, 1999), 251–71; J. Assmann, "Fünf Stufen auf dem Wege zum Kanon: Tradition und Schriftkultur im alten Israel und frühen Judentum," in *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis: Zehn Studien* (Munich: C.H. Beck, 2000), 81–100.

<sup>13</sup> Cf., e.g., J.N. Lightstone, "The Formation of the Biblical Canon in Judaism of Late Antiquity: Prolegomenon to a General Reassessment," *Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses* 8.2 (1979): 135–42 (141–42).

<sup>14</sup> Lewis, "What Do We Mean By Jabneh?"; J.P. Lewis, "Jamnia after Forty Years," *HUCA* 20–71 (1999–2000): 233–59; J.P. Lewis, "Jamnia Revisited," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 146–62; Leiman, *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture*; Schäfer, "Die sogenannte Synode von Jabne"; Stemberger, "Jabne und Kanon."

<sup>15</sup> Sundberg, *Old Testament*; Sundberg, "The Septuagint."

*Antiquities* XVIII: 16) favored a Torah-only canon while the lists of Jewish literature in Sir 39:1–3, the Prologue to Ben Sira; *MMT* C 10, 17; and 1QS I: 2–3 would advise that the other groups of ancient Judaism adhered to tripartite or bipartite canons. The idea of group-specific canons ignores the general agreement within Second Temple Jewish literature regarding which texts are quoted as authoritative.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, the lists from the Prologue to Ben Sira; Sir 39:1–3; *MMT* C 10, 17; and 1QS I:2–3 do not refer to different parts of the Jewish canon but to different categories of Jewish literature.<sup>20</sup>

An outgrowth of the concept of group-specific canons are the ideas of Collins and Lim. Building on earlier work by Collins,<sup>21</sup> Lim<sup>22</sup> argues for a majority canon theory. He thinks that “by the end of the first century of the Common Era the Pharisaic canon became the canon of Rabbinic Judaism because the majority of those who gathered in the grand coalition at Yavneh were Pharisees ... Before there was one common canon, there were several collections of authoritative Scriptures held by different groups ... the canon of the majority became the canon of Rabbinic Judaism ... It is unknown whether the authoritative collections of other Jewish groups ... also became canonical” before the destruction of the Herodian temple.<sup>23</sup> But the consensus regarding which books belong to the Jewish canon would have been reached only after the academy of Yavneh, because the rabbis continued to discuss whether various books would defile the hands. However, despite such ongoing

debates for some books, a generally-agreed-upon canon would have been established by the end of the first century C.E.

A geographic extension to the idea of group-specific canons is the hypothesis of an Alexandrian canon.<sup>24</sup> It was first mentioned by Lee in 1719<sup>25</sup> and became prominent in Protestant exegesis when Semler argued for an Alexandrian canon in 1771.<sup>26</sup> Sundberg rejected the hypothesis convincingly (despite Katz’s later support<sup>27</sup>) arguing “a lack of any primary evidence for this hypothesis.”<sup>28</sup> Nevertheless, in recent years, the idea of an Alexandrian canon has resurfaced in different variations. Examples include Hanhart,<sup>29</sup> Guillaume,<sup>30</sup> and Fabry<sup>31</sup> who all envision an (early) Septuagint

<sup>24</sup> For a detailed history of research until 1964, see Sundberg, *Old Testament*, 7–48.

<sup>25</sup> F. Lee, *Vetus Testamentum juxta septuaginta interpretes*, Vol. 2: *Veteris testamenti libros historicos omnes, sive canonicos, sive apocryphos, ex antiquissimo ms. Codice Alexandrino accurate descriptos* (eds. E. Grabe and F. Lee; Oxford: E Theatro Sheldoniano, 1719), 24.

<sup>26</sup> J.S. Semler, *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Canons nebst Antwort auf die tübingsche Vertheidigung der Apocalypsis* (Halle: Carl Hermann Hemmerde, 1771), 4–6.

<sup>27</sup> P. Katz, “The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria,” *ZNW* 47 (1956): 191–217.

<sup>28</sup> Sundberg, *Old Testament*, 51–79, the quotation is on p. 79; cf. Sundberg, “The Septuagint.”

<sup>29</sup> R. Hanhart, “Textgeschichtliche Probleme der LXX von ihrer Entstehung bis Origenes,” in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (eds. M. Hengel and A.M. Schwemer; WUNT 72; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994), 1–19 (2–5; an English translation was published under the title “Introduction” in M. Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of its Canon* [trans. M.E. Biddle; OTS; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002]), 1–17 (2–5).

<sup>30</sup> P. Guillaume, “New Light on the Nebiim from Alexandria: A Chronography to Replace the Deuteronomistic History,” *HS* 5 (2004): <http://www.jhsonline.org> and <http://purl.org/jhs>. Guillaume is inspired by the work of N.P. Lemche, “The Old Testament – A Hellenistic Book?” in *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (ed. L.L. Grabbe; JSOTSup 317; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 287–318 (288).

<sup>31</sup> H.-J. Fabry, “Das ‘Alte Testament,’” in *What is Bible?* (eds. K. Finsterbusch and A. Lange; CBET 67; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 283–304, esp. 300–304; H.-J. Fabry, “The Biblical Canon and Beyond: Theological and Historical Context of the Codices of Alexandria,” in *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint* (eds. J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp; VTSup 157; Leiden: Brill,

<sup>19</sup> Lange, “From Literature to Scripture.”

<sup>20</sup> Lange, “The Law, the Prophets, and the Other Books of the Fathers.”

<sup>21</sup> J.J. Collins, “Before the Canon: Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism,” in J.J. Collins, *Seers, Sibyls and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism* (JSJSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 3–21; J.J. Collins, “Canon, Canonization,” in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism* (eds. J.J. Collins and D.C. Harlow; Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 460–63.

<sup>22</sup> T.H. Lim, “Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. T.H. Lim and J.J. Collins; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 303–22; T.H. Lim, “A Theory of the Majority Canon,” *ExpTim* 124 (2012): 365–73; Lim, *Formation*.

<sup>23</sup> Lim, *Formation*, 179.

canon including the deuterocanonical Scriptures. Carr and Aejmelaeus argue for an Alexandrian Torah-only canon instead.<sup>32</sup> But neither the intertextuality of Egyptian Jewish literature nor the intertextuality of the letters of Paul as a former Hellenistic Jew from Asia Minor give any support to the notion of a special Alexandrian Jewish canon. On the contrary, Paul and Egyptian Jewish authors did not reference different authoritative literature than Judean Jews did.<sup>33</sup>

Recently, Satlow<sup>34</sup> proposed a model of gradual growth of the Jewish canon that is also influenced by the idea of group-specific canons. Satlow distinguishes three different grades of authority, i.e., literary, oracular, and normative authority. From the ninth through the fourth centuries B.C.E., scribes would have produced religious literature as academic exercises with only literary authority. From 330 B.C.E. through 63 B.C.E., the Sadducees and the Greek-speaking Jewish world would have granted normative authority to their foundational texts. The Sadducees would have used these normative texts to argue against the traditional temple practices of those allied with the Pharisees. But Judean Jews would have mostly valued their Scriptures as oracular texts. As the heirs of both the Sadducees and Pharisees, the rabbis forged a compromise position that elevated Scripture to “a cherished, normatively authoritative position while at the same time marginalizing that authority.”<sup>35</sup> Especially problematic is Satlow’s idea that the Jewish Scriptures would have enjoyed different grades of authority among the Jewish groups of the late Second Temple period. The example of the Qumran community alone leaves little doubt that normative and oracular authority

of the Scriptures could go hand in hand in the literature of one Jewish group. Furthermore, the eminent role of the Sadducees in Satlow’s model is built mostly on speculation as no Sadducean literature survives and information about their thought is sparse.

#### 1.1.2.1.3 From Authoritative Literature to Canon<sup>36</sup>

In Judaism, the idea of authoritative literature can be traced back to the eighth century B.C.E.<sup>37</sup> When the critical messages of the so-called doom prophets (Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah) remained unheard, these prophets responded with the textualization of their prophecies for future generations. From an intrinsic perspective, the constant claim to divine revelation by the prophetic messenger formula “thus says the Lord” and similar rhetoric marks the beginnings of the concept of religiously authoritative literature in the religious history of Judaism. By the late seventh and early sixth centuries B.C.E., the idea of religiously authoritative literature had become well established, as indicated, for example, by the promulgation of the core stratum of the book of Deuteronomy during the reign of Josiah. The fact that, according to 2 Kings 22, the book of Deuteronomy was found in the Jerusalem temple and needed authorization by the prophetess Hulda hints at a Canon I structure, in which Deuteronomy derives its authority from the temple and a prophetess by way of extrinsic recognition. Nevertheless, in a Canon II structure, the promulgation of the core stratum of Deuteronomy was intended to provide authority to a Jewish state that had recently been liberated from the Neo-Assyrian Empire as well as to the government of that state.

2012), 21–34.

<sup>32</sup> Carr, “Canonization in the Context of Community,” 35–45; A. Aejmelaeus, “Die Septuaginta als Kanon,” in *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion: Kanonisierungsprozesse Religiöser Texte von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart: Ein Handbuch* (eds. E.-M. Becker and S. Scholz; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 315–27.

<sup>33</sup> Lange, “Canonical History.”

<sup>34</sup> Satlow, *Bible*.

<sup>35</sup> Satlow, *Bible*, 6.

<sup>36</sup> This paragraph is a summary of my own ideas about the canonical history of the Hebrew Bible that I have developed in several publications: Lange, “From Literature to Scripture”; Lange, “2 Maccabees 2:13–15: Library or Canon”; Lange, “The Law, the Prophets, and the Other Books of the Fathers”; Lange, “Canonical History”; Lange, “Qumran Library in Context.”

<sup>37</sup> Cf., e.g., S.B. Chapman, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation* (FAT 27; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

The dual conquest of Jerusalem in 597 and 587 B.C.E., as well as the destruction of the Solomonic temple and the city in 587 B.C.E., marks the beginning of the Babylonian exile and represents one of the most fundamental crises in Jewish history. To give meaning to this crisis, Judaism turned to its authoritative literature; in doing so, it created a new Jewish identity. Thus, during the Babylonian exile, the authoritative literature of Judaism fits into Folkert's conceptual framework of Canon II in providing religious authority. Intrinsic claims of authority were now met by extrinsic recognition. The interpretative rewriting of prophetic texts and the merging of various law codes and narratives to a core stratum of the Torah demonstrate how, since the period of the Babylonian exile, religiously authoritative literature became and remained the cornerstone of the Jewish cultural memory, something achieved without even the concept of a closed canon.

In Persian and Hellenistic times, Jewish culture and religion relied upon an ever-increasing body of authoritative, but not yet canonical, literature as the textual embodiment of the Jewish cultural memory. However, following the Persian period, the Jerusalem temple became a second source of Jewish identity; participation in the temple cult warranted Jewish identity. It stands to reason that the temple cult employed authoritative Jewish texts in its service in a Canon I structure while, undoubtedly, the use of the Torah in the famous Passover letter from Elephantine (*TAD A 4.1*) hints at an extrinsic recognition of the Torah in a Canon II structure.<sup>38</sup> In both periods, the authoritative literature of ancient Judaism seems to fit pat-

<sup>38</sup> For the Passover letter from Elephantine, see P. Grelot, "Études sur le 'Papyrus Pascal' d'Éléphantine," *VT* 4 (1954): 349–84; P. Grelot, "Le papyrus pascal et le problème du pentateuque," *VT* 5 (1955): 250–65; P. Grelot, "Sur le 'papyrus pascal' d'Éléphantine," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (eds. A. Caquot and M. Delcor; AOAT 212; Kevelaer: Butzon & Bercker, 1981), 162–72; E. Gass, "Der Passa-Papyrus (Cowl 21) – Mythos oder Realität," *BN* 99 (1999): 55–68; M.F. Whitters, "Some New Observations about Jewish Festal Letters," *JSJ* 32 (2001): 272–88; R.G. Kratz, "Temple and Torah: Reflections on the Legal Status of the Pentateuch between Elephantine and Qumran," in *The Pentateuch as*

terms of both Canon I and II, simultaneously providing authority to the Jerusalem temple but also receiving authority from it.

The so-called Hellenistic religious reforms of the years 175–167 B.C.E. mark the next catalyst in the process at the end of which stands the canon of the Hebrew Bible. When the Hellenizing Jewish high priests Jason and Menelaos converted the Jerusalem temple into a sanctuary for Zeus Olympius under the guidance and direction of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV, and when Antiochus penalized not only the Jewish cult but also the possession of Torah scrolls, circumcision, and Sabbath observance with capital punishment (1 Maccabees 1; 2 Maccabees 2–6), the temple and its cult were temporarily lost as a bulwark of Jewish identity. In response, Judaism developed the idea of Holy Scriptures to warrant the preservation of its religious identity by way of its written cultural memory. Authoritative books became holy writ. While a physical temple building could be defiled easily by the Seleucid oppressor and by Hellenizing Jews, the destruction of all copies of the Jewish Scriptures was simply impossible. Jewish Scriptures thus provided an alternate focus for the religion and culture of Judaism. Therefore, the book of *Jubilees*, written between the years 160–150 B.C.E., understands Mount Sinai as a temple because the Torah was revealed on it.<sup>39</sup> The Torah itself became a sanctuary and as such was recognized on an extrinsic level of canonicity. In this way, the Torah replaced the institution that had provided, at least in part, for its authority.

This change manifests itself even linguistically when the divinatory exegesis of Jer 25:11–12 in Daniel 9 is described in Dan 9:2 as בִּינְתִי בְּסֵפֶרִים "I gained knowledge in the books."<sup>40</sup> The example from Daniel 9 demonstrates how readers gained new understanding of both the Jewish Scriptures and their own contemporary history in a dual interpretative process. For this process, they employed

*Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 77–103.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Lange, "From Literature to Scripture," 104–05.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Lange, "From Literature to Scripture," 103–04.

philological as well as transpositional hermeneutic strategies.<sup>41</sup>

After the Hellenistic religious reforms, Judaism defined its identity and interpreted its history increasingly through the interpretation of its Scriptures by way of commentaries as well as by way of rewriting and expansion. No commentary appears in the preserved Jewish literature before the Hellenistic religious reforms while soon afterwards several commentary genres exist. The birth of Jewish commentary is especially well illustrated by the Qumran pesharim. This hermeneutical reorientation from paratextual literature to commentaries,<sup>42</sup> agrees well with several of the criteria of scriptural status that Barton defined.<sup>43</sup> The time of the Hellenistic religious reforms marks thus a paradigm shift in the canonical history of the Hebrew Bible from authoritative literature to Holy Scripture. Still without a closed canon, a Canon II structure became dominant in Judaism as a consequence of the Hellenistic religious reforms.

Although the Jerusalem temple was rededicated to the God of Israel in 164 B.C.E. and although its cult was reestablished, the shift from authoritative literature to Scripture and the increased interpretive attention for the Jewish Scriptures demonstrate that since the second century B.C.E. a Canon II concept without a closed canon gained a permanent role in Jewish thought. The Jewish

canonical process thus confirms even before the emergence of a closed canon an important observation of Smith's: "Where there is canon, it is possible to predict the *necessary* occurrence of a hermeneute ... whose task it is continually to extend the domain of the closed canon over everything that is known or everything that exists *without* altering the canon in the process."<sup>44</sup>

Despite the increasing importance of Holy Scriptures in ancient Judaism after the so-called Hellenistic reforms and despite the developing commentary literature of that period, no indication of a closed canon can be found in the preserved sources. On the contrary, the intertextuality of Jewish literature in the later second and most of the first centuries B.C.E. point to an openness in all three sections of the later Jewish canon. A good example is the use of the book of *Jubilees* in CD 16:1–5 mentioned above (→ 1.1.2.1.2).<sup>45</sup> It indicates that the book of *Jubilees* was regarded as Torah and demonstrates thus an openness in the concept of Torah. Similarly, the characterization of David's psalm writing as prophecy in 11QPs<sup>a</sup> XXVI:11 and the designation of Daniel as a prophetic book in 4QMidrEschat<sup>a</sup> IV:3 point to an openness of the Prophets category. The so-called canonical formulas or canon lists in the Prologue to Ben Sira; *MMT* C 10, 17; 1QS 1:2–3; and other texts from the Qumran library underline this observation. They are not concerned with different parts of a biblical canon but with categories of Jewish literature to which they are referring.<sup>46</sup> For example, the Essene text *MMT* C 10 mentions the book of Moses, the books of the Prophets, David, and the events of ages past. Against this quadripartite list, *MMT* speaks a few lines further down (*MMT* C 17) only of Moses and

<sup>41</sup> For the concept of transpositional hermeneutics, see A. Lange and Z. Pleše, "Transpositional Hermeneutics: A Hermeneutical Comparison of the Derveni Papyrus, Aristobolus of Alexandria and the Qumran Pesharim," *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 3 (2012): 15–67.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. A. Lange, "From Paratext to Commentary," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6–8, 2008)* (eds. A. Roitman, L.H. Schiffman, and S. Tzoref; STDJ 93, Leiden: Brill, 2011), 195–216.

<sup>43</sup> Barton, "Old Testament Canons," 153–58, identifies nine characteristics that point to the scriptural status of a book in antiquity: 1) prevalence of manuscripts; 2) citation and commentary; 3) translation; 4) exemplification; 5) consistency; 6) truth; 7) overinterpretation; 8) non-triviality; and 9) contemporary relevance. It is important to understand that Barton argues also for points 5), 6), and 8) from an extrinsic perspective and not from the perspective of intrinsic claims by scriptural texts themselves.

<sup>44</sup> Smith, "Sacred Persistence," 48.

<sup>45</sup> Cf. Lange, "From Literature to Scripture."

<sup>46</sup> Lange, "The Law, the Prophets, and the Other Books of the Fathers." For the Prologue to Ben Sira, cf. also the similar argument by F. Borchardt, "Prologue of Sirach (Ben Sira) and the Question of Canon," in *Sacra Scriptura: How "Non-Canonical" Texts Functioned in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, L.M. McDonald, with B.A. Jurgens; Jewish and Christian Texts in Context and Related Studies 20; London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 64–71.

the Prophets. Bipartite references to Moses and the Prophets can be found elsewhere in Essene texts in 1QS 1:2–3; VIII:15–16. *MMT* and the *Community Rule* refer most likely to different types of Jewish literature whose scriptural authority they evoke for Halakhic and other purposes. The Prologue to Ben Sira underlines this observation. When the grandson of Ben Sira emphasizes that his grandfather read “the law, the prophets, and the others,” he emphasizes the general learnedness of Ben Sira in Jewish literature, i.e., that Ben Sira read all of Jewish literature and not only the books of a given canon. The grandson is thus not exclusive but inclusive in his argument.

The idea of a closed canon developed in Judaism in response to the acculturative pressure of the Roman Empire. This link becomes apparent in the parallel process of textual standardization (→ 1.2.2.4.2) and is made explicit by Josephus in *Ag. Ap.* 1.38–47, when he compares the Jewish canon with Greco-Roman literature. The Hellenistic influence in the development of the Jewish canon is also underlined by the number of twenty-four books mentioned in 4 *Ezra* 14:45. The number twenty-four corresponds to the twenty-four books of the Iliad and the Odyssey (see below).

The letters of Paul, which were written in the years 52–60 C.E., already quote explicitly only texts from the Jewish canon, although they allude without a quotation formula to other Jewish literature from the Second Temple period.<sup>47</sup> This observation accords with indications for a standardized text of the Hebrew canon from the reign of Herod the Great (→ 1.2.2.4.2).<sup>48</sup> For example, the revision of the Old Greek text of the Minor Prophets toward their proto-Masoretic text is documented by 8HevXII gr, a manuscript that can be dated paleographically to Herod’s reign (→ 9.3.4). The demise of the Hasmonean state seems to have provoked a renewed focus on the Jewish Scriptures. The Jerusalem temple was the center at which most of the scholarly work concerned with the Jewish Scriptures took place.

If the textual standardization of the canon took place at the Jerusalem temple (→ 1.2.2.4.2), the creation of the Jewish canon most likely also took place there. However, the priests who created the Jewish canon did not employ as role models the famous canons of Greek authors from the library of Alexandria. To counteract the increasing cultural pressure of the Hellenistic world, they created an alternate model, by compiling a list of holy books and not of prominent authors. The Jewish canon thus does not imitate the Alexandrian role model as did the Romans<sup>49</sup> but created something distinctively Jewish to counteract the Greco-Romanization of Judea.

The creation of the Jewish canon during the reign of Herod the Great also might have initiated group-specific mechanisms. Texts that enjoyed scriptural recognition at least with some Jewish groups – like *Jubilees* did with the Essenes – were now excluded from that elevated status. Thus, for example, in the case of *Jubilees*, the canon excluded Halakhic positions that were accepted by the Essenes but by neither the Pharisees nor the Sadducees. It can be speculated that in addition to canon-bound Judaism, in some milieus that were not connected closely with the Jerusalem temple the earlier approach of not delimiting the number of Holy Scriptures continued. That Paul can presuppose a Jewish canon in his letters and that Josephus speaks of it in *Ag. Ap.* 1.38–47 in a matter-of-fact manner that builds on a general agreement, leaves little doubt that the Jerusalem temple canon quickly became a consensus position in ancient Judaism.<sup>50</sup>

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Lange, “Canonical History,” 676–79.

<sup>48</sup> Cf. Lange, “Qumran Library in Context.”

<sup>49</sup> For the Alexandrian and Roman canons, see Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, 203–08; H. Cancik, “Standardization and Ranking of Texts in Greek and Roman Institutions,” in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (eds. M. Finkelberg and G.G. Stroumsa; Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 2; Brill: Leiden, 2003), 117–30; A.D. Vardi, “Canons of Literary Texts at Rome,” in *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond: Literary and Religious Canons in the Ancient World* (eds. M. Finkelberg and G.G. Stroumsa; Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 2; Brill: Leiden, 2003), 131–52.

<sup>50</sup> For Josephus’ canon, see S. Mason, “Josephus and His

After the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in 70 C.E., the Jewish canon as the key element of the Jewish cultural memory provided not only for the survival but even for the flourishing of Judaism during the time of exile and persecution. Josephus' *Against Apion* (1.38–47) indicates that a dual criterion existed by the end of the first century C.E. that underlined the special value of the texts of the canon: 1) Their authors were inspired prophets; 2) They are all of old age. The two aspects are interconnected because, for Josephus, prophetic inspiration ceased to exist at the time of Artaxerxes.

