THE ECLECTIC TEXT

A Scholarly Case Against Biblical Inerrancy

Textual Criticism, Canonical History, and the Evidence

Drawing on the scholarship of:

Bruce M. Metzger • Emanuel Tov • Sidnie White Crawford
Bart D. Ehrman • Karen H. Jobes • Moisés Silva • Frank Moore Cross
Eugene Ulrich • James VanderKam • Martin Hengel

Preface

This work undertakes a systematic scholarly examination of the textual, canonical, and historical evidence that bears directly upon the doctrine of biblical inerrancy — the claim, held in various forms by large segments of Christian and Jewish communities, that the biblical text as transmitted is free from error, or that its original autographs were divinely inerrant and reliably transmitted to the present day. Through a sustained engagement with the fields of textual criticism, canonical history, and comparative manuscript studies, this volume demonstrates that the texts known today as the Hebrew Bible and the Christian New Testament are, in the precise technical sense, eclectic compilations — the products of centuries of scribal transmission, theological editing, canonization debates, and translational decisions — rather than pristine preservation of singular original documents.

The argument advanced here is not theological in the pejorative sense; it does not aim to dismantle faith. Rather, it is an argument from evidence: the manuscript traditions themselves, the history of canonization, the discoveries at Qumran, the divergences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint, and the documented patterns of scribal alteration all converge upon a single conclusion — the text we possess is a reconstruction, however learned and careful, and not a transparent window onto a fixed original. The scholars whose work undergirds this study — Bruce M. Metzger, Emanuel Tov, Sidnie White Crawford, Bart D. Ehrman, Eugene Ulrich, and many others — are among the most rigorous and respected minds in the discipline of biblical studies and they have reached these conclusions on the basis of evidence, not ideology.

The book is organized in seven parts. Part One examines the doctrine of inerrancy and its historical development. Parts Two and Three treat the textual criticism of the Old and New Testaments respectively. Part Four surveys the canonization of both Testaments. Part Five examines major translation traditions from the Septuagint through Jerome's Vulgate and into

the English Bible traditions. Part Six investigates the theological divergences between competing manuscript traditions. Part Seven presents specific documented cases of scribal alteration for theological purposes. A comprehensive bibliography concludes the volume.

PART ONE

The Doctrine of Inerrancy and Its Problems

Chapter One: What Is Biblical Inerrancy?

1.1 The Doctrine Defined

Biblical inerrancy, in its strongest form, holds that the Bible in its original autographs was without error in all that it affirms — historically, scientifically, and theologically. The 1978 Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy, signed by over three hundred evangelical scholars, articulates this position formally: the Scripture, being wholly and verbally God-given, is without error or fault in all its teaching. A modified form, sometimes called limited inerrancy or infallibility, restricts the claim to matters of faith and doctrine. A third position, plenary verbal inspiration, insists that every word of the original autographs was divinely superintended.

The critical difficulty with all three positions, as scholars of textual criticism have long recognized, is twofold. First, the original autographs — the very documents to which inerrancy is attributed — do not exist. No original manuscript of any biblical book survives. Second, the manuscripts that do survive differ from one another in tens of thousands of places. The text that readers encounter in any modern Bible translation is itself a scholarly reconstruction based on the comparison and evaluation of manuscripts that already diverge substantially. As Bruce M. Metzger, Emeritus Professor of New Testament Language and Literature at Princeton Theological Seminary and one of the twentieth century's foremost textual critics, acknowledged plainly: 'The textual critic seeks to ascertain from the divergent copies which form of the text should be regarded as most nearly conforming to the original.' This is, by definition, an act of reconstruction, not of transmission.

1.2 The Historical Development of the Inerrancy Doctrine

The doctrine of biblical inerrancy in its modern, codified form is, paradoxically, a relatively recent development. While patristic writers such as Origen, Augustine, and Jerome held high views of scriptural authority, they simultaneously acknowledged textual difficulties and interpreted Scripture with considerable hermeneutical flexibility. Augustine, in his letters to Jerome, famously engaged the question of apparent discrepancies between Matthew and Mark, suggesting reconciliation rather than asserting mechanical errorlessness.