Therefore, it should not be surprising that in this period *4 Ezra* 14:37–48 and Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.38–47 disclose for the first time how many books belong to the Jewish canon. That Josephus speaks of twenty-two books while *4 Ezra* mentions twenty-four books could point to a remaining fluidity in the canonical history of the Bible regarding which books belong to which sections of the Jewish canon. The number twenty-four seems to draw on the Homeric model of the twenty-four books of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* – a number that goes back to the twenty-four characters of the Greek alphabet – and the number twenty-two seems to be an adjustment of this system to the twenty-two characters of the Hebrew alphabet.<sup>51</sup> In any case, in order to make the books of the Hebrew canon fit these numbers, various books had to be merged into one. A possible explanation of how this was achieved concerning the numbers of twenty-four and twenty-two books might be provided by Jerome's *Prologus Galeatus* to his Vulgate translation of 1 Samuel–2 Kings. Drawing on Jewish sources, Jerome describes the tripartite Jewish canon of his time as patterned by the number of twenty-two books corresponding to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew

alphabet. Table 1 (→ 1.1.2.1.4) summarizes his description and gives Jerome's Latin transcriptions of the Hebrew names of the biblical books. However, Jerome refers to a second Jewish tradition that knew a canon of twenty-four books. That Ruth is regarded in one of Jerome's Jewish traditions as a part of Judges and in the other as part of the Writings section attests to the remaining structural fluidity of the canon in late antiquity. In some Jewish circles, Ruth was merged with Judges, and Lamentations with Jeremiah out of the need to reduce the number of books in the canon to twenty-two to accord with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet.

*4 Ezra* 14:45 provides no further information about the Jewish canon than the number of twenty-four books. When Josephus speaks about five books of Moses, thirteen books of the prophets, and four books of hymns and instructions (*Ag. Ap.* 1.39–40), the tripartite structure of his canon is obvious. However, Josephus says so little about the identity of the books that one can only speculate as to which books belong to the prophets and which books are among the hymns and instructions. The tripartite structure of Josephus' canon reflects the earlier tripartite structure of the lists of Jewish literature in the Prologue to Ben Sira and elsewhere. The analogy implies that the Jewish canon includes the most important representatives of the Law, Prophets, and Writings from among the whole range of Jewish literature.

#### 1.1.2.1.4 Shapes of the Jewish Canon after the Second Temple Period

The rabbinic period is characterized by a lack of evidence when it comes to the history of the Jewish canon.<sup>52</sup> But texts such as *b. Meg.* 7a; *b. B. Bat.* 14b–15a; and *b. Sanh.* 90a as well as the extensive use of the Hebrew Bible in rabbinic literature leave no doubt that the Jewish canon was undisputed and generally accepted in rabbinic

Twenty-Two Book Canon," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 110–27.

<sup>51</sup> See G. Darshan, "Twenty-Four or Twenty-Two Books of the Bible and the Homeric Corpus," *Tarbiz* 77 (2007): 1–22 [Hebr.]; G. Darshan, "The Twenty-Four Books of the Hebrew Bible and the Alexandrian Scribal Methods," in *Homer and the Bible in the Eyes of Ancient Interpreters* (ed. M.R. Niehoff; Jerusalem Studies in Religion and Culture 16; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 221–44, esp. 226–29.

<sup>52</sup> Cf. J.N. Lightfoot, "The Rabbis' Bible: The Canon of the Hebrew Bible and the Early Rabbinic Guild," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 163–84 (164); cf. Stemberger, "Entstehung und Auffassung des Kanon im rabbinischen Denken," 86–87.

TABLE 3 *The Shape of the Canon according to Jerome and Talmud Babli Baba Batra*

<i>b. B. Bat.</i> 14–15b	Jerome, <i>Prologus Galeatus</i>	Second Jewish Opinion according to <i>Prologus Galeatus</i>
Torah No more information	Five books of Moses <i>Bersith</i> <i>Hellesmoth</i> <i>Vaiecra</i> <i>Vaiedabber</i> <i>Addabarim</i>	No information given
Prophets Joshua Judges Samuel Kings Jeremiah Ezekiel Isaiah Minor Prophets	Eight books of prophets <i>Iosue Bennum</i> <i>Sopthim</i> (together with Ruth) <i>Samuhel</i> <i>Malachim</i> <i>Esaias</i> <i>Hieremias</i> (together with <i>Cinoth</i> ) <i>Hiezecihel</i> <i>Thareasra</i>	Ruth and Lamentations belong to the Hagiographa
Writings Ruth Psalms Job Proverbs Qohelet Canticles Lamentations Daniel Esther Ezra (incl. Nehemiah) Chronicles	Nine books of Hagiographa <i>Iob</i> <i>David</i> Solomon (incl. <i>Masaloth</i> , <i>Accoeleth</i> , <i>Sirassirim</i> ) <i>Daniel</i> <i>Dabre Atamim</i> <i>Ezras</i> <i>Hester</i>	Ruth and Lamentations belong to the Hagiographa

Judaism. Nevertheless, the extant sources indicate two remaining issues in the canonical process: 1) the sequence of the biblical books; and 2) the question regarding which books defile the hands.

In their reports on the Jewish canon, Jerome's *Prologus Galeatus* and Talmud Babli *B. Bat.* 14b–15a agree with Josephus and 4 *Ezra* regarding which books belong to the Bible. However, the sequence of the biblical books and to which section of the canon each one belongs differ (see Table 1 below).<sup>53</sup> The *Prologus Galeatus* reports on two

<sup>53</sup> Similar lists that seemingly detail the structure of the Jewish canon are attested by Melito of Sardes (preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* IV.26.12–14; → 1.1.2.2.5.1), Origen (preserved in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* VI.25.1–2; → 1.1.2.2.5.2), Epiphanius of Salamis (*De Mensuris et Ponderibus* 23) and the so-called

different Jewish opinions<sup>54</sup> regarding where Ruth and Lamentations should be placed in the canon,

\_\_\_\_\_ Bryennios manuscript (→ 1.1.2.2.6.6) (J.P. Audet, "Hebrew-Aramaic List of Books of the Old Testament in Greek Transkription," *JTS* 1 [1950]: 135–54). All four lists are problematic as sources for the history of the Jewish canon. Melito draws on a Christian source from the East that might in turn be influenced by Jewish traditions. But Melito or his Christian source are responsible of the structure of his canon list. The other three are lists that claim to give details about the Jewish names of the biblical books but do not indicate to reiterate the structure and book sequence of the Jewish canon. It is entirely possible that these three canon lists structure the books of the Jewish canon according to a pattern familiar to their Christian audiences instead of the tripartite structure of their Jewish sources.

<sup>54</sup> For the Jewish origins of Jerome's canon list, see among others E. Zenger, "Der Psalter im Horizont von Tora und Prophetie: Kanongeschichtliche und kanonhermeneutische

i.e., with the Writings or with Judges and Jeremiah respectively.

Similar differences in the sequence of biblical books are even attested in medieval Jewish manuscripts. Two examples may suffice: 1) In MT<sup>A</sup>, MT<sup>L</sup>, MT<sup>L34</sup>, MT<sup>S1</sup>, and MT<sup>Y</sup>, Chronicles precedes Psalms as the first book of the Ketuvim collection in contrast to today's Hebrew Bible; 2) In German and French Bible codices, Jeremiah precedes Isaiah.<sup>55</sup> Only with the appearance of \*RB<sup>2</sup> did a general agreement begin to form within Judaism about the sequence of the books included in the biblical canon.

The fluidity in the details of the shape of the Jewish canon should not be overemphasized. It needs to be remembered that within Judaism its Holy Scriptures continued to be copied only on scrolls for a long time even after the invention of the mega-codex format around the beginning of the fourth century C.E. Therefore, for Judaism, the question regarding the sequence of the Holy Scriptures did not pose itself to the same to degree as within Christianity because it was impossible to fit all twenty-four books into a single scroll. Even after the first codices emerged in the eighth or ninth century C.E. that contained a collection of biblical books or even the whole Bible, Judaism continued to use exclusively scrolls for liturgical purposes. The shape of the canon was thus stabilized only due to the influence of the Second Rabbinic Bible (\*RB<sup>2</sup>) as the first widely dispersed printed Hebrew Bible in Judaism.

Another issue that is often connected with the canonicity of biblical books in rabbinic literature is the formula "to defile the hands." The rabbis debated during the time of the academy of Yavneh and afterwards whether several texts defile the hands. Seemingly, they agree that all biblical books would create such a defilement (*m. Kelim* 15:6; *m. Yad.* 2:19; 3:5; 4:6; *t. Kelim B. Mešī'a* 5:8; *t. Yad.* 2:14; *b. Šabb.* 14a–b) while non-biblical texts would not

Perspektiven," in *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 111–34 (117–18).

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Swete, \*Introduction, 200. For the different book sequences in Jewish biblical manuscripts, see recently also Barton, "The Old Testament Canons," 163–64.

(e.g., Ben Sira according to *t. Yad.* 2:13<sup>56</sup> and Homer according to *m. Yad.* 4:6). For that reason, rabbinic discussions over whether Canticles (*m. Yad.* 3:5; *t. Yad.* 2:14; *b. Meg.* 7a), Qohelet (*m. Yad.* 3:5; *m. Ed.* 5:3; *t. Yad.* 2:14; *b. Meg.* 7a), and Esther (*b. Meg.* 7a) defile the hands or not were regarded as indications that the rabbis were still debating which books should belong to the Writings section of the canon.<sup>57</sup>

That the issue is much more complicated is clear in *m. Yad.* 4:5 when it specifies under which conditions a biblical scroll renders the hands unclean.

[The Holy Scriptures] render the hands unclean only if they are written in the Assyrian characters, on leather, and in ink.<sup>58</sup>

When *m. Yad.* 3:5 regulates that only a text of at least eighty-five characters defiles the hands, this demonstrates also that biblical books only defile the hands of the person holding them under certain preconditions. This observation is confirmed by regulations specifying when biblical texts do not defile the hands, i.e., when they are translations (*m. Yad.* 4:5), when they are written in paleo-Hebrew (*m. Yad.* 4:5), when they were copied by Minim (*t. Yad.* 2:13),<sup>59</sup> and when they are citations in non-biblical texts (*t. Yad.* 2:12).

<sup>56</sup> For the role of Ben Sira in rabbinic literature, see recently J.R. Labendz, "The Book of Ben Sira in Rabbinic Literature," *AJSR* 30 (2006): 347–92; T.A. Ellis, "Negotiating the Boundaries of Tradition: The Rehabilitation of the Book of Ben Sira (Sirach) in b. Sanhedrin 100b," in *Sacra Scriptura: How "Non-Canonical" Texts Functioned in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, L.M. McDonald, with B.A. Jurgens; Jewish and Christian Texts in Context and Related Studies 20; London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 46–63.

<sup>57</sup> Cf., e.g., P.S. Alexander, "The Formation of the Biblical Canon in Rabbinic Judaism," in *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (eds. P.S. Alexander and J.-D. Kaestli; Publications de l'Institut romand des sciences bibliques 4; Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2007), 57–80.

<sup>58</sup> Translations according to H. Danby, *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2011 [reprint of Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933]), 784.

<sup>59</sup> For the interpretation of *t. Yad.* 2:13, see J. Maier, *Jüdische Auseinandersetzung mit dem Christentum in der Antike* (EdF 177; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft,

If the same biblical book defiles hands in its original language but not in translation, written on parchment but not on papyrus, written in square script but not in translation, etc., then whether a text defiles the hands or not does not pertain directly to its canonical status. As only a copy that accords with certain Halakhic regulations defiles the hands, Stemberger concluded that the formula “to defile the hands” does not pertain to the canonicity but to the liturgical usability of a text and/or manuscript.<sup>60</sup> Stemberger’s interpretation of the evidence is confirmed by *b. Meg.* 7a, which argues that Rabbi Samuel regarded the Esther Scroll as inspired but claimed that it does not defile the hands. Therefore, for the books of Qohelet, Canticles, and Esther, the debates over whether they defile the hands do not pertain to their canonical status but to whether they should be used in Jewish liturgy. This debate alone is of great interest for the canonical history of the Hebrew Bible because it pertains to the question of the liturgical use of the Megillot in the early rabbinic period.<sup>61</sup>

When the rabbis discuss whether or not a book

1982), 60; Stemberger, “Jabneh und der Kanon,” 168; Stemberger, “Entstehung und Auffassung des Kanons in rabbinischen Denken,” 74.

<sup>60</sup> Stemberger, “Entstehung und Auffassung des Kanon im rabbinischen Denken,” 72–75; Stemberger, “Jabne und Kanon,” 166–70. Stemberger’s observations also argue against the ideas of J. Barton (*Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* [London: Darton, Longman, and Todd Ltd., 1986], 68–71; *The Spirit and the Letter: Studies in the Biblical Canon* [London: SPCK, 1997], 108–21; “The Canonicity of the Song of Songs,” in *Perspektiven der Hoheliedauslegung/Perspectives on the Song of Songs* [ed. A.C. Hagedorn; BZAW 346; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2005], 1–5) and M.J. Broyde (“Defilement of the Hands, Canonization of the Bible, and the Special Status of Esther, Ecclesiastes,” *Judaism: A Quarterly Journal of Jewish Life and Thought* 44 [1995]: 65–79) that the rabbis debate whether Canticles, Qohelet, and Esther defile the hands because the tetragrammaton does not appear in any of these books.

<sup>61</sup> For the relatively late use of the Megillot in Jewish liturgy, see G. Stemberger, “Die Megillot als Festlesungen der jüdischen Liturgie,” in G. Stemberger, *Judaica Minora*, Vol. 1: *Biblische Traditionen im rabbinischen Judentum* (TSAJ 133; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 234–47, and P. Brand, *Endgestalten des Kanons: Das Arrangement der Schriften Israels in der jüdischen und christlichen Bibel* (BBB 131; Berlin: Philo, 2001), 136–41.

renders the hands unclean, this does not put its canonical status in doubt. It only qualifies or disqualifies it for liturgical use. In the language of Folkert, the issue concerns a Canon I and not a Canon II structure. That texts used liturgically render the hands unclean pertained originally to the sanctity of those manuscripts of holy books that were used in liturgy. A manuscript used liturgically participates in the sanctity of the liturgical act. This sanctity was transmitted to the hand that touched them. Those who touched the holy scrolls were therefore commanded to wash their hands in order to avoid a transferral of the sanctity of holy books to non-worthy objects. Later on, the rabbis couched the concept of washing the sanctity off one’s hands ultimately “in terms of impurity, in that this was the only realm in rabbinic theology where such a transfer by contact survived.”<sup>62</sup>

Assmann, A., “Canon and Archive,” in *Cultural Memory Studies: An International and Interdisciplinary Handbook* (eds. A. Erl and A. Nünning; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2008), 97–108.

Barton, J., “The Old Testament Canons,” in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to 600* (eds. J.C. Paget and J. Schaper; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 145–64.

Beckwith, R., *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1985).

Beckwith, R., “Formation of the Hebrew Bible,” in Mulder, \**Mikra*, 39–86.

<sup>62</sup> S. Friedman, “The Holy Scriptures Defile the Hands – The Transformation of a Biblical Concept in Rabbinic Theology,” in *Minhah le-Nahum: Biblical and Other Studies Presented to Nahum M. Sarna in Honour of his 70th Birthday* (eds. M. Brettler and M. Fishbane; JSOTSup 154; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 117–32 (132); Stemberger, “Entstehung und Auffassung des Kanon im rabbinischen Denken,” 73–74. T. Lim, “The Defilement of the Hands as a Principle Determining the Holiness of Scriptures,” *JTS* 61 (2010): 501–15, speaks of a sancta contagion which developed in analogy to the contagion caused by the holy ark according to *m. Yad.* 3:5. For the sanctity of Torah scrolls in ancient Judaism, see also M. Goodman, “Sacred Scriptures and Defiling the Hands,” *JTS* 41 (1990): 97–107.

- Bodenstein Karlstadt, A., *De Canonicis Scripturis Libellus* (Wittenberg: Viridi Montanus, 1520).
- Buhl, F., *Kanon und Text des Alten Testamentes* (Leipzig: Akademische Buchhandlung [W. Faber]), 1891.
- Graetz, H., *Kohélet קהלת oder der Salomonische Prediger: Übersetzt und kritisch erläutert* (Leipzig: Winter, 1871), 147–73.
- Graetz, H., “Der Abschluss des Kanons des Alten Testaments,” *MGWJ* 35 (1886): 281–98.
- van der Kooij, A., “The Canonization of Ancient Books Kept in the Temple of Jerusalem,” in *Canonization and Decanonization: Papers Presented to the International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR), Held at Leiden 9–10 January 1997* (eds. A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn; SHR 82; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 17–40.
- van der Kooij, A., “Canonization of Ancient Hebrew Books and Hasmonean Politics,” in *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 27–38.
- Lange, A., “From Literature to Scripture: The Unity and Plurality of the Hebrew Scriptures in Light of the Qumran Library,” in *One Scripture or Many? Canon from Biblical, Theological, and Philosophical Perspectives* (eds. C. Helmer and C. Landmesser; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 51–107.
- Lange, A., “2 Maccabees 2:13–15: Library or Canon?” in *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology: Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9–11 June, 2005* (eds. G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér; JSJSup 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 155–67.
- Lange, A., “The Law, the Prophets, and the Other Books of the Fathers’ (Sir, Prologue): Canonical Lists in Ben Sira and Elsewhere?” in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime’on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18–20 May, 2006* (eds. G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér; JSJSup 127; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 55–80.
- Lange, A., “The Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible and the Christian Old Testament in Light of Egyptian Judaism,” in *Kraus-Kreuzer, \*Septuaginta 2014*, 660–80.
- Lange, A., “The Qumran Library in Context: The Canonical History and Textual Standardization of the Hebrew Bible in Light of the Qumran Library,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Qumran and the Concept of a Library* (eds. S. White Crawford and C. Wassen; STDJ 116; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 261–79.
- Leiman, S.Z., *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence* (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 47; Hamden: Archon Books, 1976), 51–124.
- Lewis, J.P., “What Do We Mean By Jabneh?” *JBR* 32 (1964): 125–32.
- Lim, T.H., *The Formation of the Jewish Canon* (The Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).
- Ryle, H.E., *The Canon of the Old Testament: An Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture* (London: Macmillan, 1892).
- Satlow, M., *How the Bible Became Holy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014).
- Schäfer, P., “Die sogenannte Synode von Jabne: Zur Trennung von Juden und Christen im ersten/zweiten Jh. n. Chr.,” *Jud* 31 (1975): 54–61, 116–24.
- Smith, J.Z., “Sacred Persistence: Toward a Redescription of Canon,” in J.Z. Smith, *Imagining Religion: From Babylon to Jonestown* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 36–52.
- Smith, J.Z., “Canons, Catalogues and Classics,” in *Canonization and Decanonization: Papers Presented to the International Conference of the Leiden Institute for the Study of Religions (LISOR), Held at Leiden 9–10 January 1997* (eds. A. van der Kooij and K. van der Toorn; SHR 82; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 295–312.
- Stemberger, G., “Jabne und Kanon,” *Jahrbuch für Biblische Theologie* 3 (1988): 163–74.
- Stemberger, G., “Entstehung und Auffassung des Kanon im rabbinischen Denken,” in G. Stemberger, *Judaica Minora*, Vol. 1: *Biblische Traditionen im rabbinischen Judentum* (TSAJ 133; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 69–86.
- Sundberg, A.C., *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (HTS 20; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964).
- Sundberg, A.C., “The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism,” in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 68–90.
- Wildeboer, G., *The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament: An Historico-Critical Enquiry* (trans. B. Wisner Bacon; London: Luzac, 1895).

### 1.1.2.2 The History of the Christian Old Testament Canon

This article discusses how the Christian canon of the Old Testament developed until, in his letter to Bishop Exsuperius of Toulouse, Pope Innocent I

authorized a specific canon list in the year 405 C.E. (→ 1.1.2.2.6.6). Innocent's decision marks an important turning point in the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament because for the first time a canonical list was backed by papal authority. Nevertheless, the structure and book repertoire of the Old Testament canon remained fluid in the Western and Eastern churches even after Innocent's letter. The final closing of the Christian canons happened in the Western churches only with the decree of the Council of Trent on April 8th, 1546 and with the definition of the Protestant canon by Martin Luther's first German Bible translation in 1534. In the East, the Synod of Jerusalem (1672) played a similar role for the Orthodox Church. Before Martin Luther and the decisions of these councils, various divergent Christian canons and divergent collections of deuterocanonical writings developed. Together with the Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox canons, the Arabic, Armenian, Coptic, Ethiopic, Georgian, and Syriac canons will be discussed in the articles on the canonical history of the deuterocanonical texts in → 11.1.1.

#### 1.1.2.2.1 Terminology

The terminology of the study of the Bible's canonical history is discussed in detail in → 1.1.2.1.1. In addition to what I have argued there, a few remarks about Christian terms are important.

1. The first to designate the collection of Jewish Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures as "Septuagint" were Christians. The earliest attestation of the Greek term οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα "The Seventy," which renders into Latin as *septuaginta*, can be found in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* (*Dial.* 68.7; 71.1–2; 120.4; 124.3; 131.1; cf. 84.3; cf. *1 Apol.* 31.1–5).<sup>1</sup> Later on, the same use of the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hengel, "Die Septuaginta als von Christen beanspruchte Schriftensammlung bei Justin und den Vätern vor Origines," 41–46. For a different opinion, see A.C. Sundberg, "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 68–90 (70–71). The Latin term *septuaginta* is first attested with Augustine (*Civ.* 18.42; cf. Sundberg, "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism," 72).

term Septuagint is attested, for example, in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.16.1.<sup>2</sup> This observation is all the more interesting as the legend about the seventy-two translators who rendered the Torah into Greek in the *Letter of Aristeas* had an extensive reception history in Second Temple Judaism (see, e.g., Philo, *Mos.* 2.37; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.57 cf. 12.56, 99, 107). It is furthermore important that Justin uses the term "The Seventy" in a polemical context accusing the Jews of having "taken away many texts (πολλὰς γραφάς) from the translations effected by those seventy elders who were with Ptolemy" (*Dial.* 71.1) in order to suppress testimony of the crucified Christian Messiah. Already in its earliest use, the term Septuagint is thus not only Christian but is clearly used in a polemic context accusing Jews of deleting passages from the Holy Scriptures in order to deny the true nature of Jesus.

2. The term Old Testament is a Christian term as well. It is first attested in the writings of Melito of Sardes (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.13–14) and is part of Christian supersessionist thought (see below → 1.1.2.2.5).
3. The term Bible is also a Christian term. The first known occurrence of the word Bible as a designation of the books of a biblical canon is in the *Homily on Colossians* by John Chrysostom. He describes the study of the books of the Old and New Testaments as "medicine for the soul" (φάρμακα τῆς ψυχῆς; 9.1). In this passage, Chrysostom calls the books of the Bible βιβλία. But the term Bible became prominent only with Martin Luther who entitled his 1534 German translation of the Hebrew Bible and the Greek New Testament as *Biblia*.

#### 1.1.2.2.2 The Septuagint Old Testament Canon and the Jewish Canon

The Christian Old Testament canon differs in three respects from the Jewish canon. The first difference is that the latter is written in Hebrew while

<sup>2</sup> See Sundberg, "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism," 71.

the former goes back to a Jewish Greek translation of the books of the Hebrew Bible. Only later on did Christians also employ translations into other languages. The second difference pertains to the number of books included in the Hebrew Bible and in the Christian Old Testament respectively. The third difference concerns the sequence of these books. To illustrate the evidence for the latter two differences, the table below compares the most important Septuagint codices and Christian canon lists from (late) antiquity with one another. A more complete synopsis of the canon lists of the fourth century can be found in → 1.1.2.2.6 (table 2).