The Princeton Theology of the nineteenth century — associated with Charles Hodge, A. A. Hodge, and B. B. Warfield — formalized the doctrine in its modern shape, in part as a response to the emerging historical-critical methods of German scholarship. Warfield's 1881 essay, co-authored with A. A. Hodge, 'Inspiration,' laid the philosophical groundwork for locating inerrancy in the now-inaccessible autographs. This move, critics have noted, renders the doctrine effectively unfalsifiable: since no autograph survives, no surviving manuscript divergence can technically disprove inerrancy as defined. Bart D. Ehrman, in his widely read study Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why (2005), identifies this circularity as a fundamental epistemological problem: the doctrine is asserted for documents that cannot be examined and defended against evidence from documents that admittedly differ from whatever the originals may have been.

PART TWO

The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament

Chapter Two: The Masoretic Text and Its Rivals

2.1 The Masoretic Text: What It Is and Is Not

The Hebrew Bible that underlies most modern Old Testament translations is the Masoretic Text (MT), a stabilized form of the Hebrew Scriptures produced by the Jewish scribal guild known as the Masoretes between approximately 500 and 1000 CE. The most important complete manuscript of the MT is the Leningrad Codex (Codex Leningradensis, 1008 or 1009 CE), which serves as the base text of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) and its successor Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ), the standard critical editions used by scholars today. The Aleppo Codex, slightly older, is the authoritative text but incomplete due to the loss of sections in the twentieth century.

Emanuel Tov, Professor Emeritus of Bible at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and one of the leading authorities on the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible, has devoted his scholarly career to mapping the relationships between manuscript traditions. In his magisterial work Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (3rd edition, 2012), Tov demonstrates that the MT, though authoritative within Rabbinic Judaism, is one among several ancient text traditions — not obviously the most original and certainly not unchanged by scribal transmission. The Masoretes themselves added vowel points, cantillation marks, and marginal annotations (the Masorah Parva and Masorah Magna) to a consonantal text that had existed in relative fluidity for centuries. The consonantal text that the Masoretes received was already, by their time, a stabilized but not necessarily original form.

Tov's research has identified at least five distinct text types among the manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible: the proto-Masoretic text, the Samaritan Pentateuch, texts aligned with the Septuagint's Hebrew Vorlage, pre-Samaritan texts, and texts characterized by no consistent affiliation. The existence of multiple ancient text types, all traceable to antiquity, demonstrates that there was no single, stable, universally received Hebrew text in the Second Temple period. The MT's dominance is the result of historical processes — particularly the rabbinic standardization following the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE and the exclusion of competing traditions — not evidence of its singular fidelity to an original.

2.2 The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Plurality of the Hebrew Text

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) between 1947 and 1956 at Qumran near the northwestern shore of the Dead Sea constitutes the most significant manuscript discovery for Old Testament textual criticism in the modern era. The scrolls, produced by a Jewish sectarian community that flourished from approximately the second century BCE to the first century CE, include fragments of every book of the Hebrew Bible except Esther. They predate the Masoretic manuscripts by approximately a thousand years and provide an invaluable window into the state of the text before rabbinic standardization.

Sidnie White Crawford, Professor of Hebrew Bible at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln and an editor of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series, has done extensive work on the scriptural scrolls from Qumran. Her studies demonstrate that the DSS manuscripts do not present a unified text. Rather, they represent at least three distinct textual families: manuscripts that align closely with the proto-Masoretic tradition, manuscripts that align with the Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint, and manuscripts that exhibit a distinctive expanded text akin to the Samaritan Pentateuch, as well as

manuscripts that exhibit unique readings not paralleled in any other known tradition.

The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa-a), the most complete biblical manuscript found at Qumran and dating to approximately 125 BCE, exhibits thousands of minor variants from the MT of Isaiah. While most are orthographic, many are substantive, demonstrating that the text of Isaiah was not fixed in the second century BCE. Equally significant is the shorter Psalms Scroll (11QPsa), which contains the psalms in a different order from the MT Psalter and includes psalms not found in the canonical Psalter at all. This raises profound questions about the stability and finality of even the canonical collection.

Frank Moore Cross of Harvard University and Shemaryahu Talmon of the Hebrew University, in their landmark studies of the DSS, proposed what became known as the local texts theory — that different text types were associated with different geographical centers (Babylonia, Palestine, Egypt) before the rabbinic standardization of the first and second centuries CE. Eugene Ulrich, Chief Editor of the biblical scrolls from Qumran and Professor Emeritus at Notre Dame, has refined this model, arguing in The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible (1999) that the scrolls reveal not merely variant texts but variant literary editions — that is, different forms of biblical books that represent distinct stages of literary composition and editorial activity, not merely scribal copying errors.

This is a finding of enormous consequence for the inerrancy debate. If the books of the Hebrew Bible existed in multiple literary editions simultaneously in antiquity — as the evidence from Qumran strongly indicates — then the question of which edition represents the inerrant original becomes not merely difficult but incoherent. Jeremiah provides the most dramatic example: the MT of Jeremiah is approximately one-eighth longer than the Hebrew text underlying the Septuagint version of Jeremiah, and the scrolls from Cave 4 at Qumran (4QJer-b and 4QJer-d) align with the

shorter, pre-Septuagint form, confirming that the shorter Jeremiah is a genuine ancient Hebrew tradition and not merely a translational abbreviation.

2.3 The Samaritan Pentateuch

The Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) is an ancient Hebrew version of the five books of Moses preserved by the Samaritan community, which separated from mainstream Judaism no later than the fourth century BCE and possibly earlier. The SP differs from the MT in approximately six thousand places, of which about nineteen hundred are shared agreements with the Septuagint against the MT, suggesting a common ancestor. Many of the SP's distinctive readings are expansionist — harmonizing parallel passages, adding explanatory phrases, and making theological modifications consistent with Samaritan theology, particularly the centrality of Mount Gerizim rather than Jerusalem as the site of divine presence.

The existence of the SP as a living religious text, accepted by a community that traces its roots to biblical Israel, illustrates that the boundaries of the authoritative text were contested from an early period. Tov's analysis in Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible notes that while the SP frequently represents an expansionist scribal tradition, it occasionally preserves readings that may reflect an earlier form of the text than the MT. The Qumran scrolls include a group of pre-Samaritan manuscripts — most notably 4QpaleoExod-m — that share the expansionist character of the SP but without the specifically Samaritan theological alterations, demonstrating that the SP's textual base existed as a mainstream Jewish text tradition before the Samaritan community adopted and modified it.

2.4 The Septuagint: A Witness to a Different Hebrew Bible

The Septuagint (LXX) — the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures produced primarily in Alexandria, Egypt beginning in the third century BCE

— is far more than a translation. It is a witness to Hebrew Vorlagen (underlying Hebrew texts) that in many cases differed substantially from the MT. The Letter of Aristeas, the pseudepigraphical account of the LXX's origins, presents the translation as miraculously unified and authoritative, but modern scholarship recognizes the LXX as a collection of translations by different translators of different quality, different translational philosophy, and at different times, representing a complex textual tradition in its own right.

Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, in their standard textbook Invitation to the Septuagint (2nd edition, 2015), provide a detailed accounting of the ways in which the LXX diverges from the MT. Some divergences are translational — the result of interpretive decisions by translators. But others are textual — reflecting a Hebrew manuscript tradition that differs from the proto-Masoretic text. The case of Jeremiah, noted above, is the most dramatic, but it is far from unique. The book of Job in the LXX is approximately one-sixth shorter than the MT. The book of Proverbs in the LXX rearranges chapters and contains different material. The Psalter in the LXX contains an additional psalm (Psalm 151). The book of Daniel in the LXX differs so substantially from the MT version that the early church largely replaced the LXX Daniel with the translation of Theodotion.