The table on p. 51 shows that the Christian Old Testament canon had a different structure than the Jewish canon. Instead of Torah, Prophets, and Writings, the Christian Old Testament canon structured its texts, as in the case of Melito, into historical books, poetical books (teachings and hymns), and prophets.<sup>3</sup> However, this structure is not a common agreement. LXX<sup>4</sup> attests to the sequence: historical books, prophets, historical books, poetical books. Also different from Judaism, the various canon lists and codices disagree as to which books should be included in the Christian Old Testament. The earliest Christian canon list of the Old Testament by Melito of Sardes does not include any deuterocanonical books and, even in the fourth century, the mega-codices and church councils disagree as to which deuterocanonical Scriptures should be part of the Christian Old Testament.

The above observations underline that the deuterocanonical Scriptures were included only gradually into the Christian Old Testament. Even in the second century C.E., Melito could still create a canon list that did not include a single deuterocanonical book and, in the third century C.E., Origen included the Letter of Jeremiah only as a part of the book of Jeremiah. That the majority of Christian canon lists place the prophets section at the end of the Old Testament pointing to the New Testament demonstrates that the Christian Old Testa-

ment canon was created in a supersessionist reading of the Hebrew Bible that denied Judaism a claim to its salvation history.

### 1.1.2.2.3 History of Research

In comparison to the canonical histories of the Jewish Bible and the New Testament, surprisingly little research has been done on the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament canon.<sup>4</sup> When scholars study this topic at all, most of them focus on individual aspects of it. These studies will – to a limited degree – be discussed in my own sketch of the canonical history of the Old Testament below. Here, I will summarize the history of research based only on a limited number of studies that are dedicated to more than one language tradition and/or century. Based on these few studies, two basic models for the canonical history of the Old Testament can be discerned: 1) The Christian church adopted its Greek Old Testament canon from Alexandrian or Palestinian Judaism including those texts that are not part of the Jewish canon (for the Alexandrian canon and the implausibility of this hypothesis, see → 1.1.2.1.2); 2) The Septuagint canon is a Christian collection of Jewish Greek translations that grew over time until the fourth century C.E. and later. This position understands the Septuagint canon thus as a Christian Bible.

<sup>4</sup> It is perhaps symptomatic that neither the *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare* (2 vols; eds. M. Karrer and W. Kraus; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011) nor the *T & T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (ed. J.K. Aitken; London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015) include a chapter on the canonical history of the Septuagint.

<sup>5</sup> The merged cells in this table indicate where a canon list regards two or more biblical books as one. For further lists, see Westcott, *General Survey*, 531–71; Swete, *\*Introduction*, 198–214; Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, 58–59; Junod, “Annexe”; Wermelinger, “Annexe”; McDonald, *Biblical Canon*, 439–44; and in the blog *Bible Research: Internet Resources for Students of Scripture* by M.D. Marlowe (<http://www.bible-researcher.com/canon8.html> last accessed February 14, 2016). However, none of these compilations is exhaustive.

<sup>6</sup> According to Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 4.26.12–14.

<sup>7</sup> According to Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25.1–2.

<sup>8</sup> Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 39.17.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Dorival, “La Septante dans le monde chrétien,” 329.

TABLE 4 *The Old Testament according to Some Christian Authors, Mega-Codices, and Councils*<sup>5</sup>

Melito of Sardes <sup>6</sup>	Origen <sup>7</sup>	Athanasius <sup>8</sup>	Cyril of Jerusalem <sup>9</sup>	Epiphanius <sup>10</sup>	LXX <sup>b</sup>	LXX <sup>s</sup>	LXX <sup>a</sup>	Council of Hippo <sup>11</sup>	Third Council of Carthage <sup>12</sup>	Letter of Pope Innocent I <sup>13</sup>
Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen
Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod		Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod
Num	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev		Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev
Lev	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num
Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut		Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut
Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh		Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh
Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg		Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg
Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth		Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	1-4 Kgdms
1-4 Kgdms	1-2 Kgdms	1-2 Kgdms	1-2 Kgdms	Job	1-4 Kgdms	1-2 Chr	1-4 Kgdms	1-4 Kgdms	1-4 Kgdms	Ruth
1-2 Chr	3-4 Kgdms	3-4 Kgdms	3-4 Kgdms	Psalms	1-2 Chr	1-2 Esd	MinP	1-2 Chr	1-2 Chr	16 Prophets
Psalms	1-2 Chr	1-2 Chr	1-2 Chr	Prov	1-2 Esd	Esth	Isa	Job	Job	1-5 Solomon
Prov	1-2 Esd	1-2 Esd	1-2 Esd	Qoh	Psalms	Tob	Jer	Psalms	Psalms	Psalms
Qoh	Psalms	Psalms	Esther	Cant	Prov	Jdt	Baruch	1-5 Solomon	1-5 Solomon	Job
Cant	Prov	Prov	Job	1 Kgdms	Qoh	1-2 Macc	Lam	MinP	MinP	Tobit
Job	Qoh	Qoh	Psalms	2 Kgdms	Cant	Isa	Ep Jer	Isa	Isa	Esther
Isa	Cant	Cant	Prov	3 Kgdms	Job	Jer	Ezek	Jer	Jer	Judith
Jer	Isa	Job	Qoh	4 Kgdms	Wis	Lam	Dan	Ezek	Ezek	1-2 Macc
MinP	Jer	MinP	Cant	1 Chr	Sir	MinP	Esth	Dan	Dan	Ezra
Dan	Lam	Isa	MinP	2 Chr	Esth	Psalms	Tob	Tob	Tob	1-2 Chr
Ezek	Ep Jer	Jer	Isa	MinP	Jdt	Prov	Jdt	Jdt	Jdt	
Esd	Dan	Bar	Jer	Isa	Tob	Qoh	1-2 Esd	Esth	Esth	
	Ezek	Lam	Bar	Jer	MinP	Cant	1-4 Macc	1-2 Esd	1-2 Esd	
	Job	Ep Jer	Lam	Lam	Isa	Wis	Psalms	1-2 Macc	1-2 Macc	
	Esth	Ezek	Ep Jer	Ep Jer	Jer	Sir	Job			
	[Macc]	Dan	Ezek	Bar	Bar	Job	Prov			
			Dan	Ezek	Lam		Qoh			
				Dan	Ep Jer		Cant			
				1 Esd	Ezek		Wis			
				2 Esd	Dan		Sir			
				Esther			Pss Sol			

<sup>9</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures* 4:33-37 (= PG 43:244).

<sup>10</sup> Epiphanius, *Pan.* 8.6. Epiphanius gives two further canon lists in *De mensuris et ponderibus* 4 and 22-23 that differ from each other even inside this theological treatise by one and the same author. *De mensuris et ponderibus* 4: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1-2 Chronicles, 1-2 Kingdoms, 3-4 Kingdoms, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, 1-2 Esdras, Esther; *De mensuris et ponderibus*

22-23: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Job, Judges, Ruth, Psalms, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, 1 Kingdoms, 2 Kingdoms, 3 Kingdoms, 4 Kingdoms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, Esther.

<sup>11</sup> *Breviarum Hipponense*, canon 36.

<sup>12</sup> See n. 9.

<sup>13</sup> Critical edition in Turner, "Pope Innocent's Epistle to Exsuperius of Toulouse" (see n. 134).

### 1.1.2.2.3.1 The Alexandrian Canon Model

The first position, that the church would have adopted an Alexandrian canon, was prominent for a long time. Examples include Westcott and Buhl. In 1864, *Westcott*<sup>14</sup> viewed the Old Testament as “the enlarged Canon of the Alexandrine LXX.” In the church, it “was sanctioned by popular use, but appeals were made to the Hebrew Canon, which alone was universally and formally admitted” in Christianity.<sup>15</sup> At the end of the fourth century C.E., the Latin canon would have developed, which included all deuterocanonical writings with full canonical authority granted to them.

*Buhl* argued in 1891<sup>16</sup> that the early church was committed to the Alexandrine system of canon. When the Palestinian system of canon became dominant in ancient Judaism, frictions between Judaism and Christianity evolved. The canonical lists of Melito and Origen communicate Jewish ideas about canon to prepare Christians for a debate with Jews. Neither Melito nor Origen would have rejected the deuterocanonical texts. During the fourth century C.E., the Greek church would have attributed a status of second-rate authority to the deuterocanonical texts while the Latin church, being led by North Africa, followed ecclesiastical practice in giving full canonical status to the deuterocanonical texts.

In 1900, *Swete*<sup>17</sup> recognized a separation of the Eastern and Western churches. In the Greek-speaking East, the Palestinian Hebrew canon as known from Judaism today was decisive. To this Jewish canon of twenty-two books, the structure of the Alexandrian canon would have been applied. Eastern Christianity would have expanded the Jewish canon by those deuterocanonical books that could be merged with biblical books of the Jewish canon, for example, the Letter of Jeremiah and Baruch with Jeremiah. The Western church had no scruples regarding following the Alexandrian Jewish canon and gave full canonical status to all

deuterocanonical texts: “There can be little doubt that, notwithstanding the strict adherence of the Eastern lists to the number of the Hebrew books, the Old Latin canon truly represents the collection of Greek sacred books which came into the hands of the early Christian communities at Antioch, Alexandria and Rome.”<sup>18</sup> “The presence of the non-canonical books in Greek Bibles cannot be attributed to the skilled writers of the fourth and fifth centuries. They have but perpetuated an older tradition, a tradition probably inherited from the Alexandrian Jews.”<sup>19</sup>

*Katz*<sup>20</sup> argued in 1956 for a Palestinian version of the Alexandrian Jewish canon model. He reckons with a twenty-two-book canon with the characteristic book sequence of the Septuagint. The Greek canon inherited by Christianity would have been only one among many canons in Palestine in the late Second Temple period. The rabbis would have adjusted the Hebrew canon as known today only later in response to the catastrophic consequences of the First Jewish War. Katz summarizes his positions with almost an anti-Jewish undertone as follows:

It is owing to the LXX and the early Fathers that a prospect was kept open which the rabbis had done their utmost to obscure. In the decisive moment Jerusalem lost its grip of the Dispersion and when it was restored the Church kept aloof up to Origen. For this very reason many pre-rabbinic traditions outlived destruction, and their survival has kept alive a grand chapter of history which Palestinian Judaism in its hour of utter debacle and distress had to strike out for sheer survival. The rabbis must not be blamed for concentrating on what they considered the essentials. However, not even the most determined change of mind can ever undo realities.<sup>21</sup>

In 1984, a French collection of essays marked an important step in the study of the Old Testament’s canonical history as the first comprehensive discourse on the patristic evidence since the study of

<sup>14</sup> Westcott, *Bible in the Church*.

<sup>15</sup> Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, 139.

<sup>16</sup> Buhl, *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments*.

<sup>17</sup> Swete, *\*Introduction*, esp. 217–30 (quoted here according to the edition of 1900).

<sup>18</sup> Swete, *\*Introduction*, 224.

<sup>19</sup> Swete, *\*Introduction*, 225.

<sup>20</sup> Katz, “The Old Testament Canon.”

<sup>21</sup> Katz, “The Old Testament Canon,” 202.

Sundberg.<sup>22</sup> While the contributions to *Le Canon de l'Ancien Testament* disagree on minor issues, an overall argument develops in the volume that the shorter and the longer Christian canons grew out of Jewish traditions from pre-Christian times. The shorter version would go back to a canon favored by the Pharisees, while the longer one would go back to Jewish circles who were open to a larger collection of Scriptures.

Despite the final rejection of the hypothesis of an Alexandrian Jewish canon by Sundberg (→ 1.1.2.1.2), Fabry<sup>23</sup> has recently (2012 and 2014) argued for a similar model guided by Katz' hypothesis of a Palestinian Greek canon in the shape of the Septuagint. Fabry regards the Septuagint canon as an earlier text that reflects the textual reality of the later Second Temple period. Christianity adapted both the Hebrew and Septuagint canons from Judaism. The Latin church of the West would have opted in the fourth century for the earlier Septuagint canon, while the Greek Church oriented itself toward an extended Hebrew canon.

#### 1.1.2.2.3.2 The Christian Collection Model

The magisterial study of Sundberg (1964)<sup>24</sup> abolished the paradigm of an Alexandrian Septuagint canon that became the Old Testament of early Christianity. Sundberg left no doubt that an Alexandrian Jewish canon never existed (→ 1.1.2.1.2). In the first and early second centuries C.E., the Law and Prophets sections of the Jewish canon had already gained their final shape while

the third part of the Jewish canon was still in flux. Before separating from Judaism, early Christianity participated in this situation of limited canonical fluidity and accepted both the closed canonical sections of the Law and the Prophets and an unbound third group of Jewish religious texts as its Scriptures. After Judaism and Christianity parted ways, both formed their own canons. For Judaism, Sundberg recognizes the closing of the Writings section already around the year 90 C.E.

The forming of the Christian Old Testament canon from the larger literature received from Judaism at the inception of the church appears to be the result of the impact of the closed canon of Jamnia in Judaism upon the more inclusive practice of the church. That impact was not wholly successful. It was felt in the church almost exclusively as a canonical list of titles. Consequently, the church preserved those additional books that had become related to the canonical titles through agglomeration. Also, the impact of the Jewish canon appears not to have been so great against those extra-canonical books that continued to circulate in Judaism and this eventuated in the retention of these books, as well, in the Old Testament canon of the church.<sup>25</sup>

Sundberg judges the impact of the Jewish canon to have been even greater in the Greek Eastern church than in the Latin Western churches.

As part of a multi-authored introduction to the Septuagint,<sup>26</sup> Dorival discussed in 1988 the canonical history of the Greek Old Testament.<sup>27</sup> He is guided in his approach by Sundberg's study discussed above. For Dorival, the church inherited the books of the Old Testament from Judaism before the closure of the canon in Jabneh/Jamnia (→ 1.1.2.1). In the first four centuries, the Greek church had a tendency to limit its Old Testament

<sup>22</sup> *Le Canon de l'Ancien Testament: Sa Formation et son histoire* (eds. J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger; MdB; Geneva: Labor et fides, 1984). For Sundberg's study, see below.

<sup>23</sup> Fabry, "Kanongeschichte"; cf. also H.-J. Fabry, "Das 'Alte Testament,'" in *What is Bible?* (eds. K. Finsterbusch and A. Lange; CBET 67; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 283–304.

<sup>24</sup> Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 81–107, 129–70; cf. A.C. Sundberg, "The Old Testament of the Early Church (A Study in Canon)," *HTR* 51 (1958): 205–26; A.C. Sundberg, "The 'Old Testament': A Christian Canon," *CBQ* 30 (1968): 143–55; A.C. Sundberg, "The Old Testament of the Early Church Revisited," in *Festschrift in Honor of Charles Speel* (eds. T.J. Sienkewicz and J. Edmond; Monmouth: Monmouth College, 1996), 88–110; A.C. Sundberg, "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 68–90.

<sup>25</sup> Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 169.

<sup>26</sup> Dorival–Harl–Munnich, \**Septante*.

<sup>27</sup> Dorival, "La Septante dans le monde chrétien." G. Dorival's article "L'apport des Pères de l'Église à la question de la clôture du canon de l'Ancien Testament," in *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 81–110, engages only with the importance of patristic literature for the reconstruction of the canonical history of the Jewish Bible.

to the books of the Hebrew canon. Nevertheless, for those biblical books that include additional text in their Greek translations and for those biblical authors to whom more than one book was attributed, the church accepted these additions and additional books by way of agglomeration as argued by Sundberg. The Greek church attributed a secondary non-canonical status of ecclesiastical authority to the remaining deuterocanonical texts. With regard to the structure of the canon, Dorival observes mainly a tripartite system of historical, poetic, and prophetic books for the Greek Church of the fourth century.

McDonald (1988, 1995, 2007)<sup>28</sup> argues that the Septuagint was the Christian Bible from the beginning of the church. The church inherited the books collected in the Septuagint from Judaism in the first century C.E. before the two separated. Judaism never formed a formal Septuagint canon. Only the books treated as canonical by the church fathers became part of the Septuagint. The Eastern church was committed to the shorter twenty-two or twenty-four-book canon of Judaism, while the Western church under the influence of Augustine included many deuterocanonical writings into its canon.

In contrast to McDonald, Ellis (1991)<sup>29</sup> regards the Septuagint as the Greek version of the Jewish twenty-two-book canon in the first century C.E. In the second and third centuries C.E., the delimitation of the Septuagint collection would have been blurred. The churches of the fourth century responded to these blurred margins. The Greek church remained more or less with the book repertoire of the Hebrew canon. Guided by North African Christianity in general and Augustine in particular, the Latin-speaking churches decided instead for a wider canon.

The title of Hengel's study elucidates his main argument, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture* (1994

and 2002).<sup>30</sup> He argues that the individual translations of the books of the Septuagint into Greek were produced by Jews, but that as a canon of Scriptures the Septuagint including its deuterocanonical books was brought together by Christians in the late first century C.E. The integration of deuterocanonical texts reflects the ecclesiastical usage of Scriptures in the Christian communities of Rome, as documented by *1 Clement*. This Roman Christian usage was in turn influenced by the Jewish Diaspora in Rome. The New Testament would show though that the early Christian communities of Judea and its environs adhered merely to the Jewish canon. The Roman Jewish use of the additional books in the Septuagint would thus have ultimately inspired the Christian Septuagint canon.

In a wider study on Jewish-Christian relations, Horbury (1998)<sup>31</sup> agrees with Hengel on the Christian character of the Septuagint collection of Scriptures. But Horbury points the attention of scholars to the Christian perception of the Christian Septuagint canon in (late) antiquity. He observes that Christians wanted to share the Jewish Bible in the canonical form recognized by Jews. "The patristic comments attest a clear and widespread Christian inclination to recognize the Jewish norm of biblical literature, and therewith the position of the Jews as hereditary custodians of scripture. The Christians think that they share the Jewish Bible, and they want to share it in its most authoritatively recognized Jewish form."<sup>32</sup> Only later on did the ecclesiastical criterion lead to an extension of the Jewish canon in Christianity.

More recent developments in the study of the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament include a book chapter and a series of articles by Gallagher (2012–2014).<sup>33</sup> In patristic times, Gal-

<sup>28</sup> McDonald, *Biblical Canon* (2007). 1st and 2nd ed.: *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1988); *The Formation of the Christian Biblical Canon* (rev. and expanded ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1995).

<sup>29</sup> Ellis, *Old Testament*, 6–36.

<sup>30</sup> The original German study was published in 1994: "Die Septuaginta als 'christliche Schriftensammlung': Ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons." The English translation appeared in 2002: *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*.

<sup>31</sup> W. Horbury, *Jews and Christians in Contact and Contradiction* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), esp. 27–33, 206–15.

<sup>32</sup> Horbury, *Jews and Christians*, 211.

<sup>33</sup> E.L. Gallagher, "The Old Testament in Patristic Bibli-

lagger sees the canonical history of the Old Testament developing between a synagogal and an ecclesiastical criterion, i.e., between a Christian canon determined by the Jewish canon and a Christian canon determined by ecclesiastical practice and tradition: “the Fathers generally debated whether the synagogue or the Church had the right to specify the books in the OT.”<sup>34</sup> It will be interesting to see what results Gallagher will reach in his developing studies of the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament.

Since the work of Sundberg and Hengel, the Septuagint has been understood with very few exceptions as a Christian collection of Jewish Scriptures. Agreeing with this sentiment, I argue in → 1.1.2.1 that a group-specific Jewish Alexandrian canon never existed. The survey below will confirm this observation and demonstrate that Christianity developed its Greek Old Testament canon out of the Jewish canon in a canonical process that took several hundred years.

#### 1.1.2.2.4 The Christian Old Testament in the First Century C.E.

In the beginnings of Christianity, Christian authors turned to the Jewish canon that had developed during the reign of Herod the Great (→ 1.1.2.1.3). The way in which various authors of the New Testament employed the Jewish Scriptures shows that early Christian groups were familiar with the Jewish canon in the first century C.E. and seem to have accepted it.<sup>35</sup> The letters of Paul from the years 52–60 C.E. employ texts from the Jewish canon in explicit quotations only, although they also allude without a quotation formula to other Jewish liter-

cal Theory,” in Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 13–61 (2012); Gallagher, “The Old Testament ‘Apocrypha’” (2012); Gallagher, “Prologus Galeatus” (2013); Gallagher, “Writings Labeled ‘Apocrypha’” (2014). Gallagher also runs a blog on the question of canon: “Our Beans: Biblical and Patristic Studies, Especially Dealing with the Reception of the Hebrew Bible in Early Christianity” (<http://sanctushieronymus.blogspot.co.at/p/canon-studies.html>, last accessed February 14, 2016).

<sup>34</sup> Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 61.

<sup>35</sup> Thus, e.g., Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 22; Scarsaune, “The Question of Old Testament Canon,” 445.

ature from the Second Temple period.<sup>36</sup> Even after the letters of Paul, in the New Testament, the only striking exception to this rule is the use of 1 *En* 1:9 in Jude 14–15. That Christians were willing to employ the Enochic *Book of Watchers* (1 *Enoch* 1–36) in the same way as they referred to the Scriptures of the Jewish canon points to a certain fluidity and openness of the Christian canon beyond the borders of the Jewish one in the late first or early second century C.E.<sup>37</sup> However, a single allusion to the Enochic *Book of Watchers* cannot be taken as evidence for a Christian adoption of a supposed Alexandrian canon. This is especially true because, even according to the proponents of this theory, this Alexandrian canon would not have included the *Book of Watchers*.<sup>38</sup> That texts like Acts 13:15 refer to the Law and the Prophets while Luke 24:44 refers to Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms could hint to a structure of the early Christian canon that fluctuated between a bipartite and a tripartite pattern.

#### 1.1.2.2.5 Christian Old Testament Canon in the Second and Third Centuries C.E.

As in the first century C.E., the evidence for the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament is sparse for the second and third centuries C.E. Skarsaune’s studies of the use of the Scriptures in the work of Justin Martyr indicate a Christian canon that equaled the Hebrew one in its size, because Justin quotes explicitly only books from the Hebrew Bible. Skarsaune was also able to demonstrate that Justin took his quotations from testimony books and might not (always) have had

<sup>36</sup> Cf. A. Lange, “The Canonical History of the Hebrew Bible and the Christian Old Testament in Light of Egyptian Judaism,” in *Die Septuaginta – Text, Wirkung, Rezeption: 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.–22. Juli 2012* (eds. W. Kraus et al.; WUNT 325; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 660–80 (676–79).

<sup>37</sup> For the date of the Letter of Jude, see, e.g., R. Heiligenthal, “Jude, Epistle of,” *Religion Past and Present* [http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/religion-past-and-present/jude-epistle-of-SIM\\_11021](http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/religion-past-and-present/jude-epistle-of-SIM_11021) last accessed February 14, 2016.

<sup>38</sup> For the hypothesis of an Alexandrian Jewish canon, see → 1.1.2.1.2.

direct access to the books of the Old Testament.<sup>39</sup> Justin's approach to the canon is also reflected in other Christian literature from the second century C.E.<sup>40</sup> Nevertheless, just as the Letter of Jude in the New Testament employs the Enochic *Book of Watchers* explicitly, so the *Letter of Barnabas* in the early second century C.E. uses the book of Ben Sira (*Barn.* 19:2 = *Sir* 7:30 and *Barn.* 19:9 = *Sir* 4:31) and the *Epistle of Enoch* (*Barn.* 16:6 = *1 En* 91:13).<sup>41</sup> Tertullian's defense of *Enoch* (*Cult. fem.* 1.3) might point in a similar direction.

Aside from the study of explicit quotations, little evidence survives for the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament in the second and third centuries C.E. Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* preserves two quotation fragments of Melito of Sardes (*Hist. eccl.* 4.26.12–14) and Origen (*Hist. eccl.* 6.25.1–2) respectively that include Old Testament

canon lists. Origen's canon list is illuminated by other evidence from his oeuvre.

#### 1.1.2.2.5.1 Melito of Sardes

Melito of Sardes refers in the introduction to his *Eklogai* "Excerpts" to an Old Testament canon list that he encountered when traveling "to the East" (εις την ανατολήν). The canon list contains twenty-one books in a sequence that is at variance with the Hebrew canon (*Hist. eccl.* 4.26.12–14). It has often been claimed that Melito's reference to the East indicates a Jewish origin of his canon list.<sup>42</sup> Against this theory, it needs to be emphasized that Melito refers to the East in general as the source of his canon list but does not mention Jewish sources. He most likely encountered his canon list among Christian communities in the Roman province of *Syria-Palaestina*, who in turn drew on Jewish tradition for their canon list.<sup>43</sup> The term ἐκρηύχθη "was preached" also suggests that Christian communities were the source of Melito's canon list. On the whole, it would be surprising for Melito to travel to the East in order to research the Jewish canon given the presence of a large Jewish community in Sardes and given the hatred of Jews that Melito expresses in his *Peri Pascha*.<sup>44</sup> The basic agreement of Melito's canon list with the book

<sup>39</sup> O. Skarsaune, *The Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 56; Leiden: Brill, 1987); O. Skarsaune, "From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church," in *The New Testament and Christian-Jewish Dialogue: Studies in Honor of David Flusser* (ed. M. Lowe; Jerusalem: Ecumenical Research Fraternity in Israel, 1990), 207–19; Skarsaune, "The Question of Old Testament Canon"; similarly Westcott, *Bible in the Church*, 106; Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 147–49; Hengel, "Die Septuaginta als von Christen beanspruchte Schriftensammlung bei Justin und den Vätern vor Origenes," 46–51; Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 28–29.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 66–67.

<sup>41</sup> Cf., e.g., H.P. Rüger, "Das Werden des christlichen Alten Testaments," *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 3 (1988): 175–89 (185). For the use of Enochic texts in Christian literature from the second century C.E. and later, see also Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 163–69; Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 67–68. Against Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 53, and Fabry, "Das 'Alte Testament,'" 299, there is no clear indication that Irenaeus of Lyon attests to a broader reception of deuterocanonical texts: "In the Christian Greek authors of the second century (Apostolic Fathers included, Clement of Alexandria excluded), only two formal quotations are to be found in which one of the Old Testament Apocrypha is quoted as Scripture: Baruch 3:29–4:1 in Irenaeus *Proof of the Apostolic Preaching* 97; and Baruch 4:36–5:9 in Irenaeus *Adv. Haer.* v.55.1. In both cases, however, Irenaeus quotes the texts as 'Jeremiah'" (Skarsaune, "The Question of Old Testament Canon," 445 [italics are by Skarsaune]).

<sup>42</sup> See, e.g., Katz, "The Old Testament Canon," 196–97; Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 133–34; N.R.M. de Lange, *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 25; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 50; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 11–12; Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 61; Fabry, "Kanongeschichte," 687.

<sup>43</sup> Thus Beckwith, *Old Testament*, 184–85; J. Ruwet, "Canon alexandrine des Écritures: Saint Athanase," *Bib* 33 (1952): 1–29 (16); Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 23–24. Dorival, "L'apport des Pères de l'Église à la question de la clôture du canon de l'Ancien Testament," 81–110 (88 n. 6), regards Melito's informants as Jewish Christians.

<sup>44</sup> Thus Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 24. For an analysis of the anti-Jewish rhetoric in Melito's *Peri Pascha*, see E. Werner, "Melito of Sardis, the First Poet of Deicide," *HUCA* 37 (1966): 191–210; A.T. Kraabel, "Melito the Bishop and the Synagogue at Sardis: Text and Context," in *Studies Presented to George M.A. Hanfmann* (eds. D.G. Mitten et al.; Monographs in Art and Archeology 2; Mainz: von Zabern, 1971), 72–85.

1	Γένεσις "Genesis"	ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς βίβλου Βρησιθ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν "ἐν ἀρχῇ" "From the beginning of the book <i>Bresith</i> , which is 'in beginning'"
2	Ἔξοδος "Exodus"	Ουελλεσμωθ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν "ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα" " <i>Ouelesmoth</i> which is 'these are the names'"
3	Λευιτικόν "Leviticus"	Ουῦκρα, "καὶ ἐκάλεσεν" " <i>Oukra</i> 'and he called'"
4	Ἀριθμοί "Numbers"	Αμμεσφεκωδεῖμ " <i>Ammesphkodeim</i> "
5	Δευτερονόμιον "Deuteronomy"	Ελληαδδεβαρεῖμ, "οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι" " <i>Elleaddebarim</i> 'these are the words'"
6	Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Ναυῆ "Jesus son of Nave"	Ἰωσουεβεννον <i>Iosoue ben Noun</i>
7	Κριταί, Ρούθ, παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν ἐνί "Judges, Ruth among them in one (book)"	Σωφτειμ <i>Softeim</i>
8	Βασιλειῶν α' β', παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐν "first and second Kingdoms are one (book) with them"	Σαμουήλ, "ὁ θεὸς κλητός" "Samuel 'the called of God'"
9	Βασιλειῶν γ' δ' ἐν ἐνί "third and fourth Kingdoms in one"	Ουαμμελχδαυιδ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν "βασιλεία Δαυιδ" " <i>Ouammelch David</i> , which is 'the Kingdom of David'"
10	Παραλειπομένων α' β' ἐν ἐνί "first and second Chronicles in one"	Δαβρηιάμειν, ὅπερ ἐστὶν "λόγοι ἡμερῶν" "Dabreiamain which is 'words of days'"
11	Ἔζρας α' β' ἐν ἐνί "first and second Esdras in one" (= Ezra–Nehemiah)	Εζρα, ὅ ἐστὶν "βοηθός" "Ezra which is 'an assistant'"
12	βίβλος Ψαλμῶν "book of Psalms"	Σφαρθελλειμ " <i>Sfarthelleim</i> "
13	Σολομώνος παροιμίαι "Proverbs of Solomon"	Μελωθ " <i>Meloth</i> "
14	Ἐκκλησιαστής "Ecclesiastes"	Κωελθ " <i>Koelth</i> "
15	Ἰσμημα αἰσμάτων οὐ γάρ, ὡς ὑπολαμβάνουσιν τινες, Ἰσμηματα αἰσμάτων "Song of Songs, indeed not as some suppose 'Songs of Songs'"	Σιρασσιρεῖμ " <i>Sirassireim</i> "
16	Ἰσαΐας "Isaiah"	Ἰεσσια " <i>Iessia</i> "
17	Ἰερειμίας σὺν Θρήνοις καὶ τῇ Ἐπιστολῇ ἐν ἐνί "Jeremiah together with Lamentations and the Letter in one"	Ἰερεμια " <i>Ieremia</i> "
18	Δανιήλ "Daniel"	Δανιήλ "Daniel"
19	Ἰεζεκιήλ "Ezekiel"	Ἰεζεκιήλ "Iezekiel"
20	Ἰώβ "Job"	Ἰωβ "Iob"
21	Ἔσθηρ ἔξω δὲ τούτων ἐστὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκά, ἅπερ ἐπιγράφεται Σαρβηθσαβαναϊελ	Ἔσθηρ "Esther" "Outside of these are the Maccabees, which are entitled <i>Sarbethsabanaiel</i> "

repertoire of the Jewish canon<sup>45</sup> indicates though that the Christian sources for Melito's canon list were ultimately guided by a Jewish canon tradition. The book sequence of Melito's canon differs from the Jewish one. Melito's list attests to a tripartite canon of Historical Books (Moses,<sup>46</sup> Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kingdoms, Chronicles), Poetical Books (Psalms, Proverbs,<sup>47</sup> Qohelet, Canti-

cles, Job) and Prophetic Books (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Minor Prophets, Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra–Nehemiah). On the whole, the book sequence is determined in each of the three sections by historical considerations, hence Isaiah appears, e.g., at the beginning of the prophetic section. It is likely that either

<sup>45</sup> Only the book of Esther is missing. The book of Lamentations was most likely regarded as a part of Jeremiah by Melito (thus, e.g., Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 151 n. 86).

<sup>46</sup> That Numbers precedes Leviticus in Melito's list is an ignorant scribal error.

<sup>47</sup> Whether the Greek phrase Σολομώνος Παροιμίαι ἢ καὶ Σοφία means "the Proverbs of Solomon, which are also [known as] Wisdom" or whether it means "of Solomon Proverbs

and the Wisdom," is disputed. Melito could have referred with this phrase to the book of Proverbs by its two Greek names Παροιμίαι "Proverbs" and Σοφία "Wisdom" (thus, e.g., Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 133–34 n. 10; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 11; Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 22) or he could have included two Solomonic books into his canon list, Proverbs and the Wisdom of Solomon (thus, e.g., Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 151). Given Eusebius' report that the book of Proverbs was sometimes called Wisdom (*Hist. eccl.* 4.22.9) and that Melito does not refer to any other deuterocanonical texts in his list, the former seems more likely.

Melito or his Christian source is responsible for this structural difference from the Jewish canon. The basic structure of Melito's Old Testament canon is determined by Christian supersessionist thought. With the Prophetic Books at the end, Melito and/or his Christian source understand the Jewish Scriptures as forecasting Jesus as the Messiah. This theologically motivated structure of Melito's canon is confirmed by his use of the term Old Testament (τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης "the old covenant," i.e., the Old Testament). Melito's canon list is the earliest known attestation of the term Old Covenant, i.e., Old Testament. Given Melito's depreciation of Judaism in his *Peri Pascha* there can be little doubt that for Melito the term Old Testament indicates an outdated covenant made by God with Israel but rejected by Israel in its killing of Jesus, hence God's New Covenant with the Church. Melito's canonical thought is thus clearly motivated by his supersessionism if not by an anti-Semitic understanding of the salvation history.

What is probably most remarkable about Melito's canon list is that it neither refers to nor rejects any alternate canon models despite the fact that Marcion had already rejected the Old Testament entirely in his canon and reduced the New Testament to the Gospel of Luke and a select list of Pauline epistles.<sup>48</sup> Melito's silence on this issue is an example of how unaffected the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament was by inner-Christian conflict until the fourth century C.E.

#### 1.1.2.2.5.2 Origen's Canon List and His Bible

After Melito's list, the next Old Testament canon list is preserved in a quotation fragment of a Psalms commentary by Origen (185–254 C.E.) in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.25. The Psalms commentary can be dated between the years 222 and 225 C.E.<sup>49</sup> Origen

says: "It should indeed be known that the canonical books, as the Hebrews have transferred them, are twenty-two, corresponding with the number of their letters" (τὰς ἐνδιαθήκους βίβλους, ὡς Ἑβραῖοι παραδιδόασιν, δύο καὶ εἴκοσι, ὅσος ἀριθμὸς τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς στοιχείων ἐστίν). There can hence be little doubt that Origen draws on Jewish tradition for his canon list. His Jewish source is also reflected in the quotation of both the Greek and Hebrew names of the biblical books, the latter together with their Greek translations. Therefore, as Origen's list is a rare witness to the late ancient Hebrew names of the biblical books, I quote its text in detail on p. 63 (see also below, table 4).

There are several problems connected with Origen's canon list:

1. That Origen's list does not include the Minor Prophets goes back to scribal error for several reasons:<sup>50</sup> a) Origen claims to list twenty-two books but his list includes only twenty-one; b) The canon list of Hilary of Poitiers (→ 1.1.2.2.6; *Exposition of the Psalms* 15) includes the Minor Prophets but is based on Origen's canon list;<sup>51</sup> c) The Minor Prophets were of great interest to late ancient Christianity and are therefore present in all other Christian canon lists.
2. The book of Ruth is understood as part of Judges and the book of Lamentations and the Letter of Jeremiah are recognized as part of Jeremiah. It is interesting that Origen does not give Jewish names for these books although Jerome (see below, → 1.1.2.2.6.4) leaves no doubt that such Jewish names existed for Ruth and Lamentations. At least with regard to the Letter of Jeremiah, it needs to remain an open question whether it was part of a Jewish canon that Origen might

<sup>48</sup> For Marcion's Bible and other conflicts with heretics about the New Testament, see, e.g., B. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 75–106, and S. Moll, *The Arch-Heretic Marcion* (WUNT 250; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 77–107.

<sup>49</sup> Cf., e.g., P. Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Christianisme antique 1; Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 368–71, and C.A. Blais-

ing, *Psalms 1–50* (ACCS: Old Testament 7; Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2009), xix.

<sup>50</sup> De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, 52–53, with n. 25 (176); Ellis, *Old Testament*, 13; Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 156; Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 63.

<sup>51</sup> For Hilary's dependence on Origen, see already H.H. Howorth, "The Influence of St. Jerome on the Canon of the Western Church, II," *JTS* 11 (1909–1910): 321–47 (323–25).

- have known.<sup>52</sup> It is at least as possible that they were attached to Jeremiah in the agglomeration process described by Sundberg and Dorival.<sup>53</sup>
3. The two books of Esdras “which are in one” refer to Ezra–Nehemiah,<sup>54</sup> as the Septuagint book of 3 Ezra (= 1 Esdras) overlaps too much with Ezra–Nehemiah to be counted as one book in two parts. Otherwise, 1 Samuel–2 Kings and 1–2 Chronicles also would have been counted by Origen as one book.
  4. Origen’s canon list clearly regards Maccabees as a book outside the canon. Nevertheless, Origen included at least Ben Sira,<sup>55</sup> Wisdom of Solomon,<sup>56</sup> and Judith<sup>57</sup> into his Hexapla. Thus, Origen himself adhered to a wider canon than that represented by his own canon list.<sup>58</sup> This is confirmed by Origen’s use of various deutero-canonical texts in his oeuvre. Gallagher points in particular to Origen’s correspondence with Julius Africanus.<sup>59</sup>

<sup>52</sup> Cf. Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 135; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 14–15, considers it to be a scribal gloss to Origen’s list.

<sup>53</sup> See → 1.1.2.2.3.2.

<sup>54</sup> Ellis, *Old Testament*, 16–17.

<sup>55</sup> J. Ziegler (ed.), *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12.2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 57–63; J. Ziegler, “Die hexaplarische Bearbeitung des griechischen Sirach,” *BZ NF* 4 (1969): 174–84 (repr. in J. Ziegler, *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* [MSU 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], 510–28); J. Ziegler, “Die Vokabel-Varianten der O-Rezension im Griechischen Sirach,” in *Hebrew and Semitic Studies Presented to Godfrey Rolles Driver in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday 20 August 1962* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 172–90 (repr. in Ziegler, *Sylloge*, 615–33).

<sup>56</sup> J. Ziegler (ed.), *Sapientia Salomonis* (2nd ed.; Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 12.1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 50–56.

<sup>57</sup> R. Hanhart (ed.), *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum 8.4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 23–25; R. Hanhart, *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Judith* (MSU 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 14–45.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 11.

<sup>59</sup> Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 30–49; For Origen’s correspondence with Julius Africanus, see N.R.M. de Lange, “The Letter to Africanus: Origen’s Recantation,” in *Papers Presented to the Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 1975*, Part 2: *Monastica et Ascetica, Orientalia*,

The last observation makes it likely that Origen’s canon list does not reflect his own canonical thought but goes back to a source text; however, it is unlikely that this quoted source represents a Jewish canon list. Despite the clear Jewish influence in Origen’s canon list, its structure is different from any Jewish canon that we know of from late antiquity (see table 1 in → 1.1.2.1.4). Origen uses for the books of 1 Samuel–2 Kings their Greek names (1–4 Kingdoms) although he knows their Hebrew names (Samuel and Kings). The best explanation for this observation is that Origen employed an existing Christian canon list to which he added the Greek transcriptions of the Hebrew names of the biblical books.<sup>60</sup> This observation also explains why Origen does not follow the structure of the Jewish canon but places the Prophets followed by Job and Esther at the end of the Old Testament. Origen’s canon list represents thus the Christian Old Testament to which he added the Hebrew names of the biblical books.<sup>61</sup> His Hexapla demonstrates that neither his Christian source nor his Jewish canon tradition represent Origen’s own canonical thought.<sup>62</sup> Instead, Origen himself had a more open canon concept and referred for a

*E Saeculo Secundo, Origen, Athanasius, Cappadocian Fathers, Chrysostom, Augustine* (ed. E.A. Livingstone; StPatr 16; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1985), 242–47.

<sup>60</sup> Against de Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, 53, who wants to find “a divergent Jewish tradition” at work.

<sup>61</sup> Against D. Barthélemy, “Origène et le texte de l’Ancien Testament,” in D. Barthélemy, *Études*, 203–17 (207); M. Harl (ed.), *Origène, Philocalie 1–20 Sur les Écritures* (SC 302; Paris: Cerf, 1983), 266; J.N.B. Carleton Paget, “The Christian Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Alexandrian Tradition,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation*, Vol. 1: *From the Beginnings until the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, Part 1: *Antiquity* (ed. M. Saebø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 478–542 (503); Hengel, *Septuagint as Christian Scripture*, 63; McDonald, *Biblical Canon*, 201–02; Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 37–38, who argue that Origen reiterates a Jewish position on the canon. Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 134–35, wants to find a Jewish canon list containing the names of the twenty-two Hebrew books, which Origen then enlarged, restructured, and explained by adding the Greek book names.

<sup>62</sup> Against Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 157–58; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 13–19; A.E. Steinmann, *The Oracles of God: The Old Testament Canon* (St. Louis: Concordia Academic Press, 1999), 155, who think that Origen advocates the canon list for the church.

closed canon only to the Jewish one.<sup>63</sup> This is also indicated by Origen's correspondence with Julius Africanus. It leaves little doubt that the latter argued for the Jewish twenty-two-book canon, while Origen himself supported a wider canon.<sup>64</sup> In his Psalms commentary, Origen employed a Christian canon list that adhered to the Jewish twenty-two-book canon, because he wanted to educate his Christian audience about the book repertoire and the names of the books of the Jewish canon.

With regard to Origen's Hexapla, another observation is important for the canonical history of the Old Testament. The Hexapla not only indicates that Origen adhered to an Old Testament canon that was larger than the Jewish Bible: Eusebius' report on Origen's work on this singular project also indicates the rarity of Greek copies of the books of the Hebrew Bible. For example, Eusebius explains in *Hist. eccl.* 6.16 that Origen needed to search for Greek versions of the Psalms in Nicopolis, near Actium, and another unspecified place. This means that in his native Caesarea he had difficulties finding copies of all Greek versions of the Psalms.

#### 1.1.2.2.5.3 Eusebius of Caesarea

Eusebius' *Ecclesiastical History* appeared in several revisions in which Eusebius adjusted this work to the developing events of his time. The first version can be dated as early as 290 C.E. and the latest version was finalized after 324 C.E.<sup>65</sup> *Ecclesiastical History* includes an extensive discussion of the New Testament canon (*Hist. eccl.* 3.25). For the New Testament, Eusebius distinguishes between recognized books (ὁμολογουμένα "accepted/agreed upon"), disputed books (ἀντιλεγόμενα "controversial"), spurious books (νόθοι "counterfeit, faked"), and heretical books (αἰρετικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀναπλάσματα "fictions of heretical men").<sup>66</sup> The recognized books are those that Eusebius regards as

"canonical" (ἐνδιαθήκους), the spurious and heretical books are those that he rejects entirely. He defines the category of disputed books "in that they are not canonical, but disputed, yet nevertheless are known to most churchmen" (*Hist. eccl.* 3.25.6; οὐκ ἐνδιαθήκους μὲν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀντιλεγόμενας, ὅμως δὲ παρὰ πλείστοις τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν γινωσκομένης). For the Old Testament, Eusebius did not leave us a similarly detailed discussion of its canon. Nevertheless, his discussion of Clement of Alexandria in *Hist. eccl.* 6.13 demonstrates that Eusebius also applied his system of recognized and disputed books to the Old Testament. In *Hist. eccl.* 6.13.6, he writes

He (scil. Clement) makes use also in them (scil. his works) of testimonies from the disputed scriptures (ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντιλεγόμενων γραφῶν), of the so-called Wisdom of Solomon, and of Jesus, the son of Sirach, and of the Letter to the Hebrews, and of the (Letter) of Barnabas, and of (the Letter) Clement and (of the Letter of) Jude.

#### 1.1.2.2.5.4 The Old Testament Canon and the Persecution under Diocletian in 303 C.E.

The measures Diocletian took during his infamous persecution of Christians included the confiscation and burning of Christian books. Eusebius reports that he saw with his own eyes how Christian Scriptures were burned at the market place (*Hist. eccl.* 8.2.1 and 4). This Roman book burning was possible because the Roman persecutors had a good idea which texts they needed to look for.<sup>67</sup> Thus, the persecution under Diocletian indicates that a specific set of (canonical) Christian Scriptures was easily identifiable for the Roman persecutors.<sup>68</sup> It is unknown to what extent books of the Old Testament were affected by this book burning. The report of the confiscation of a total of

<sup>67</sup> Thus, e.g., the report of Lactantius (*Inst.* 5.2) about Hierocles, who was not only governor of Bithynia but also one of the chief promoters of the persecution.

<sup>68</sup> For the impact of Diocletian's persecution on the canonical history of the Christian Bible, see, e.g., Metzger, *Canon of the New Testament*, 106–08; H.Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 144–50; E. Ferguson, "Factors Leading to the Selection of the New Testament Canon: A Survey of

<sup>63</sup> De Lange, *Origen and the Jews*, 52.

<sup>64</sup> Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 135–38; Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 30–49.

<sup>65</sup> See D.S. Wallace-Hadrill, "Eusebius von Caesarea," *TRE* 10: 537–43 (540).

<sup>66</sup> For Eusebius' groups of canonical and non-canonical texts, see, e.g., Metzger, *Canon of the New Testament*, 201–07.

thirty-seven codices from the church at Cirta in Numidia, one of them being “the law,” is interesting.<sup>69</sup> This report not only indicates that the texts of the Old Testament were affected by Diocletian’s book burnings but also that, in the early fourth century C.E., a Christian community could own a sizeable collection of texts although by far not the whole Bible. However, it is also important to recognize that many, many copies of the Christian Scriptures were destroyed by the Roman Empire shortly before the Constantinian shift.