Martin Hengel, whose Judaism and Hellenism (1974) remains a foundational work for understanding the cultural context of the LXX's production, emphasizes that the Septuagint became the Bible of the earliest Christians and of the diaspora Jewish communities, giving it an authority that rivaled and in some communities supplanted the Hebrew text. The New Testament authors, writing in Greek, predominantly quote the LXX rather than translating the Hebrew directly, meaning that the scriptural text on which the theological arguments of the New Testament are built is often the Greek LXX — which in some cases differs theologically from the MT.

2.4.1 A Theologically Significant Divergence: Isaiah 7:14

One of the most studied divergences between the MT and the LXX occurs at Isaiah 7:14. The MT reads: 'Therefore the Lord himself will give you a sign: the young woman (ha-almah) is with child and shall bear a son, and shall name him Immanuel.' The Hebrew term almah denotes a young woman of marriageable age and does not specifically mean virgin. The LXX translates almah with the Greek parthenos, which typically means virgin. Matthew 1:23, quoting the LXX, applies this verse to the virginal conception of Jesus. This divergence — the LXX's parthenos versus the MT's almah — is not merely a translation choice; it represents a theological interpretation embedded in the Greek translation that shaped the entire New Testament appropriation of the passage. The divergence between the MT and LXX at this single verse has generated more scholarly literature than perhaps any other single textual issue in the Old Testament and illustrates precisely how the choice of text tradition carries massive theological consequences.

PART THREE

The Textual Criticism of the New Testament

Chapter Three: The Greek New Testament — A Text in Flux

3.1 The Manuscript Tradition: Scale and Diversity

The New Testament is, from the perspective of manuscript attestation, the most extensively documented text from the ancient world. More than 5,800 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament are known, ranging from tiny papyrus fragments to magnificent illuminated codices. To this Greek evidence is added the witness of early translations (Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Armenian, Gothic, and others) and the quotations of New Testament texts in the writings of the church fathers. This wealth of evidence is, however, a double-edged testimony: the very quantity of manuscripts reveals the extent of variation in the textual tradition.

Bruce M. Metzger and Bart D. Ehrman, in their definitive study The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration (4th edition, 2005), estimate that the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament contain in the range of 200,000 to 400,000 textual variants — differences among the manuscripts in wording, spelling, word order, additions, omissions, and substitutions. Ehrman, who was Metzger's doctoral student at Princeton, has been more aggressive in highlighting the significance of these variants for questions of textual integrity; Metzger himself was more conservative in his assessments while remaining equally rigorous as a scholar. Both agree that the vast majority of variants are trivial — misspellings, itacisms, word order variations — and that a much smaller set of substantive variants affects the meaning of the text. But that smaller set remains large and, in several notable cases, theologically significant.

3.2 The Major Textual Traditions and Their Divergences

3.2.1 The Critical Text (Nestle-Aland / UBS)

The Critical Text is the eclectic Greek New Testament produced by the process of modern textual criticism and published in two parallel scholarly editions: the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece (28th edition, NA28) and the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament (5th edition, UBS5). These editions, produced by an international committee of scholars, represent the current consensus of New Testament textual criticism. They are called 'eclectic' because they do not follow any single manuscript or manuscript family but rather select, passage by passage, the reading judged most likely to be original on the basis of a combination of external evidence (age, geographical spread, and manuscript quality) and internal evidence (what a scribe would be more or less likely to change, what fits the author's style, what is the shorter reading, etc.).