In summary: Very little information is available for documenting the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament in the second and third centuries C.E. It appears that the question of the Old Testament canon was only of minor importance to Christianity in this period. Those sections of Christianity that accepted the Old Testament were either indirectly (Melito) or directly (Julius Africanus in his correspondence with Origen) guided by the Jewish canon but re-patterned its structure according to Christian thought (Melito). Origen wants to inform his Christian audience about the Hebrew twenty-two-book canon in preparation for discussions with Jews but attests to a wider Old Testament canon that also included deuterocanonical texts. The extent and structure of this canon is no longer known.

Especially in the second century C.E. but also later, many Christians depended on collections of *testimonia* for their access to the Old Testament. A good example is the use of Scripture by Justin Martyr. Origen’s celebrated compilation of the Hexapla was an exceptional enterprise. Reports on how he acquired or did not acquire access to particular Greek versions of biblical books demonstrate how rare Greek copies of biblical books were in his time. Reports about the persecution under Diocletian could indicate a recognition of the Christian Scrip-

tures in the pagan world and demonstrate a more widespread dispersion of biblical books some fifty years after Origen.

#### 1.1.2.2.6 The Christian Old Testament Canon in the Fourth Century

While the surviving evidence from the first, second, and third centuries C.E. for the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament is sparse, many canon lists and other sources are preserved from the fourth century C.E. This richness of sources reflects an increased interest in the question of canon in late ancient Christianity that was most likely being triggered by three factors: 1) Since the edict of Milan and the Constantinian shift, Christianity was not only accepted in the Roman Empire but was on its way to becoming its official religion. In this changed climate, the Christian church developed into an official institution. An official church needed to grow out of what was previously a religious movement consisting of a spectrum of different Christian groups and milieus. This process involved the condemnation of various heretic groups; 2) Official sanction and support led to the economic affluence of Christians as illustrated, for example, by the early Christian gold glasses.<sup>70</sup> This affluence enabled Christian communities and individuals not only to acquire biblical manuscripts, but the possession of such manuscripts and writing artefacts was even used as a symbol that represented social status and wealth. This symbolic use of biblical scribal culture is illustrated, for example, by the Hypogeum of Trebius Justus Asel-

Some Recent Studies,” in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 295–320 (317).

<sup>69</sup> See the report on this book confiscation in *Gesta apud Zenophilum* (O.R. Vassall-Philippis, *The Work of St. Optatus against the Donatists* [London: Longmans, Green, 1917], 353, 355–58).

<sup>70</sup> C.L. Avery, “Early Christian Gold Glass,” *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin* 16 (1921): 170–75; G. Bovini, *Monumenti figurati paleocristiani conservati a Firenze nelle raccolte pubbliche e negli edifici di culto* (Vatican City: Pontificio Istituto di Archeologia Cristiana, 1950); R. Morey and G. Ferrari (eds.), *The Gold-Glass Collection of the Vatican Library: With Additional Catalogues of Other Gold-Glass Collections* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1959); F. Fülöp, “Early Christian Gold Glasses in the Hungarian National Museum,” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 16 (1968): 401–12; J. Engemann, “Bemerkungen zu römischen Gläsern mit Goldfoliendekor,” *JAC* 11–12 (1968–1969): 7–25; M. Sternini, “A Glass Workshop in Rome (17th–18th century A.D.),” *Kölner Jahrbuch für Vor- und Frühgeschichte* 24 (1991): 105–14.

lus in Rome and the depiction of writing materials and codices in it.<sup>71</sup> The great importance that Christians in the fourth century placed on the possession of scrolls and codices is also documented in the grave of Veneranda in the Domitilla catacomb.<sup>72</sup> In the early fifth century or maybe even in the late fourth century, Christian wealth led to the production of the oldest extant illuminated Christian Bible manuscripts, the so-called Quedlinburg Itala<sup>73</sup> and the so-called Cotton Genesis;<sup>74</sup> 3) The Roman Empire lent official support to the Bible and in consequence also to its canon. For example, between 331 and 335 C.E., Emperor Constantine commissioned fifty Bible codices from Eusebius of Caesarea for the growing number of churches in Constantinople (Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4.36–37). Emperor Constans I placed a similar order for Bible codices with Athanasius of Alexandria in the years 337–339 C.E. (Athanasius, *Apol. Const.* 4.2).<sup>75</sup> Given that Athanasius produced one of the

earliest canon lists from the fourth century (see below, → 1.1.2.2.6.2), the link between the production of early biblical mega-codices and the canonical history of the Christian Bible is evident.

Traditionally, the eastern and western sections of the Roman Empire and their Latin- and Greek-speaking churches are discussed separately in the study of the canonical history of the Old Testament.<sup>76</sup> This model emphasizes that in the East

Brill, 2010], 65–78). Both Skeat and Elliot suggest that LXX<sup>b</sup> and LXX<sup>s</sup> were produced as part of Constantine's manuscript order. LXX<sup>s</sup> would not have been completed while LXX<sup>b</sup> would have actually been shipped to Constantinople.

<sup>76</sup> Thus, e.g., Westcott, *Bible in the Church*; Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 129–70; Junod, “La formation”; Wermelinger, “Le canon des latins”; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 19–33; McDonald, *Biblical Canon*, 206.

<sup>77</sup> The merged cells in this table indicate where a canon list regards two or more biblical books as one. Convenient compilations of the important texts and canon lists can be found in Westcott, *General Survey*, 531–71; Swete, \*Introduction, 198–214; Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 58–59; Junod, “Annexe”; Wermelinger, “Annexe”; McDonald, *Biblical Canon*, 439–44; and in the blog Bible Research: Internet Resources for Students of Scripture by M.D. Marlowe (<http://www.bible-researcher.com/canon8.html> last accessed February 14, 2016). None of these compilations is exhaustive.

<sup>78</sup> Hilary of Poitiers, *Commentary on the Psalms* 15.

<sup>79</sup> *Breviarum Hipponense*, canon 36.

<sup>80</sup> Augustine, *Doctr. chr.* 2.8.26–29.

<sup>81</sup> Rufinus, *Exposition of the Creed (Commentarius in Symbolum apostolorum)* 36–38.

<sup>82</sup> Critical edition in Turner, “Pope Innocent's Epistle to Exsuperius of Toulouse” (see n. 134).

<sup>83</sup> Athanasius, *Ep. fest.* 39.17.

<sup>84</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechetical Lectures* 4.33–37 (= PG 43.244).

<sup>85</sup> Epiphanius, *Pan.* 8.6. Epiphanius gives two further canon lists in *De mensuris et ponderibus* 4 and 22–23 that differ from each other even within this theological treatise by one and the same author. *De mensuris et ponderibus* 4: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–2 Chronicles, 1–2 Kingdoms, 3–4 Kingdoms, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, 1–2 Esdras, Esther; *De mensuris et ponderibus* 22–23: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Job, Judges, Ruth, Psalms, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, 1 Kingdoms, 2 Kingdoms, 3 Kingdoms, 4 Kingdoms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, Esther.

<sup>86</sup> Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmen* 1.12.5.

<sup>87</sup> *Iambics for Seleucus* (quoted according to Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmen* 2.2.8 = PG 37.1593–96).

<sup>71</sup> For the Hypogeum of Trebius Justus Asellus, see M. Andaloro, *L'orizzonte tardoantico e le nuove immagini: corpus 1* (Milan, Jaca Book, 2006), 259–63; O. Marucchi, “Scoperta del sepolcro di Trebio Giusto sulla via Latina,” *Nuovo Bullettino di Archeologia Cristiana* 17 (1911): 201–35; R. Rea (ed.), *L'ipogeo di Trebio Giusto sulla via Latina: scavi e restauri* (Scavi e restauri 5; Vatican City: Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra, 2004); F. Bisconti, *Le pitture delle catacombe romane: restauri e interpretazioni* (Todi: Tau, 2011), 209–20.

<sup>72</sup> See U.M. Fasola, *Die Domitilla-Katakomben und die Basilika der Märtyrer Nereus und Achilleus* (trans. K. Köberl; ed. P. Pergola; 3rd ed.; Römische und Italienische Katakomben 1; Vatican City: Pontificia Commissione di Archeologia Sacra, 1989), 39–41.

<sup>73</sup> For the Quedlinburg Itala, see I. Levin, *The Quedlinburg Itala: The Oldest Illustrated Biblical Manuscript* (Litterae textuales 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985).

<sup>74</sup> For the Cotton Genesis, see K. Weitzmann and H.L. Kessler, *The Cotton Genesis: British Library Codex Cotton Otho B. VI* (The Illustrations in the Manuscripts of the Septuagint 1; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986).

<sup>75</sup> For Constantine's manuscript order, see T.C. Skeat, “The Codex Sinaiticus, the Codex Vaticanus and Constantine,” *JTS* 50 (1999): 583–625 (repr. in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat* [ed. J.K. Elliot; NovTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2004], 193–237); J.K. Elliot, “T.C. Skeat on the Dating and Origin of the Codex Vaticanus,” in *The Collected Biblical Writings of T.C. Skeat*, 281–94 (repr. J.K. Elliot, *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles: Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation* [NovTSup 137; Leiden:

TABLE 5 Some Canonical Lists of the Fourth Century<sup>77</sup>

	Western Lists						Eastern Lists					
Hilary of Poitiers <sup>78</sup>	Synod of Hippo and Third synod of Carthage <sup>79</sup>	Augustine <sup>80</sup>	Jerome (Prologus Galeatus)	Jerome ( <i>Epist.</i> 53.8)	Rufinus of Aquileia <sup>81</sup>	Letter of Pope Innocent I <sup>82</sup>	Athanasius <sup>83</sup>	Cyril of Jerusalem <sup>84</sup>	Epiphanius <sup>85</sup>	Gregory of Nazianzus <sup>86</sup>	Amphilochus <sup>87</sup>	
Five books of Moses	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	Gen	
	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	Exod	
	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	Lev	
Josh	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	Num	
	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	Deut	
Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh	Job	Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh	Josh	
Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg	Josh	Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg	Judg	
Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	(Ruth)	Judg	Ruth	1-4 Kgdms	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	Ruth	
				Ruth								
1-2 Kgdms	1-4 Kgdms	1-4 Kgdms	1-2 Sam/ Kgdms	Samuel	1-4 Kgdms	Ruth	1-2 Kgdms	1-2 Kgdms	Job	Kgdms	1-4 Kgdms	
3-4 Kgdms	1-2 Chr	1-2 Chr	1-2 Kgs/ 3-4 Kgdms	Kings	1-2 Chr	16 Prophets	3-4 Kgdms	3-4 Kgdms	Psalms	Chr	1-2 Chr	
1-2 Chr	Job	Job	Isa	MinP <sup>88</sup>	1-2 Esd	1-5 Solomon	1-2 Chr	1-2 Chr	Prov	Esd	1-2 Esd	
Ezra-Neh	Psalms	Tobit	Jer (Lam)	Isa	Esther	Psalms	1-2 Esd	1-2 Esd	Qoh	Job	Job	
Psalms	1-5 Solomon	Esther	Ezek	Jer (Lam)	Isa	Job	Psalms	Esther	Cant	Psalms	Psalms	
Prov	MinP	Judith	MinP	Ezek	Jer	Tobit	Prov	Job	1 Kgdms	Qoh	Prov	
Qoh	Isa	1-2 Macc	Job	Dan	Ezek	Esther	Qoh	Psalms	2 Kgdms	Cant	Qoh	
Cant	Jer	1-2 Esd	Psalms	Psalms	Dan	Judith	Cant	Prov	3 Kgdms	Prov	Cant	
MinP	Ezek	Psalms	Prov	Solomon	MinP	1-2 Macc	Job	Qoh	4 Kgdms	MinP	MinP	
Isa	Dan	Prov	Qoh	(Prov, Qoh, Cant)	Job	Ezra	MinP	Cant	1 Chr	Isa	Isa	
Jer Lam	Tob	Cant	Cant		Ps	1-2 Chr	Isa	MinP	2 Chr	Jer	Jer	
Ep Jer	Jdt	Qoh	Dan	Esther	Prov		Jer	Isa	MinP	Ezek	Ezek	
Dan	Esth	Wis	1-2 Chr	1-2 Chr	Qoh		Bar	Jer	Isa	Dan	Dan	
	1-2 Esd	Sir	1-2 Esd	Ezr-Neh	Cant		Lam	Bar	Jer		Esther	
Ezek	1-2 Macc	MinP	Esther				Ep Jer	Lam	Lam			
Job		Isa	(Ruth and Lam)				Ezek	Ep Jer	Ep Jer			
Esther		Jer					Dan	Ezek	Bar			
[add Tobit]		Dan						Dan	Ezek			
[add Judith]		Ezek							Dan			
									1 Esd			
									2 Esd			
									Esther			

<sup>88</sup> Jerome quotes the names of the Minor Prophets in *Epist.* 53.8 in the following sequence: Hosea, Joel, Amos,

Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi.

the Jewish twenty-two-book canon would have remained dominant, while the West would have been more open to the inclusion of deuterocanonical Scriptures. The distinction between the Eastern and Western canonical histories of the Old Testament becomes important after the fourth century. However, Table 5 on p. 63 leaves little doubt that in the fourth century C.E. no clear distinction between Western and Eastern Old Testament canons can be made regarding the inclusion or exclusion of deuterocanonical texts. The dual opposition between Western and Eastern churches is insufficient to depict their regional differences in the canonical history of the Old Testament. These regional differences were more complex given that various Christian authors from the East and West influenced one another in their ideas about the Old Testament canon.

#### 1.1.2.2.6.1 Hilary of Poitiers

The above table shows, for example, that in 365 C.E. the Western cleric Hilary of Poitiers, who was the bishop of Poitiers in Gaul, does not include the deuterocanonical Scriptures into his Old Testament canon. In his *Commentary on the Psalms* (§ 15),<sup>89</sup> Hilary distinguishes clearly between the twenty-two books of the Old Testament and two further books (Tobit and Judith). The twenty-two books of the Old Testament would correspond to the number of characters in the Hebrew alphabet. Tobit and Judith were added by some to reach the number twenty-four, which corresponds to the number of characters in the Greek alphabet.<sup>90</sup> Except that Origen's list lacks the Minor Prophets and mentions a book of Maccabees as being outside the canon, Hilary's canon list corresponds with the one

<sup>89</sup> For the date of Hilary's *Commentary on the Psalms* after 365 C.E., see C. Moreschini and E. Norelli, *Storia della letteratura cristiana antica greca e latina*: Vol. 2.1: *Dal concilio di Nicea agli inizi del Medioevo* (Brescia: Morcelliana, 1996), 357–68.

<sup>90</sup> Ellis, *Old Testament*, 26–27, wants to interpret Hilary's reference to a twenty-four-book canon in light of the Cheltenham list discussed below (→ 1.1.2.2.8). But the Latin Cheltenham list argues for the twenty-four elders of Revelation while Hilary refers for a twenty-four-book canon to the twenty-four letters of the Greek alphabet.

of Origen (see above → 1.1.2.2.5.2). Hilary is thus a testimony to the influence of Origen's list in the western part of the empire.<sup>91</sup> But Hilary also illustrates the high appreciation of the books of Tobit and Judith in his time. Furthermore, Hilary leaves little doubt that only the book repertoire and not the structure of the Christian Old Testament were determined by the Jewish canon. In his canonical structure, Hilary follows Origen, who seems to be guided by the supersessionist pattern already established by Melito, instead of following the Jewish model.

#### 1.1.2.2.6.2 Athanasius of Alexandria

The first detailed theological discussion of the Old Testament canon can be found in the thirty-ninth Easter letter of Bishop Athanasius of Alexandria (367 C.E.). Athanasius' statement seems to have multiple backgrounds. That Emperor Constantine I ordered Bible codices from Athanasius for the churches of Constantinople in the years 337–339 C.E. (Athanasius, *Apol. Const.* 4.2) might have inspired Athanasius' canonical thought. After all, the invention of the mega-codex in the fourth century made it possible for the first time to combine all biblical books into one codex.<sup>92</sup> Beyond such technical observations, Athanasius' thirty-ninth Easter letter is well suited to illustrate the social and religious conflicts that triggered the canon making in early orthodox Christianity.

Athanasius speaks in §§ 17, 20–21 of three different groups of texts: the canonical ones, the books read in the church, and the apocryphal ones. The category of apocryphal texts is pejorative and mainly associated with Athanasius' conflict with heretical groups.<sup>93</sup> According to Athanasius, such apocrypha were attributed, for example, to Enoch, Moses, and Isaiah (§ 21).

Two religious groups can be identified against whom Athanasius formulates his canon list. His attack against the Jews seems to be aimed mainly

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 184–85; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 26: "Apparently influenced by catalogues of the Greek church."

<sup>92</sup> See n. 147 below.

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Gallagher, "Writings Labeled 'Apocrypha,'" 3–4.

at the Jewish rejection of the Christian New Testament.

Concerning them the Lord put the Sadducees to shame when he said, “You err because you do not know the Scriptures or their meaning,” and he reproved the Jews, “Search the Scriptures, for it is they that testify to me.” (§ 19)<sup>94</sup>

Athanasius furthermore attacks Arians and other versions of Christianity as heretics. According to the bishop, they either emphasized their own teaching authority (Arians) or mixed apocryphal with canonical books (Melitians).<sup>95</sup>

Inasmuch as certain people have attempted to set in order for themselves the so-called apocryphal books (τὰ λεγόμενα ἀπόκρυφα) and to mix these with the divinely inspired Scripture (τῇ θεοπνεύστῳ γραφῇ), about which we are convinced it is just as those who were eyewitnesses from the beginning and assistants of the Word handed down to our ancestors, it seemed good to me, because I have been urged by genuine brothers and sisters and instructed from the beginning, to set forth in order the books that are canonized (τὰ κανονιζόμενα), transmitted, and believed to be divine, so that those who have been deceived might condemn the persons who led them astray, and those who have remained pure might rejoice to be reminded (of these things). (§ 16)

For Athanasius, Christ is the only teacher whose teachings are communicated through the Old and New Testament canons. Any apocryphal texts are to be avoided as they “are inventions of the heretic” (αἰρετικῶν ἐστὶν ἐπίνοια; § 21) used to lead the simple astray. Athanasius’ attack on the apocrypha is reminiscent of Eusebius’ third and fourth categories of spurious and heretical texts (→ 1.1.2.2.5.3). It gives further details though in opposing the apocryphal texts as falsifications that were composed by the heretics. The apocryphal text would communicate heresy but the canonical ones would communicate the teachings of Christ. Athanasius

thus uses the canon as a means of opposing other Christian groups and their authoritative texts. In this way, he uses the establishment of a canonical list as an instrument to strengthen the authority of the official church against all groups that he identifies as being heretical. That Athanasius’ approach to canon had an impact on Christianity is illustrated, for example, by the sermon against apocryphal books of the Coptic monastic leader Shenute (350–466 C.E.).<sup>96</sup>

Beyond his attack on heretical apocryphal texts, Athanasius knows also a category of texts that are not canonical but are being read in the church (§§ 20–21).

There are other books, in addition to the preceding, which have not been canonized (ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἕξωθεν· οὐ κανονιζόμενα), but have been appointed by the ancestors (τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων) to be read to those who newly join us and want to be instructed (ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι) in the word of piety: the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the book called Teaching of the Apostles, and the Shepherd. 21 Nevertheless, beloved, the former books are canonized; the latter are (only) read; and there is no mention of the apocryphal books (κάκεινων κανονιζομένων καὶ τούτων ἀναγινωσκομένων οὐδαμοῦ τῶν ἀποκρύφων μνήμη).

This third category of books is reminiscent of Eusebius’ category of disputed texts (→ 1.1.2.2.5.3). In contrast to Eusebius, Athanasius describes this third category of books not as controversial (ἀντιλεγόμενα) texts but as other books that are outside of the canonical writings (ἕτερα βιβλία τούτων ἕξωθεν “other books outside of these”). Athanasius’ term ἕξωθεν “outside” is reminiscent of the word ἕξω “outside” with which Origen excluded Maccabees from the canon in his canon list (see above, → 1.1.2.2.5.2). These outside books are Wisdom of Solomon, Wisdom of Sirach, Esther (sic!), Judith, and Tobit. Not being canonical, Athanasius still describes them as

<sup>94</sup> All translations of Athanasius’ thirty-ninth Easter letter are taken from D. Brakke, “A New Fragment of Athanasius’s Thirty-Ninth *Festal Letter*: Heresy, Apocrypha, and the Canon,” *HTR* 103 (2010): 47–66.

<sup>95</sup> Brakke, “Canon Formation”; Brakke, “New Fragment.”

<sup>96</sup> Brakke, “Canon Formation,” 412. For Shenute’s sermon, see T. Orlandi, “A Catechesis against Apocryphal Texts by Shenute and the Gnostic Texts of Nag Hammadi,” *HTR* 75 (1982): 88–89.

appointed by the (church) fathers to be read by those catechoumens who seek instruction: οὐ κανονιζόμενα μὲν τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγινώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις καὶ βουλομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον “not being canonized but appointed by our fathers to be read to those which are just coming and which want to be instructed in the word of piety.” Athanasius’ ideas regarding the texts that are read in the church later formed the ideas of his pupil Epiphanius of Salamis (→ 1.1.2.2.6.5; *Pan.* 8.6; *De Mensuris et Ponderibus* 4). However, causing confusion for the modern reader, Epiphanius dubs Athanasius’ second category of authoritative books as “apocryphal” books and not as “other books.”<sup>97</sup>

Despite Athanasius’ polemic against Jews in his discussion of the Christian canon, the bishop depends heavily on a Jewish core canon of twenty-two books according to the number of characters in the Hebrew alphabet. However, in the tradition of Melito, Origen, and others, Athanasius changes the structure of this Jewish core canon by placing the prophets in general and Daniel in particular at its end. With the eschatological prophecies of Daniel at the end, the Athanasian Old Testament points to Christ and the New Testament. That the Jewish canon is no more than a guiding principal for Athanasius is also evident in his merging of Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, and the Letter of Jeremiah into one book.

### 1.1.2.2.6.3 The Synod of Hippo and the Third Synod of Carthage

Two regional synods in North Africa were the first to create ecclesiastical laws in order to delimit the books belonging to the Christian Old

Testament:<sup>98</sup> the synod of Hippo (393 C.E.),<sup>99</sup> and the third synod of Carthage (397 C.E.). The synods passed identical decisions regarding the canon of the Christian Old Testament, with the synod of Carthage confirming the decisions of Hippo.<sup>100</sup> That the synods of Hippo and Carthage disagree with Athanasius regarding the contents and sequence of the canon marks the regional diversity of the Old Testament canon in Egypt (Athanasius) and the Roman province of Africa (Synods of Hippo and Carthage) in the fourth century but points also to a wider theological conflict. Influenced by Augustine,<sup>101</sup> the synod of Hippo and the third synod of Carthage<sup>102</sup> included, beyond Athanasius’ Old

synod of Laodicea and therefore most likely was added subsequently to explain the mention of canonical and uncanonical books in canon 59 of this synod (see T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* [2 vols.; Erlangen: A. Deichert, 1888–1892], 2.197–202; Hahneman, *Muratorian Fragment*, 157). When Jerome refers in his prologue to the book of Judith (line 4) to a decision of the first council of Nicea (325 C.E.), namely that it would have counted the book of Judith among the sacred Scriptures, he must be in error. Neither such a decision regarding the book of Judith nor any other decision about a canon of the Old Testament is mentioned in the proceedings of the Nicean council. It is possible that the book of Judith was mentioned in the deliberations of the council and that such a mention was later interpreted as a formal decision of the Nicean council (thus already C.J. Hefele, *A History of the Christian Councils, from the Original Documents, to the Close of the Council of Nicea, A.D. 325* [trans. W.R. Clark; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1894], 370–71; C.J. Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church, Vol. 2: A.D. 326 to A.D. 429* [trans. H. Nutcombe Oxenham; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1894], 296).

<sup>99</sup> For the textual documentation of the synod of Hippo, see C. Munier, “La tradition manuscrite de l’Abrégé d’Hippone et le Canon des Ecritures des Eglises africaines,” *SacEr* 21 (1972–1973): 43–54.

<sup>100</sup> For the small textual differences between the text of the lists from Hippo and Carthage and their textual relationship, see La Bonnardière, “The Canon of Sacred Scripture,” 30–32.

<sup>101</sup> For the relation between the canon lists of the two North African councils and Augustine’s canon list, see A.-M. La Bonnardière, *Biblia Augustiniana: A.T.*, Vol. 4: *Le Livre des Sagesse* (Paris: Études Augustinienne: 1970), 44–57; La Bonnardière, “The Canon of Sacred Scripture,” 26–41; M. Moreau, I. Bochet, and G. Madec, *La doctrine chrétienne = De doctrina christiana: texte critique du CCL revu et corr./introd. et trad. de Madeleine Moreau* (Bibliothèque augustinienne Oeuvres de saint Augustin 11.2; Paris: Desclée, de Brouwer, 1997), 512–14.

<sup>102</sup> For these two African synods, see Moreau, Bochet, and Madec, *La doctrine chrétienne*, 507–10.

<sup>97</sup> Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament*, 23.

<sup>98</sup> The canon list of the council of Rome from 382 C.E. is not included in this article, as it seems to reflect a later canon list. Thus first E. von Dobschütz, *Das Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis: In kritischem Text herausgegeben und untersucht* (TU 38.4; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1912); cf. e.g. G.M. Hahneman, *The Muratorian Fragment and the Development of the Canon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992), 158–61. For the same reason, the canon list of the synod of Laodicea (canon no. 60) is not included. It is lacking in the earliest textual witnesses to the canons of the

Testament canon, not only the book of Esther but also Wisdom of Solomon, Ben Sira, Tobit, Judith, and 1–2 Maccabees. In addition to a different treatment of the deuterocanonical books, the two North African synods also adhere to a different structure of the canon. The books of 1–2 Chronicles are followed by Job, Psalms, and 1–5 Solomon (= Proverbs, Canticles, Qohelet, Wisdom, Ben Sira) while Tobit, Judith, Esther, Ezra–Nehemiah, and 1–2 Maccabees follow the book of Daniel.

Thus, the synod of Hippo and the third synod of Carthage did not distinguish the deuterocanonical texts from the books of the Jewish core canon of the Christian Old Testament; they are equally authoritative. In contrast to Athanasius, the canonical status of each book within the two synodal canon lists is determined without regress to patristic authority and inspiration.<sup>103</sup> Gallagher has shown that the synods counteracted both the Manicheans and the Pricillianists with their decision regarding the canon of the Christian Bible.<sup>104</sup> Therefore, the *Breviarum Hipponense* introduces its canon list: “beyond the canonical scriptures nothing is to be read in the Church under the name of divine scripture” (*praeter scripturas canonicas nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum scripturaram*; canon 36). The canon lists of Hippo and Carthage represent the first Latin canon that is independent of Greek canon lists. Provoked by conflicts with heretics, the decisions of the two synods mark a paradigm shift in the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament. This paradigm shift became church law with the papal decree of Innocent I in 405 C.E. (see below, → 1.1.2.2.6.6).

#### 1.1.2.2.6.4 Jerome, Rufinus of Aquileia, and Augustine

With their decisions, the two synods of Hippo and Carthage mark a conflict in canonical theory between two of the most important theo-

logians of their time, namely Augustine and Jerome. Written in 393 C.E.,<sup>105</sup> the *Prologus Galeatus* is the preface to Jerome’s Latin translation of 1 Samuel–2 Kings. In this prologue, Jerome argues harshly against a canonical recognition of the deuterocanonical books. It can be no coincidence that only a short while after Jerome wrote his prologue the synod of Hippo decided in favor of a canonical status for the deuterocanonical books (see → 1.1.2.2.6.3).<sup>106</sup> Gallagher summarizes the situation as follows: “The six books excluded by Jerome and accepted by Hippo had established themselves in the late fourth-century Latin church as the definite collection of such ‘ecclesiastical’ books (to use Rufinus’ terminology; *Symb.* 36) ... Jerome’s unusually harsh statement about their position in the apocrypha ought to be seen as a reaction against the opposite sentiments emanating from North Africa.”<sup>107</sup>

This prologue to the scriptures may serve as a helmeted preface to all the books which we render from Hebrew into Latin, so that we prevail to understand, whatsoever is outside of them (scil. the books of the canon listed in lines 23–51) will be placed aside among the apocrypha. Therefore, Wisdom, which is usually entitled “of Solomon” and the book of Jesus

<sup>105</sup> For this date of the *Prologus Galeatus*, see Gallagher, “Prologus Galeatus,” 100, and the literature quoted there in n. 2.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. Gallagher, “Prologus Galeatus” (esp. 105–06). For Jerome’s position on the Old Testament canon, see, e.g., L. Sander, *Etudes sur saint Jérôme: Sa doctrine touchant l’inspiration des Livres saints et leur Vérité, l’Autorité des Livres deutérocanoniques, la Distinction entre l’Épiscopat et le Presbytérat, l’Origénisme* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1903); H.H. Howorth, “The Influence of St. Jerome on the Canon of the Western Church,” *JTS* 10 (1908): 481–96; 11 (1909): 321–47; 13 (1911): 1–13; P.W. Skehan, “St. Jerome and the Canon of the Holy Scriptures,” in *A Monument to Saint Jerome: Essays on Some Aspects of His Life, Works, and Influence* (ed. F.X. Murphy; New York: Sheed & Ward, 1952), 259–87; Sundberg, *The Old Testament of the Early Church*, 148–53; Wermelinger, “Le canon des latins,” 186–91; D. Brown, *Vir Trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992), 62–71; Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 115–21, 189–200; Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 50–53; Gallagher, “The Old Testament ‘Apocrypha’”; E.L. Gallagher, “Why Did Jerome Translate Tobit and Judith?” *HTR* 108 (2015): 356–75.

<sup>107</sup> Gallagher, “Prologus Galeatus,” 99.

<sup>103</sup> Ellis, *Old Testament*, 28–29.

<sup>104</sup> Gallagher, “Prologus Galeatus,” 14; cf. Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 206, who wants to see the decision of the two councils also directed against Jerome.

son of Sirach and Judith and Tobit and the Shepherd (of Hermas?) are *not* in the canon. The first book of Maccabees I got to know in Hebrew, the second is Greek, which can also be proven from its very style (φρασιν). (lines 52–57)<sup>108</sup>

In the *Prologus Galeatus*, Jerome condemns every book that is “outside of them” (*extra hos*). *Hos* “them” refers to the books in the canon list that precedes lines 52–57 in the *Prologus Galeatus*, i.e., the books of the Jewish Bible that Jerome is translating “from Hebrew into Latin” (*de hebraeo ... in latinum*). Any book that is outside the Hebrew canon needs to be regarded as “among the apocrypha” (*inter apocrypha*), which “are not in the canon” (*non sunt in canone*). Jerome specifies this group as Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus Sirach, Judith, Tobias, the Shepherd (of Hermas), and 1–2 Maccabees. It is particularly interesting that Jerome uses the term *apocrypha* to condemn the deuterocanonical texts as not being canonical.<sup>109</sup> Athanasius used the term apocrypha (ἀπόκρυφα) in his thirty-ninth Easter letter as a designation of heretical texts (§ 16). Athanasius specified that these are texts that lead astray “by the similarities of their names with true (biblical) books” (ἀπατώμενοι τῇ ὁμωνυμίᾳ τῶν ἀληθῶν βιβλίων; § 21). It is therefore all the more interesting that, in *Vir. ill.* 1, Jerome repudiates as apocryphal Scriptures (*apocryphas scripturas*) the *Acts of Peter*, the *Gospel of Peter*, the *Preaching of Peter*, the *Apocalypse of Peter*, and the *Judgement of Peter*, i.e., pseudepigraphical books that employ the name of a biblical author in their titles. This can hardly be a coincidence but instead points to a conscious adaptation of Athanasius’ canonical terminology by Jerome. Thus, Jerome places the deuterocanonical texts on the same level as pseudepi-

graphic heretical texts.<sup>110</sup> Gallagher has explained why Jerome went to such extreme lengths:

I suggest that Jerome's unusually strict stance against the deuterocanonicals expressed in his *Prologus Galeatus* ... represents his attempt to affirm strongly the normative status of the *Hebraica veritas* in the face of those who would confer canonical status on any book read as divine scripture in church.<sup>111</sup>

The other difference between the canon list of the *Prologus Galeatus* and that of the synod of Hippo also relates to the idea of the *Hebraica veritas* “Hebrew truth.” This difference concerns the sequence of the biblical books, which Jerome structures, against all other patristic literature, according to the Jewish Bible (see table 2). The level to which Jerome depends in the *Prologus Galeatus* on the Jewish canon is emphasized by his giving firstly the Hebrew and only afterwards the Greek names of the biblical books.<sup>112</sup> Jerome was the first Christian author to follow the Hebrew canon not only in its book repertoire but also in its book sequence (→ 1.1.2.1.4).<sup>113</sup>

Jerome is an example of another important phenomenon in the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament, namely the canonical fluctuation in the thought and oeuvre of even a single Christian author from late antiquity. In his letter to Paulinus, bishop of Nola, from the year 394 C.E., Jerome summarizes the content of the books of the Old Testament (*Epist.* 53.8). While the book repertoire in this letter is identical to that in the *Prologus Galeatus*, the book sequence differs significantly. Job is now placed between Deuteronomy and Judges, the Minor Prophets come before Isaiah, Daniel is the last prophet, and Esther is not at end of the canon but is placed before 1–2 Chronicles and Ezra–Nehemiah.

<sup>108</sup> The text of Jerome’s prologues is quoted in the following according to the line numbers of the Vulgate edition of Weber and Gryson (*\*Vulgata*). The italics in the translation are mine.

<sup>109</sup> For the very negative meaning of the term *apocrypha* in Jerome’s oeuvre, see Gallagher, “The Old Testament ‘Apocrypha,’” 223–33; Gallagher, “Writings Labeled ‘Apocrypha,’” 11–14. An extensive history of research on this question can be found in Gallagher, “The Old Testament ‘Apocrypha.’”

<sup>110</sup> Thus also Gallagher, “The Old Testament ‘Apocrypha,’” *passim* and esp. 231.

<sup>111</sup> Gallagher, “Prologus Galeatus,” 106.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 194.

<sup>113</sup> The minor disagreements in the book sequence between MT<sup>L</sup> and Jerome fall within the margins of canonical fluctuation of the late ancient and early medieval Jewish canon.

Furthermore, aside from the extreme statement of the *Prologus Galeatus*, Jerome follows elsewhere a more moderate approach to the question of deuterocanonical texts. Especially interesting is the prologue to his translation of the Solomonic texts. With regard to Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon, Jerome writes:

Therefore, like the Church certainly reads the books of Judith, Tobias, and the Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, thus one may also read these two scrolls for the edification of the people, (but) not for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas. (lines 19–21)

This approach to the deuterocanonical texts is typical of Jerome's position and reflects the ideas of Athanasius and Eusebius.<sup>114</sup> It is most likely representative of a common opinion in the Christian churches of the fourth century C.E.<sup>115</sup> The same approach to the deuterocanonical texts can be found in Jerome's *Prologue to Judith* (lines 1–2). How much Jerome's position fluctuates<sup>116</sup> is evident in his letter to Laeta of the year 403 C.E. In this letter, Jerome attacks the "apocryphal writings" (*apocrypha*)<sup>117</sup> almost as harshly as he does in the *Prologus Galeatus* in order to exclude them from the biblical curriculum of the addressee's daughter-in-law (*Epist.* 107.12).

Jerome is thus not only one of the most important canon theorists in late ancient Christian literature but he also illustrates that the canon of the Old Testament remains somewhat fluid even

within the oeuvre of a single theologian of his caliber. Another example for this phenomenon are the three canon lists of Epiphanius of Salamis (see → 1.1.2.2.6.5).<sup>118</sup>

In his more moderate approach, Jerome is followed by Rufinus of Aquileia.<sup>119</sup> Rufinus also distinguishes in his *Exposition of the Creed* (*Commentarius in Symbolum apostolorum = Symb.*) 36–38 between a) the books of the Jewish canon, b) apocrypha, and c) non-canonical texts that have authority within the church.<sup>120</sup> Rufinus dubs the last category "ecclesiastical." These ecclesiastical books include Wisdom of Solomon, Ben Sira, Tobit, Judith, and Maccabees. The impact of Athanasius' canonical thought is evident in Rufinus' second category of books, which he describes as *apocrypha*<sup>121</sup> and which are prohibited in the churches. Rufinus might even be referring indirectly to Athanasius because he attributes his two categories of ecclesiastical books and *apocrypha* to an authority that he describes as *majores* "ancestors" or *patres* "fathers" (*Symb.* 37–38). Ecclesiastical books are allowed to be read in the churches but cannot be used for doctrinal purposes.

But it should also be known that there are other books which are called not "canonical" but "ecclesiastical" (*non Canonici sed Ecclesiastici*) by the ancestors: that is, the Wisdom which is said to be from Solomon, and another Wisdom which is said to be from the son of Sirach, which according to the Latins is called by this name *Ecclesiasticus*, which is designating not the author of the booklet but its character. To the same class belong the booklet of Tobit and Judith, and the books of the Maccabees ... They were willing to have all these read in the churches but not brought forward for the confirmation of doctrine (*quae omnia legi quidem in ecclesiis voluerunt, non tamen pro-*

<sup>114</sup> Cf. Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 195–96, 199–200; Gallagher, "Prologus Galeatus," 102–05; Gallagher, "The Old Testament 'Apocrypha,'" 231–33.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Gallagher, "Prologus Galeatus," 105.

<sup>116</sup> This fluctuation in Jerome's canonical thought should not be regarded as a late development in Jerome's canonical theory. Against Skehan and others, Jerome consistently excludes the deuterocanonical books from the Biblical canon. However, he sometimes draws on the ideas of Athanasius and others who grant these texts a type of second-rate authority (Skehan, "St. Jerome and the Canon of the Holy Scriptures," 262; Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 148–53; Wermelinger, "Le canon des latins," 86–91).

<sup>117</sup> For an analysis of the term apocrypha in Jerome's oeuvre, see Gallagher, "Writings Labeled 'Apocrypha'."

<sup>118</sup> For Jerome's relationship with Epiphanius, see Ellis, *Old Testament*, 32.

<sup>119</sup> Cf., e.g., Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 153; Hahneman, *Muratorian Fragment*, 154.

<sup>120</sup> See Ellis, *Old Testament*, 29–30.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. Ellis, *Old Testament*, 27; Gallagher, "Prologus Galeatus," 101–02. In his "Writings Labeled 'Apocrypha,'" 6–8, Gallagher finds also the influence of Origen in Rufinus' use of the term apocrypha.

*ferri ad auctoritatem ex his fidei confirmandam*). The other writings they called “*apocrypha*,” which they refused to have read in the churches (*caeteras vero Scripturas Apocryphas nominarunt, quas in Ecclesiis legi noluerunt*). (Rufinus, *Symb.* 38)

In his book repertoire, Rufinus follows Jerome while differing in his book sequence. Rufinus distinguishes in his deliberations only between the Law and the Prophets (§ 36) but describes in his canon list proper a more complicated structure of the Old Testament. The five books of Moses (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy) are followed by Judges–Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, Chronicles, 1–2 Esdras, which are in turn followed by the Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Minor Prophets), and then by Job, Psalms, and three books of Solomon (Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles).<sup>122</sup>

Later on, Rufinus seems to have revised his position, most likely under the influence of Augustine and Pope Innocent’s letter of the year 405 C.E. (→ 1.1.2.2.6.6). Because Jerome was guided in his Hebrew-Latin translation work and in his canon model by Jewish scholars, Rufinus attacks Jerome in this later period with anti-Semitic slander. He accuses Jerome of having hired a Jew from the synagogue of Satan as his master.<sup>123</sup> With this change of mind, Rufinus joins the majority of Christian theologians who attacked Jerome harshly for the idea of the *Hebraica veritas* “Hebrew truth” (→ 1.2.1.1.2).

Jerome’s best-known opponent on the question of the Old Testament canon was Augustine. Augustine’s position on canon was inseparably linked with the two synods of Hippo and Carthage (→ 1.1.2.2.6.3).<sup>124</sup> In his book *De doctrina christiana*,

which was written in the year of the third synod of Carthage (397 C.E.), Augustine gives a canon list that agrees with the one of the two synods except for details of the book sequence. This basic agreement can hardly be a coincidence given the role Augustine played at both synods. In *Doctr. chr.* 2.8.24–29, Augustine establishes the authority of the individual churches as the source of canon making. The background of this ecclesial argumentation lies in a conflict with heretical groups, such as the Manicheans and Priscillianists, in North Africa.<sup>125</sup> Against the canons of these heretical groups, Augustine invokes the authority of the apostles (e.g., *Faust.* 13.5; 33.9). In *Doctr. chr.* 2.8.24–25, he argues instead by way of ecclesial practice.<sup>126</sup> Books that are used in ecclesiastical liturgy during church services should be regarded as canonical. In the cases of books on which the individual Christian parishes disagree, either the opinion of the majority of parishes should be followed or that of the churches with the greatest (episcopal) authority. Beyond liturgical practice, Augustine refers to acceptance by the church as a second source of canonical authority, thus evoking implicitly the authority of the synod of Hippo<sup>127</sup> and hallowed church usage.<sup>128</sup>

In the matter of canonical scriptures he should follow the authority of as many catholic churches as possible, including of course those that were found worthy to have apostolic seats and receive apostolic letters. 25. He will apply this principle to the canonical scriptures: to prefer those accepted by all catholic churches to those which some do not accept. As for those not universally accepted, he should prefer

<sup>122</sup> Ellis, *Old Testament*, 27, is reminded in this structure and book sequence of Josephus’ canon (→ 1.1.2.1.3).

<sup>123</sup> Thus Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Christian Church*, 153–54. Sundberg refers to PL 21.610.

<sup>124</sup> For Augustine’s position on the Old Testament canon, see, e.g., C.J. Costello, “St. Augustine’s Doctrine on the Inspiration and Canonicity of Scripture” (PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 1930); Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Early Church*, 155–57; F.D. Taylor, “Augustine of Hippo’s Notion and use of the Apocrypha Thesis” (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 1978); Wermelinger, “Le canon des latins,” 174–83; La Bonnardière, “The Canon of Sacred Scripture,” 26–41; Hen-

nings, *Briefwechsel*, 110–15, 200–16; Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 53–60. To my regret, I did not have access to the two PhD theses.

<sup>125</sup> See, e.g., Wermelinger, “Le canon des latins,” 154–60; Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 200–03.

<sup>126</sup> Cf., e.g., Costello, “St. Augustine’s Doctrine,” 77–86; Sundberg, *Old Testament of the Christian Church*, 156; Taylor, “Apocrypha,” 81; Wermelinger, “Le canon des latins,” 195; Ellis, *Old Testament*, 30; La Bonnardière, “The Canon of Sacred Scripture,” 35; Gallagher, *Hebrew Scripture*, 53–55.

<sup>127</sup> Cf. Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 207.

<sup>128</sup> Ellis, *Old Testament*, 30.

those accepted by a majority of churches, and by the more authoritative ones, to those supported by fewer churches, or by churches of lesser authority. Should he find that some scriptures are accepted by the majority of churches, but others by the more authoritative ones (though in fact he could not possibly find this situation) I think that they should be considered to have equal authority. (*Doctr. chr.* 2.8.24–25)<sup>129</sup>

After his introduction, Augustine gives in *Doctr. chr.* 2.8.26–29 a canon list that accepts as fully canonical – like the synods of Hippo and Carthage – those books to which Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, and Rufinus attributed second-rate authority. As Augustine establishes the authority of his canon explicitly with church tradition as well as practice and implicitly with the decision of the synod of Hippo, it is all the more important to recognize that he feels free to disagree with the canon list of the synod in the sequence of the biblical books. In contrast to the synod of Hippo, Augustine places the books of Tobit, Esther, Judith, 1–2 Maccabees, and 1–2 Esdras between Job and Psalms. This disagreement illustrates once again that the authority of synod rulings regarding the Old Testament canon affected its structure only to a limited degree. While Augustine is committed to the book repertoire of Hippo, he feels entitled to create a different book sequence pointing thus to the canonical fluidity of the structure of the Old Testament canon in the fourth century C.E.

Augustine's position on the Old Testament canon did not change during his long and distinguished career. This is indicated, for example, by his remarks about Wisdom of Solomon and Ben Sira in *De civitate Dei*. Augustine wrote *De civitate dei* after the sack of Rome by the Vandals in 410 C.E. In *Civ.* 17.20, Augustine is keenly aware of the differences between the Christian Old Testament canon and the Jewish canon. This awareness led to one of

the few negative remarks about Jews in Christian discussions of the Old Testament canon in late antiquity.<sup>130</sup>

He (scil. Solomon), too, is found to have included prophecies in his books, three of which have been accorded canonical authority, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs. But two others, of which one is called Wisdom and the other Ecclesiasticus, are usually attributed to Solomon on the ground of a certain resemblance to his style. Leading scholars, however, unhesitatingly reject his authorship. Yet the church, especially the western church, has from early times accepted them as authoritative. In the one of these that is called the Wisdom of Solomon Christ's passion is most clearly prophesied ... However, the writings not included in the Jewish canon do not have as much weight when used against our opponents. (*Civ.* 17.20)<sup>131</sup>

In summary: Before the fourth century, the twenty-two books of the Jewish canon were recognized as the Christian Old Testament canon. At least in the case of Origen's list, the book of Jeremiah was extended to include not only Lamentations but also the Letter of Jeremiah. The fourth century C.E. brings a wealth of canon lists, most likely provoked by the evolving role of the church and the altered circumstances of book production (see below → 1.1.2.2.6.7). These canon lists mark a limited canonical fluidity beyond the basic consensus of the twenty-two-book canon.

At the end of the fourth century, three different positions emerge. Two of them are extreme. In his *Prologus Galeatus*, Jerome recognizes only the books of the Jewish canon as canonical. He even follows the structure and book sequence of the Jewish canon as he knows it. The other extreme position is represented by the synod of Hippo, the third synod of Carthage, and Augustine. For them, all deutero-canonical Scriptures are fully canonical. In an extrinsic approach, the criteria for the canonical

<sup>129</sup> The translations of passages from *Doctr. chr.* 2.8 are according to R.P.H. Green, *Augustine: De doctrina Christiana* (OECT; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 67–71.

<sup>130</sup> For Augustine's position on the Old Testament canon after the decree of Innocent I, see La Bonnardière, "The Canon of Sacred Scripture," 34–39.

<sup>131</sup> Translation according to E.M. Sanford and W.M. Green, *Augustine: City of God*, Vol. v: *Books 16–18.35* (LCL 415; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 341–43.

authority of all Scriptures are their liturgical use in the churches, i.e., ecclesiastical practice, apostolic authority, and acceptance by the church.

A middle ground between these two extremes is represented by the canon lists of Athanasius and Rufinus as well as by statements of Jerome beyond his *Prologus Galeatus* and by remarks of Eusebius. On the one hand, Eusebius, Athanasius, Jerome, and Rufinus recognize the intrinsic claims to inspirational authority for the canonical books. On the other hand, they accept the extrinsic attribution of second-rate authority to some books outside the Jewish canon because of their use in liturgy and in the education of catechumens.

Beyond these three basic positions for the book repertoire of the Old Testament canon, its canonical fluidity is more extensive in the fourth century C.E. with regard to its book sequence. Examples are the position of the books of Lamentations, Baruch, and Letter of Jeremiah in particular and the book sequence of the Jewish canon in general. Hilary of Poitiers, Athanasius, Cyril of Jerusalem, and Epiphanius merge Jeremiah with Lamentations, the Letter of Jeremiah, and (sometimes) Baruch. For other canon lists, it needs to remain uncertain whether or not Lamentations, Baruch, and the Letter of Jeremiah were included as only Jeremiah is mentioned explicitly. Otherwise, even Augustine disagrees with the book sequence of the canons of the synods of Hippo and Carthage in positioning the books of Tobit, Esther, Judith, 1–2 Maccabees, and 1–2 Esdras between Job and Psalms (*Doctr. chr.* 2.8.26–29). Furthermore, in Augustine's list, Daniel precedes Ezekiel while it follows Ezekiel in the canon lists of the two synods. Most if not all other lists disagree with one another in their book sequences too as illustrated in tables 1 and 2. Disagreements in book sequence even exist in the oeuvre of a single author. Examples include Jerome's two lists in his *Prologus Galeatus* and in his Letter to Paulinus (*Letter* 53.8) as well as the three lists of Epiphanius of Salamis (see below, → 1.1.2.2.6.5).

On the whole, while the book repertoire of the Old Testament canon was disputed, its fluid book sequence does not seem to have been a similar

point of argument. This should not be surprising, because the canonical sequence only becomes a pressing issue for those producing a mega-codex (see below, → 1.1.2.2.6.7). Although the first mega-codices of the Bible were made in the fourth century C.E., they were the exception to the rule of book production in this century and even later. As long as the books of the Bible were generally copied separately or at most only in small collections, the book sequence of the Old Testament canon was a matter of theological signification that differed from canon list to canon list. Only on the level of macro-structure were there general agreements regarding the existence of the three corpora of Historical Books, Poetic Books, and Prophetic Books. But canonical fluidity can be observed even with regard to this macro-structure in the fourth century C.E.

#### 1.1.2.2.6.5 Further Canon Lists

In the fourth century C.E., the canonical fluidity of the Old Testament in both its book repertoire and its book sequence is also reflected in several more canonical lists, which for reasons of space constraints I can only survey briefly in this article. These additional canon lists indicate that there was even more canonical variety in late ancient Christianity than the evidence described above indicates. The Old Testament canon of Theodor of Mopsuestia (350–428/429 C.E.) seems to have been even smaller than the Hebrew Canon<sup>132</sup> as was also that of Gregory of Nazianzus (329–390 C.E.).<sup>133</sup> Most likely influenced by him, Gregory's cousin Amphilocheus (fourth century C.E.) includes only the books of the Jewish canon into his list and attacks any other books as pseudonymous, spurious (νόθοι), and unsafe (έπισφαλείς). They would be like forged coins (παράσημα, κίβδηλα, and δολού-

<sup>132</sup> See, e.g., L. Dennefeld, *Der alttestamentliche Kanon der antiochenischen Schule* (BibS[F] 14.4; Freiburg i.B.: Herdersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1909), 44–53.

<sup>133</sup> *Carmen* 1.12.5 (ca. 380 C.E.): Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra–Nehemiah, Job, Psalms, Qohelet, Canticles, Proverbs, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel.

μενα).<sup>134</sup> Other lists include some, most, or all of the deuterocanonical texts. Examples include Cyril of Jerusalem (313–386 C.E.),<sup>135</sup> the so-called Apostolic Canons (ca. 380 C.E.), and Epiphanius of Salamis (310 [320]–403 C.E.). The *Apostolic Canons* are an appendix to the last book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. They have their origin in the Syrian church of the late fourth century.<sup>136</sup> The canon list of the *Apostolic Canons* recommends Ben Sira for the education of new Christians but recognizes three books of Maccabees and Judith(?)<sup>137</sup> as canonical.<sup>138</sup> Of Epiphanius, three canon lists survive. Epiphanius' list from *Pan.* 8.6.1–4 recognizes Lamentations, the Letter of Jeremiah, and Baruch as part of the book of Jeremiah.<sup>139</sup> His other two lists in *De mensuris et ponderibus* 4 and 22–23 do not mention them at all.<sup>140</sup> As Lamentations is

missing in these two lists, there is a slight probability that Epiphanius also reckoned the Letter of Jeremiah and Baruch together with Lamentations as parts of the book of Jeremiah in the two lists of *De mensuris et ponderibus*. However, given that the list of *De mensuris et ponderibus* 22–23 refers explicitly to the Jewish canon, this is unlikely. Epiphanius' list from *De mensuris et ponderibus* 22–23 has an interesting parallel in the so-called Bryennios list. Given the misplacement of Joshua in the Bryennios list, it seems to be a corrupted version of Epiphanius' list. Most likely, Epiphanius' list in *De mensuris et ponderibus* 22–23 and the Bryennios list both go back to a shared source that needs to be situated in a Christian Syriac or Christian Aramaic milieu from the fourth century.<sup>141</sup> Because of the potential importance of the two lists for the textual criticism of the names of the biblical books, I quote them here in detail on page p. 75.<sup>142</sup>

<sup>134</sup> *Iambics for Seleucus* (ca. 380 C.E.; quoted according to Gregory of Nazianzus, *Carmen* 2.2.8 = PG 37.1593–96): Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, 1–2 Esdras, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther (“included by some”).

<sup>135</sup> *Catechetical Lectures* 4.33–37 (= PG 43.244): Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–2 Kingdoms, 3–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, 1–2 Esdras, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah (incl. Baruch, Lamentations, and Letter of Jeremiah), Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther.

<sup>136</sup> See Beckwith, *Old Testament*, 490–92; Hahnemann, *Muratorian Fragment*, 147–48.

<sup>137</sup> M.D. Marlowe emphasizes that some manuscripts of the *Apostolic Canons* do not include Judith (“The Canon of Scripture: Ancient Canon Lists,” note 2 <http://www.bible-researcher.com/apostolic.html> last accessed February 14, 2016).

<sup>138</sup> Canon 85: Five books of Moses (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), Joshua, Judges, Ruth, four books of Kings, two books of Chronicles, two books of Ezra, one book of Judith, three books of Maccabees, Job, 151 Psalms, three books of Solomon (Proverb, Qohelet, Canticles), sixteen books of the Prophets.

<sup>139</sup> *Pan.* 1.1.8 (374–377 C.E.): Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, 1 Kingdoms, 2 Kingdoms, 3 Kingdoms, 4 Kingdoms, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Letter of Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel, Daniel, 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, Esther.

<sup>140</sup> *De mensuris et ponderibus* 4 (382 C.E.): Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Qohelet, Canticles, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–2 Chronicles,

#### 1.1.2.2.6.6 A Letter by Pope Innocent I

A decision that carried greater authority than that of a regional synod was made by Pope Innocent I in 405 C.E. in his letter to Bishop Exsuperius of Toulouse. Innocent I included in this letter a list

1–2 Kingdoms, 3–4 Kingdoms, Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, 1–2 Esdras, Esther.

<sup>141</sup> For the controversial discussion about the Bryennios list and its relation to the list in Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus* 22–23, see J.-P. Audet, “A Hebrew-Aramaic List of the Books of the Old Testament Canon in Greek Transcription,” *JTS* N.S. 1 (1954): 135–54; P. Katz, “The Old Testament in Palestine and Alexandria,” *ZNW* 47 (1956): 191–217 (204–08); A. Jepsen, “Zur Kanongeschichte des Alten Testaments,” *ZAW* 71 (1959): 114–36; D. Goodblatt, “Audet’s ‘Hebrew-Aramaic’ List of Books of the OT Revisited,” *JBL* 101 (1982): 75–84; Beckwith, *Old Testament Canon*, 188–90; Hennings, *Briefwechsel*, 178–79; H. van de Sandt and D. Flusser, *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity* (Corpus Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3.5; Assen: Royal van Gorcum, 2002), 16–24.

<sup>142</sup> The text of the Bryennios list is quoted below according to the edition of Audet (“List,” 136). The text of Epiphanius' list is quoted according to E.D. Moutsoulas (ed.), *To “περί μέτρων και σταθμών” έργον Επιφανίου του Σαλαμίνος* (Athens: no publisher given, 1971), 174–75. The English translation of Epiphanius' third list is guided by J.E. Dean, *Epiphanius' Treaties on Weights and Measures: The Syriac Version* (SAOC 11; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935), 44.

of the Christian Old and New Testament canon. Given Innocent's papal authority, his decision was binding for the Western Latin church from the year 405 C.E.<sup>143</sup>

Which books really are received in the canon (*in canone*), this brief addition shows. These therefore are the things of which you wish to be taught. Five books of Moses, that is, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, and one book of Joshua the son of Naue, one book of Judges, four books of Kings together also with Ruth, sixteen books of the Prophets, five books of Solomon, the Psalter. Also of the historical books, one book of Job, one of Tobias, one of Esther, one of Judith, two books of Maccabees, two of Esdras, two of Chronicles ... But regarding the rest of the books, which are either under the name of Matthias or of the younger James, or under the name of Peter and John (which were written by a certain Leucius), or under the name of Andrew (which were written by the philosophers Xenocharides and Leonidas), or under the name of Thomas, and of whatever others exist, you should indeed know that truly they are not only to be rejected but also to be condemned (*non solum repudianda verum etiam noveris esse damnanda*).

Innocent seems to be responding in his letter to the use of gnostic and other New Testament pseudepigrapha. In defining the Christian canon against the use of heretical texts and other forgeries, Innocent also delimited the canon of the Old Testament with papal authority. The situation is reminiscent in part of the thirty-ninth Easter letter of Athanasius and the decisions of the synods of Hippo and Carthage. For the Old Testament, Innocent's canon list corresponds to those of Hippo and Carthage. But Innocent lists the books of the Old Testament in a very different order: The book of Ruth comes after 1–4 Kingdoms. After the sixteen prophets,<sup>144</sup> Innocent has first 1–5 Solomon,

then Psalms, and Job, Tobit, Esther, Judith, 1–2 Maccabees, Ezra (= Ezra–Nehemiah), and finally 1–2 Chronicles. Against Jerome, Rufinus, and others who contradicted the idea of a canon that includes the deuterocanonical books, the minority position of Augustine and the synods of Hippo and Carthage is now obligatory in the Latin church. Therefore, although the canonical fluidity of the Old Testament continued in the Eastern and Western churches after the letter of Innocent I, the letter nevertheless marks a relative closure of the Christian canon. This is all the more the case as the extensive manuscript documentation of Innocent's letter hints at the wide dispersion of this important document.<sup>145</sup>

#### 1.1.2.2.6.7 Mega-Codices and Canon

Above, I have discussed the various canon lists from the fourth century C.E. and argued that economical affluence, political developments, as well as the conflict with various Christian heresies accelerated the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament. I have also referred repeatedly to the invention of the mega-codex in the fourth century as a catalyst in the development of the Christian canon. It was only the mega-codex format that made it possible to combine all biblical Scriptures (Old and New Testament) into one book. Consequently, the question of which books should be included in such a mega-codex as the one Bible will have brought the issue of canon to the attention of Christian thinkers and officials.<sup>146</sup> Both aspects, economic affluence and the new mega-codex format, are underlined by the ordering by Emperor

<sup>145</sup> Turner, "Latin Lists," 79.

<sup>146</sup> Cf. Zahn, *Geschichte*, 1.60; R.A. Kraft, "The Codex and Canon Consciousness," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 229–33; R.A. Kraft, "What is 'Bible'? – From the Perspective of 'Text': The Christian Connection," in *What is Bible?* (CBET 67; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 106–19; Against H.R. Seeliger, "Buchrolle, Codex, Kanon: Sachhistorische und ikonographische Aspekte und Zusammenhänge," in *Kanon in Konstruktion und Dekonstruktion: Kanonisierungsprozesses religiöser Text von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart: Ein Handbuch* (eds. E.-M. Becker and S. Scholz; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 547–76 (562–64), who focuses mostly on normal-sized codices and denies their role in the canonical process.

<sup>143</sup> For a critical edition of Innocent's letter based on thirteen manuscripts, see C.H. Turner, "Latin Lists of the Canonical Books: 3. From Pope Innocent's Epistle to Exsuperius of Toulouse," *JTS* 13 (1911–1912): 77–82.

<sup>144</sup> Innocent most likely regarded Jeremiah, Lamentations, Baruch, and the Letter of Jeremiah as one book and counted it as one of the sixteen prophets.

Bryennios List <sup>147</sup>	Epiphanius, <i>De mensuris et ponderibus</i> 22–23
ὀνόματα τῶν βιβλίων παρ' ἑβραίοις "the names of the books with (the) Hebrews" βρισίθ · γένεσις "Genesis"	Οὗτος γὰρ αἱ βιβλίοι ἀριθμοῦνται "for this are the counted books" α' "one" Βιρσήθ, ἢ καλεῖται Γένεσις κόσμου "which is called the Genesis of the world"
ἐλσιμόθ · ἔξοδος "Exodus"	Ἐλσιμόθ, ἢ Ἐξοδος τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου "which is the Exodus of the son of Israel from Egypt"
ὀδοικρά · λευϊτικόν "Leviticus"	Ουαίικρά, ἢ ἑρμηνεύεται Λευϊτικόν "which is translated [into Greek] Leviticus"
διησοῦ · ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ ναυή "Jesus son of Naue" ἐλεδεββαρί · δευτερονόμιον "Deuteronomy"	Ουαῖδαβήρ, ἢ ἔστιν Ἀριθμῶν "which is [in Greek] Numbers" Ἐλεδαββερίμ, τὸ Δευτερονόμιον "The Deuteronomy"
οὐδαβίρ · ἀριθμοί "Numbers" δαρούθ · τῆς ρούθ "of Ruth" διώβ · τοῦ ἰώβ "of Job" δάσοφτιμ' · τῶν κριτῶν "of the Judges" σφερτελίμ · ψαλτήριον "Psalter" διεμουήλ · βασιλειῶν α' "1 Kingdoms"	Δησοῦ, ἢ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναυῆ "the [book] of Jesus, son of Naue" Διώβ, ἢ τοῦ Ἰώβ "the [book] of Job" Δεσωφτείμ, ἢ τῶν Κριτῶν "the [book] of Judges" Δερούθ, ἢ τῆς Ρούθ "the [book] of Ruth" Σφερτελείμ, τὸ Ψαλτήριον "the Psalter" Δεβριαμείν, ἢ πρώτη τῶν Παραλειπομένων "the first [book of] Chronicles"
διαδδουδεμουήλ · βασιλειῶν β' "2 Kingdoms" δαμαλαχίμ · βασιλειῶν γ' "3 Kingdoms" ἀμαλαχίμ · βασιλειῶν δ' "4 Kingdoms" δεβριαμείν · παραλειπομένων α' "1 Chronicles" δεριαμείν · παραλειπομένων β' "2 Chronicles" δαμαλεώθ · παροιμιῶν "Proverbs" δακοέλεθ · ἐκκλησιαστής "Ecclesiastes" σιρά σιρίμ · ἄσμα ἁσμάτων "Song of Songs" διερέμ · ἱερεμίας "Jeremiah" δαθαρσιαῖρ · δωδεκαπρόφητον "Twelve Prophets" δησαῖου · ἡσαῖου "Isaiah" διεζεκιήλ · ἰεζεκιήλ "Ezekiel" δαδανιήλ · δανιήλ "Daniel" δέσδρα · ἔσδρα α' "1 Esdras" δαδέσδρα · ἔσδρα β' "2 Esdras" δεσθήρ · ἔσθήρ "Esther"	Δεβριαμείν, Παραλειπομένων δευτέρα "second [book of] Chronicles" Δεσαμουήλ, Βασιλειῶν πρώτη "first [book of] Kingdoms" Δαδουδεσαμουήλ, Βασιλειῶν δευτέρα "second [book of] Kingdoms" Δμαλαχίμ, Βασιλειῶν τρίτη "third [book of] Kingdoms" Δμαλαχίμ, Βασιλειῶν τετάρτη "fourth [book of] Kingdoms" Δμεθαλώθ, ἢ Παροιμιῶν "the [book of] Proverbs" Δεκαέλεθ, ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής "the Ecclesiast" Σιραθσιρεῖν, τὸ Ἄσμα τῶν Ἀσμάτων "The Song of Songs" Δαθαριασαρά, τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον "the twelve Prophets" Δησαῖου, τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαῖου "the [book of] the prophet Isaiah" Διερεμίου, ἢ τοῦ Ἰερεμίου "the [book of] Jeremiah" Διεζεκιήλ, ἢ τοῦ Ἰεζεκιήλ "the [book of] Ezekiel" Δεδανιήλ, ἢ τοῦ Δανιήλ "the [book of] Daniel" Δέσδρα, ἢ τοῦ Ἐσδρα πρώτη "the first [book of] Esdras" Δέσδρα, ἢ τοῦ Ἐσδρα δευτέρα "the second [book of] Esdras" Δεσθήρ, ἢ τῆς Ἐσθήρ "the [book of] Esther"

Constantine (reigned 306–337 C.E.) of fifty Bible mega-codices from Eusebius of Caesarea (Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* 4.37.1) and the similar ordering by Emperor Constans I (reigned 333–50 C.E.) of mega-codices from Athanasius of Alexandria (Athanasius, *Apol. Const.* 4.2). It is all the more interesting that none of the three preserved mega-codices (Codex Vaticanus, LXX<sup>B</sup>, fourth century C.E.; Codex Sinaiticus, LXX<sup>S</sup>, [middle? of] fourth C.E.; Codex Alexandrinus, LXX<sup>A</sup>, middle of the fifth century

C.E.) corresponds precisely in its table of contents with any of the canon lists of the fourth century as detailed in tables 1 and 2.<sup>148</sup> This observation is of interest as Skeat and Elliot suggest that LXX<sup>B</sup> and LXX<sup>S</sup> were produced as part of Constantine's manuscript order; LXX<sup>S</sup> never would have been completed while LXX<sup>B</sup> actually would have been shipped to Constantinople.<sup>149</sup>

Despite the increased interest in the biblical canon, the three biblical mega-codices and the

<sup>147</sup> The list can be found on folio 76a in manuscript 54 of the Greek Patriarchate Library in Jerusalem, which is dated 1056 C.E. It is placed between 2 *Clement* and the *Didache*.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. also Rahlfs–Fraenkel, \**Verzeichnis*, 467–68.

<sup>149</sup> Skeat, "Codex Sinaiticus"; Elliot, "Dating and Origin of the Codex Vaticanus"; cf. B. Aland, "Die Bedeutung des Codex

various canon lists leave little doubt about how small an impact the canon theory of Christian theologians and the official church had on the canon practice in the daily life of the church. Although the increased affluence of the Christian (political and ecclesiastical) elites made the production of biblical mega-codices possible, access to them was surely restricted to only a rather limited number of readers. That Constantine and Constantians I needed to order their mega-codices from Caesarea and Alexandria respectively and could not have them produced locally in Constantinople stresses that point. Apparently, only very few centers of Christian learning owned the necessary master copies in the early fourth century C.E. that allowed for the copying of all the books of the Bible in one place. That Eusebius emphasizes Constantine's manuscript order in his biography of the emperor demonstrates how rare complete Bibles must have been then and for a long time afterwards.<sup>150</sup> Even most monastic libraries did not possess copies of all biblical books. An example is the catalogue of the library of the Monastery of St. Elijah in Upper Egypt from the seventh–eighth centuries C.E. The catalogue demonstrates beyond doubt that this Coptic library did not possess copies of all books of the Old Testament.<sup>151</sup>

vaticanus für die frühe Kirchengeschichte," in *Le manuscrit B de la Bible (Vaticanus graecus 1209): Introduction au fac-similé: Actes du colloque de Genève (11 juin 2001), Lausanne* (HTB 7; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre, 2009), 177–91 (180–85); C. Marksches, *Kaiserzeitliche christliche Theologie und ihre Institutionen: Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte der antiken christlichen Theologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 321.

<sup>150</sup> For the rareness of biblical mega-codices, see Skeat, "Codex Sinaiticus," 227–28; Marschies, *Theologie*, 320–21.

<sup>151</sup> The catalogue documents the following biblical books as holdings of the library in this sequence: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1–4 Kingdoms, 1–2 Chronicles, (1–2) Ezra, the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Psalms. Later, among a series of other literary works, Job was added together with Proverbs. See F. Feder, → 1.4.2.3, and R.-G. Coquin, "Le Catalogue de la Bibliothèque du Couvent de Saint Élie 'du Rocher,'" *BIFAO* 75 (1975): 207–39. For the library inventories of late ancient Christian libraries, see also Marksches, *Theologie*, 320–21.

### 1.1.2.2.6.8 Subsequent to the Fourth Century

It was this situation of ongoing canonical fluidity in the canonical thought of the Christian churches that led to the development of different biblical canons in the various Western and Eastern churches after the fourth century C.E. The various Christian Old Testament canons will be discussed in the articles on canon in *THB* 2 (→ 11.1.1). An example of the continued canonical fluidity in the Christian churches is provided by the Latin pandect codices of the Carolingian Renaissance that still disagree with one another regarding both the limits and the structure of the Old Testament canon (→ 1.3.5.5). Graves summarizes the situations as follows:

Latin Bibles containing the Old Testament generally begin with the Octateuch and Samuel–Kings, but beyond that there is great variety in the sequence of the books. Some influence on the ordering of books came from Greek codices such as *Vaticanus* and from Jerome's *Prologus Galeatus*. But in specific details much diversity existed. Samuel Berger listed over 212 different sequences of books for Latin biblical manuscripts containing at least part of the Old Testament.<sup>152</sup>

### 1.1.2.2.7 Conclusions

The Septuagint canon of the Old Testament is a Christian collection that consists of Jewish texts that were translated by Jews into Greek. As a collection of biblical books, the Septuagint was compiled by Christians beginning at the latest in the second century C.E. Even the name Septuagint as a designation of this collection is a Christian creation. Until its final closure, the Christian Septuagint canon developed over several centuries in its

<sup>152</sup> M. Graves, → 1.3.5.5. For the influence of LXX<sup>B</sup> and Jerome's *Prologus Galeatus*, see S. Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen Âge* (Paris: Hachette, 1893), 301–06. For Berger's lists, see Berger, *Histoire de la Vulgate*, 331–39. Cf. also P.-M. Bogaert, "The Latin Bible, c. 600 to c. 900," in *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, Vol. 2: *From 600 to 1450* (eds. R. Marsden and E.A. Matter; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), 69–92 (75–76, 83–84, 88–89).

size and structure. Both the book repertoire and the structure of the Greek and Latin Old Testaments remained fluid beyond the fourth century C.E., although a decree of Pope Innocent I in 405 C.E. can be viewed as a papal attempt to delimit the biblical canon of the Latin church. The macro-structure of the Septuagint canon is influenced by Christian theology in placing the prophetic collection at the end of the canon.

On the whole, the first centuries of Christianity illustrate a seemingly contradictory phenomenon. While the interpretation of Scripture was at the heart of Christian thought, the question of the Old Testament canon seems not to have been a major issue until the fourth century C.E. This is all the more remarkable as the Old Testament was regarded as a foundational text by early Christianity. Until the Constantinian shift, Christians accepted the Jewish canon as the core of their Greek or Latin Old Testaments but were willing to recognize the authority of additional Scriptures in an unsystematized way, indicating a limited fluidity of the Christian canon. These additional Scriptures were agglomerated to the Old Testament when more than one book was attributed to a single biblical author. In this way, for example, the book of Jeremiah included not only Lamentations but also Baruch and the Letter of Jeremiah. A secondary ecclesiastical authority was attributed to other deutero-canonical texts while denying them canonical status.

This canonical fluidity also pertained to the macro- and micro-structure of the Old Testament. There were three big corpora in the early Christian Old Testament: the Historical Books, Poetic Books, and Prophetic Books. There were variations in how they were combined and to which corpus each book was assigned. However, most Christian canons were in agreement in positioning the Prophets collection at the end of the Old Testament, immediately preceding the New Testament and indicating thus a supersessionist interpretation of the Jewish Bible targeted against Judaism. Except for such canonical macro-structures, most Christians seem to have cared little about the book sequence of the Old Testament but only about its

book repertoire. They felt entitled to shift the sequence of canonical books and book collections.

That the scope and structure of the Old Testament remained somewhat marginal in early Christian thought might relate to the fact that most Christian communities were not able to afford libraries that included copies of all books of the Old and New Testaments. Most likely, the majority of Christians never saw a complete Bible in their lifetime and will not even have encountered copies of all biblical books. The questions regarding which books belong to the canon and in which sequence they appear were thus of little importance in daily Christian life. This situation implies a disconnection between the canonical practice and the canonical theory of early Christianity. Even after the Constantinian shift in the fourth century C.E., the Church fathers and church councils discussed the issue of the Old Testament canon less extensively than other questions. The somewhat heightened importance of the question of canon led in the fourth century C.E. to the formulation of the different Old Testament canons of the Eastern and Western churches. That these Eastern and Western canons disagree in book repertoire and structure illustrates the canonical fluidity of the fourth century C.E. In the canonical history of the Old Testament, the split between Western and Eastern churches materialized in full only after the two African synods at Hippo and Carthage and after the letter of Pope Innocent I. From that time onward, a rift began to develop between the Western and Eastern canonical histories.

The Old Testament canon lists do not indicate that the biblical canon was a disputed theme between Jews and Christians until the end of the fourth century C.E. Christianity regarded the Scriptures of the Jewish canon as inspired and hence did not doubt their authority. Even when the deutero-canonical books were added to the Christian Old Testament, very little evidence points to a canonical conflict with Judaism. Christianity disagreed with Judaism in the interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures and in many other issues. A canonical conflict between Judaism and Christianity is not indicated by the extant sources until the end of the

fourth century C.E. Instead, polemics against Jews that were related to the biblical text included the anti-Semitic slander that Jews would have falsified the text of the Hebrew Bible to eliminate messianic prophecies pointing toward Jesus.<sup>153</sup> Hence, there is no indication that either Judaism or Christianity formed their canons in response to each other. Instead, in Christian sources, polemics against Christian heretics can be observed. The anti-heretic polemics indicate the exclusion of non-conformist Christian groups from the developing orthodox church by way of canon-making. Marginalization and ostracism by way of canon-making became one of the catalysts of the canonical history of the Christian Old Testament. Thus, it was an inner-Christian conflict and not a Jewish-Christian conflict that provided the sociological background of canon-making in the fourth century C.E. Canonical differences between Judaism and Christianity became an issue only after the fourth century C.E.

#### 1.1.2.2.8 Appendix 1: Undated Canon Lists

Two canon lists that were discovered in medieval Latin manuscripts are sometimes discussed in connection with the canonical history of the Old Testament in the fourth century C.E.: 1) the Cheltenham list; and 2) the *Catalogus Claromontanus*. Both lists are not concerned with the definition of the Christian canon but with the number of verses in the Christian Bible in general and in each biblical book in particular. They are thus described as stichometric lists. However, in listing these verse counts, they nevertheless do describe and delimit the Old Testament canon. Both lists are of limited importance for my topic though as they are undated and their origin remains therefore uncertain. Turner has published further stichometric lists for

which he supposes a later origin<sup>154</sup> and Hahneman points to a Syriac manuscript with a stichometric list.<sup>155</sup>

The so-called Cheltenham list was discovered by Mommsen<sup>156</sup> in a tenth-century manuscript of the Phillipps Collection at Cheltenham and is hence also designated as the Mommsen Catalogue. Today the manuscript is held by the Biblioteca Nazionale in Rome (Fondo Vittorio Emanuele 1235). A second copy of the list can be found in a ninth-century manuscript at the Stiftsbibliothek St. Gallen (no. 133). Hahneman suggests a date for the list between 365 and 393 C.E. based on speculations about the canonical history of the New Testament and various other observations.<sup>157</sup> The *Catalogus Claromontanus* is placed between the letters to Philemon and to the Hebrews in a bilingual Greek and Latin manuscript of the Pauline epistles from the fifth or sixth century C.E., i.e., the Codex Claromontanus. The origin of the Claromontanus list remains uncertain. Hahneman suggests a setting in the second quarter of the fourth century C.E. in the East.<sup>158</sup> Thus, a date in the fourth century C.E. cannot be excluded for either list but their dates and provenances remain at best speculative because neither list includes a date or refers to historical data. The text of both lists is given in table 3.

<sup>154</sup> C.H. Turner, "Latin Lists of the Canonical Books: 2. An Unpublished Stichometrical List from the Freisingen MS of Canons," *JTS* 2 (1901): 600–10.

<sup>155</sup> Hahneman, *Muratorian Fragment*, 156.

<sup>156</sup> T. Mommsen, "Zur lateinischen Stichometrie," *Hermes* 21 (1886): 142–56.

<sup>157</sup> Hahneman, *Muratorian Fragment*, 145–46. For the Cheltenham list, see more recently also P.-M. Bogaert, "Aux origines de la fixation du canon: Scriptoria, listes et titres: Le Vaticanus et la stichométrie des Mommsen," in *The Biblical Canons* (eds. J.-M. Auwers and H.J. de Jonge; BETL 163; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 152–76 (164–76).

<sup>158</sup> Hahneman, *Muratorian Fragment*, 140–43.

<sup>159</sup> The text of the Cheltenham list is quoted according to E. Preuschen, *Analecta: Kürzere Texte zur Geschichte der Alten Kirche und des Kanons* (Leipzig: Mohr, 1893), 138–40.

<sup>160</sup> The text of the list in Codex Claromontanus is quoted according to B.F. Westcott, *A General Survey of the Canon of the New Testament* (4th ed. with a new preface; London: Macmillan, 1875), 555–56.

<sup>153</sup> See W. Adler, "The Jews as Falsifiers: Charges of Tendentious Emendation in Anti-Jewish Christian Polemic," in *Translation of Scripture: Proceedings of a Conference at the Annenberg Research Institute, May 15–16, 1989* (ed. D. Goldenberg; Philadelphia: Annenberg Research Institute, 1990), 1–27; Hengel, "Die Septuaginta als von Christen beanspruchte Schriftensammlung bei Justin und den Vätern vor Origenes," 56–60; Skarsaune, "The Question of Old Testament Canon," 443–50, and → 1.1.2.2.1.

TABLE 6 *Two Stichometric Lists*

Cheltenham List <sup>159</sup>	Codex Claromonatanus <sup>160</sup>
<i>Incipit indiculum veteris testamenti qui sunt libri canonici sic</i> "Here begins a list of the canonical book of the Old Testament"	<i>Versus Scribaturarum Sanctarum</i> "Lines of the holy scriptures"
<i>Genesis</i>	<i>Genesis</i>
<i>Exodus</i>	<i>Exodus</i>
<i>Numeri</i> "Numbers"	<i>Leviticum</i> "Leviticus"
<i>Leviticus</i>	<i>Numeri</i> "Numbers"
<i>Deuteronomium</i> "Deuteronomy"	<i>Deuteronomium</i> "Deuteronomy"
<i>Hiesu Naue</i> "Joshua son of Naue"	<i>Iesu Nauue</i> "Joshua son of Naue"
<i>Iudicum</i> "Judges"	<i>Iudicum</i> "Judges"
<i>Fiunt libri VII ver XVIII C</i> "Total for the seven books 18,100 lines"	<i>Rud</i> "Ruth"
<i>Rut</i> "Ruth"	<i>Regnorum</i> "Kings"
<i>Regnorum liber I</i> "1 Kingdoms"	<i>primus liber</i> "first book"
<i>Regnorum liber II</i> "2 Kingdoms"	<i>secundus lib.</i> "second book"
<i>Regnorum liber III</i> "3 Kingdoms"	<i>tertius lib.</i> "third book"
<i>Regnorum liber IIII</i> "4 Kingdoms"	<i>quartus lib.</i> "fourth book"
<i>Fiunt versus VIIIID</i> "Total 9500 lines"	<i>Psalmi Davitici</i> "Psalms of David"
<i>Paralipomenon liber I</i> "1 Chronicles"	<i>Prouerbia</i> "Proverbs"
<i>liber II</i> "2 Chronicles"	<i>Aeclesiastes</i> "Ecclesiastes"
<i>Machabeorum liber I</i> "1 Maccabees"	<i>Cantica Canticorum</i> "Songs of Songs"
<i>liber II</i> "2 Maccabees"	<i>Sapientia</i> "Wisdom"
<i>Iob</i> "Job"	<i>Sapientia ihu</i> "Wisdom of Jesus"
<i>Tobias</i> "Tobit"	<i>XII Profetae</i> "Twelve Prophets"
<i>Hester</i> "Ester"	<i>Ossee</i> "Hosea"
<i>Iudit</i> "Judith"	<i>Amos</i> "Amos"
<i>Psalmi Davitici CLI</i> "The 151 Psalms of David"	<i>Micheas</i> "Micah"
<i>Salomonis</i> "The Book of Solomon"	<i>Ioel</i> "Joel"
<i>Prophetae maiores ver XVCCCLXX numero IIII</i> "The Major Prophets 15,370 lines, 4 in number"	<i>Abdias</i> "Obadiah"
<i>Esaias</i> "Isaiah"	<i>Ionas</i> "Jonah"
<i>Jeremias</i> "Jeremiah"	<i>Naum</i> "Nahum"
<i>Daniel</i> "Daniel"	<i>Ambacum</i> "Habakkuk"
<i>Ezechiel</i> "Ezekiel"	<i>Sophonias</i> "Zephaniah"
<i>Prophetae XII ver IIIIDCCC</i> "The Twelve Minor Prophets 3,800 lines"	<i>Aggeus</i> "Haggai"
	<i>Zacharias</i> "Zechariah"
	<i>Malachiel</i> "Malachi"
	<i>Eseias</i> "Isaiah"
	<i>Jeremias</i> "Jeremiah"
	<i>Ezechiel</i> "Ezekiel"
	<i>Maccabeorum</i> "Maccabees"
	<i>lib. Primus</i> "first book"
	<i>lib. Secundus</i> "second book"
	<i>lib. quartus</i> "fourth book"
	<i>Iudit</i> "Judith"
	<i>Hesdra</i> "Esdras"
	<i>Ester</i> "Esther"
	<i>Iob</i> "Job"
	<i>Tobias</i> "Tobit"

TABLE 7 Hebrew/Aramaic Names of Biblical Books in Greek and Latin Transcriptions

	Origen (Eusebius, <i>Hist. eccl.</i> 6.25)	Bryennios List (→ 1.1.2.2.6.5)	Epiphanius, <i>De mensuris et ponderibus</i> 22–23	Jerome, <i>Prologus Galeatus</i>	Vaticanus Reginae 199 fol. 84a <sup>163</sup>
					<i>Thorath aebraice</i>
Genesis	Βρησιθ	βρισίθ	Βιρσήθ	<i>Bersith</i>	
Exodus	Ουελλεσμωθ	έλσιμόθ	Ἐλσησιμώθ	<i>Hellesmoth</i>	<i>Helismoth</i>
Leviticus	Ουϊκρά	ὀδοικρά	Ουαϊεκρά	<i>Vaiecra</i>	<i>Vaiethra</i>
Numbers	Αμμεσφεκωδειμ	οὐδαβίρ	Ουαϊδαβήρ	<i>Vaiedabber</i>	<i>Vicidaber</i>
Deuteronomy	Ελληαδδεβαρειμ	ἐλεδεββαρί	Ἐλληδαβερείμ	<i>Addabarim</i>	<i>Abdabarim</i>
Joshua	Ιωσουεβεννου	διησοῦ	Διησοῦ	<i>Iosue Bennum</i>	<i>Iosuae Ben Nun</i>
Judges	Σωφτειμ	δάσφτιμ	Δεσφτειμ	<i>Sopthim</i>	<i>Sopthim</i>
1(–2) Samuel	Σαμουήλ	διεμμουήλ	Δεσαμουήλ	<i>Samuhel</i>	<i>Samuhel</i>
2 Samuel		διαδδουδεμουήλ	Δαδουδεσαμουήλ		
1(–2) Kings	Ουαμμελχδανιδ	δαμαλαχίμ	Δμαλαχείμ	<i>Malachim</i>	<i>Malachim</i>
2 Kings		ἀμαλαχίμ	Δμαλαχείμ		
Isaiah	Ιεσσια	δησαϊου	Δησαϊου	<i>Esaias</i>	<i>Esaia</i>
Jeremiah	Ιερεμια	διερέμ	Διερεμίου	<i>Hieremias</i>	<i>Hieremias</i>
Ezekiel	Ιεζεκιηλ	διεζεκιήλ	Διεζεκιήλ	<i>Hiezecihel</i>	<i>Ezechihel</i>
Minor Prophets		δαθαρθσαρ	Δαθαριασαρά	<i>Thareasra</i>	<i>Baruch</i> <sup>164</sup>
Psalms	Σφαρθελλειμ	σφερτελίμ	Σφερτελίμ	<i>David</i>	<i>Nabla</i>
Job	Ιωβ	διώβ	Διώβ	<i>Iob</i>	<i>Iob</i> <sup>165</sup>
Proverbs	Μελωθ	δαμαλωθ	Δμεθαλώθ	<i>Masaloth</i>	<i>Masloth</i>
Ruth		δαρούθ	Δερούθ	<i>Ruth</i>	
Canticles	Σιρασσιρειμ	σιρά σιρίμ	Σιραθσιρείν	<i>Sirassirim</i>	<i>Sirassirim</i>
Qohelet	Κωελθ	δακωέλεθ	Δεκωέλεθ	<i>Accoeleth</i>	<i>Coeleth</i>
Lamentations				<i>Cinoth</i>	
Esther	Εσθηρ	δεσθής	Δεσθήρ	<i>Hester</i>	<i>Hester</i> <sup>166</sup>
Daniel	Δανιηλ	δαδανιήλ	Δεδανιήλ	<i>Daniel</i>	<i>Danihel</i>
Ezra–Nehemiah (1–2 Esdras)	Εζρα	δέσδρα	Δέσδρα	<i>Ezras</i>	<i>Hesdrae</i>
2 Esdras		δαδέσδρα	Δέσδρα		
1(–2) Chronicles	Δαβρηϊαμειν	δεβριαμίν	Δεβριαμειν	<i>Dabre Atamim</i>	<i>Dabreiamin</i>
2 Chronicles		δεριαμίν	Δεβριαμειν		

### 1.1.2.2.9 Appendix 2: Hebrew/Aramaic Names of Biblical Books in Christian Canon Lists

Several Christian canon lists from late antiquity and early medieval times give not only the Greek or Latin but also the Hebrew or Aramaic names of

the books of the Hebrew Bible in Greek or Latin transcriptions. These lists are among the earliest witnesses to the names of the biblical books in Hebrew. Given the importance of this evidence for their textual history, I have compiled the synopsis of table 4 that allows for the comparison of these transcriptions. For the sake of convenience, the biblical books are listed in table 4 according to the modern book sequence of the Jewish canon and not according to the divergent sequences of the ancient and medieval witnesses.

<sup>161</sup> The stichometric list of biblical books attested by this manuscript was probably composed after the fourth century C.E. It is exceptional for its mention of the Hebrew names of biblical books and I include it in this table for reference purposes. The text of the list is quoted according to Turner, “Freisingen MS,” 239–41.

<sup>162</sup> *Baruch hebraice id est XII Prophetarum liber unus* “Baruch in Hebrew, that is the twelve Prophets as one book.”

<sup>163</sup> No Hebrew name in list. The Latin name is *Iob*.

<sup>164</sup> No Hebrew name in list. The Latin name is *Hester*. The

list actually mentions two books of “*Hester*”: *Hester libri duo: primus secundus* “Esther two books, first and second.”

- Beckwith, R., *The Old Testament Canon of the New Testament Church and its Background in Early Judaism* (London: SPCK, 1985).
- Brakke, D., "Canon Formation and Social Conflict in Fourth-Century Egypt: Athanasius of Alexandria's Thirty-Ninth Festal Letter," *HTR* 87 (1994): 395–419.
- Brandt, P., *Endgestalten des Kanons: Das Arrangement der Schriften Israels in der jüdischen und christlichen Bibel* (BBB 131; Berlin: Philo, 2001).
- Buhl, F., *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments* (Leipzig: Akademische Buchhandlung [W. Faber]), 1891.
- Dorival, G., "La Septante dans le monde chrétien: Canon et version," in Dorival–Harl–Munnich, \**Septante*, 321–34.
- Ellis, E.E., *The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research* (WUNT 54; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991).
- Fabry, H.-J., "Die Kanongeschichte der Hebräischen Bibel und des christlichen Alten Testaments im Licht der Kirchenväter," in Kraus–Kreuzer, \**Septuaginta 2014*, 681–97.
- Gallagher, E.L., *Hebrew Scripture in Patristic Biblical Theory: Canon, Language, Text* (VCSup 114; Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- Gallagher, E.L., "The Old Testament 'Apocrypha' in Jerome's Canonical Theory," *J ECS* 20 (2012): 213–33.
- Gallagher, E.L., "Jerome's Prologus Galeatus and the OT Canon of North Africa," in *Papers Presented at the Sixteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies Held in Oxford 2011*, Vol. 17: *Latin Writers: Nachleben* (ed. M. Vinzent; StPatr 69; Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 99–106.
- Gallagher, E.L., "Writings Labeled 'Apocrypha' in Latin Patristic Sources," in *Sacra Scriptura: How "Non-Canonical" Texts Functioned in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (eds. J.H. Charlesworth, L.M. McDonald, and B.A. Jurgens; Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies 20; London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 1–14.
- Hengel, M., "Die Septuaginta als von Christen beanspruchte Schriftensammlung bei Justin und den Vätern vor Origines," in *Jews and Christians: The Parting of the Ways A.D. 70 to 135* (WUNT 66; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1992), 39–84.
- Hengel, M., *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (with the assistance of R. Deines; trans. M.E. Biddle; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2002; Engl. trans. of "Die Septuaginta als 'christliche Schriftensammlung': Ihre Vorgeschichte und das Problem ihres Kanons," in *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* [eds. M. Hengel and A.M. Schwemer; WUNT 72; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1994], 182–284).
- Hennings, R., *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Augustinus und Hieronymus und ihr Streit um den Kanon des Alten Testaments und die Auslegung von Gal. 2,11–14* (VCSup 21; Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- Junod, É., "La formation et la compositions de l' Ancien Testament dans l' Église grecques des quatres premiers siècles," in *Le Canon de l' Ancien Testament: Sa Formation et son histoire* (eds. J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger; MdB; Geneva: Labor et fides, 1984), 105–34.
- Junod, É., "Annexe: Dossiers se principaux sources grecques," in *Le Canon de l' Ancien Testament: Sa Formation et son histoire* (eds. J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger; MdB; Geneva: Labor et fides, 1984), 135–51.
- Katz, P., "The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria," *ZNW* 47 (1956): 191–217.
- La Bonnardière, A.-M., "The Canon of Sacred Scripture," in *Augustine and the Bible* (ed. and trans. P. Bright; The Bible through the Ages 2; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999), 26–41.
- McDonald, L.M., *The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority* (updated and rev. 3rd ed.; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007).
- Skarsaune, O., "The Question of Old Testament Canon and Text in the Early Greek Church," in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of its Interpretation*, Vol. 1: *From the Beginnings until the Middle Ages (Until 1300)*, Part 1: *Antiquity* (ed. M. Saebø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 443–50.
- Sundberg, A.C., *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (HTS 20; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964).
- Wermelinger, O., "Le canon des latins au temps de Jérôme et d' Augustin," in *Le Canon de l' Ancien Testament: Sa Formation et son histoire* (eds. J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger; MdB; Geneva: Labor et fides, 1984), 152–96.
- Wermelinger, O., "Annexe: Dossiers des principaux source latines," in *Le Canon de l' Ancien Testament: Sa Formation et son histoire* (eds. J.-D. Kaestli and O. Wermelinger; MdB; Geneva: Labor et fides, 1984), 197–210.
- Westcott, B.F., *The Bible in the Church: A Popular Account of the Collection and Reception of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Churches* (London: Macmillan, 1864).
- Westcott, B.F., *A General Survey of the Canon of the New Testament* (4th ed. with a new preface; London: Macmillan, 1875), esp. 531–71.

Armin Lange