The eclecticism of the Critical Text is itself an acknowledgment that no surviving manuscript preserves the original text intact throughout. Every reading in the Critical Text is a scholarly judgment, and the apparatus of the NA28 — the dense network of manuscript sigla and variant readings printed at the bottom of each page — records the thousands of places where manuscripts disagree, allowing scholars to see the evidence and form their own judgments. The Critical Text underlies most modern scholarly translations, including the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), the English Standard Version (ESV), the New International Version (NIV), and the New American Standard Bible (NASB).

3.2.2 The Byzantine Text / Majority Text

The Byzantine Text — also called the Majority Text because it is represented in the majority of surviving Greek New Testament manuscripts — is the text type that came to dominate the Eastern church by the Byzantine period (roughly the 5th through 15th centuries CE). It is a generally

smoothed, harmonized, and expanded text that reflects the scribal tendencies of centuries of copying within an ecclesiastical context. Because medieval manuscript copying was predominantly carried out by Byzantine monasteries and scriptoria, the numerical majority of surviving manuscripts belong to this tradition.

Scholars such as Maurice Robinson and William Pierpont, who have produced the critical edition of the Majority Text, argue that the numerical prevalence of Byzantine manuscripts is itself evidence of authenticity — that the church, through centuries of use and copying, preserved the correct text. This argument has been decisively rejected by the mainstream of textual criticism. Metzger and Ehrman explain that the numerical superiority of Byzantine manuscripts reflects the historical accident of Byzantine ecclesiastical dominance and the later date at which most copying occurred, not fidelity to an ancient original. Earlier papyri, dating from the second and third centuries and predating the Byzantine tradition, frequently diverge from the Byzantine text and often align with the Alexandrian tradition.

3.2.3 The Textus Receptus

The Textus Receptus (TR), Latin for 'received text,' is the printed Greek New Testament that served as the basis for the translation of the New Testament in the King James Bible (Authorized Version) of 1611 and most Protestant translations of the Reformation era. It was first published by the humanist scholar Desiderius Erasmus in 1516, based on a handful of late medieval Greek manuscripts, none of which was earlier than the eleventh century. Erasmus's edition was hasty and incomplete — for the final verses of Revelation, he famously back-translated from the Latin Vulgate into Greek because he lacked a Greek manuscript for those verses, producing readings that exist in no Greek manuscript at all.

The TR was subsequently revised by Robert Estienne (Stephanus) and Theodore Beza and became through these revisions and through the

authority of the King James translation a text invested with enormous cultural and religious prestige. The King James Only movement, a subset of Protestant fundamentalism, treats the TR as the uniquely preserved Word of God. However, as scholars universally recognize, the TR is not an ancient manuscript tradition but a printed edition compiled from late medieval manuscripts of the Byzantine text type, often reflecting the secondary, harmonized readings that textual criticism identifies as scribal modifications rather than original readings. Daniel B. Wallace, Professor of New Testament Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary, has documented extensively that the TR contains numerous readings that are found in very few manuscripts and that are almost certainly not original.

3.2.4 The Alexandrian Text and the Papyri

The oldest Greek New Testament manuscripts, the great papyri of the second, third, and early fourth centuries, represent the most important external evidence for recovering the earliest attainable text. These papyri, housed primarily in collections in Dublin (Chester Beatty), Geneva (Bodmer), and various European and American libraries, were discovered in the dry sands of Egypt and represent the text as it circulated in early Christian communities before the Byzantine standardization. The most important include P52 (John Rylands Papyrus, c. 125 CE), the oldest known fragment of the New Testament; P45, P46, and P47 (Chester Beatty Papyri); and P66 and P75 (Bodmer Papyri).

P75, in particular, dating to approximately 175–225 CE and containing large portions of Luke and John, exhibits a text remarkably close to Codex Vaticanus (B), the great fourth-century parchment codex that is the cornerstone of the Alexandrian text and the Critical Text. This demonstrates that the Alexandrian text, far from being a later scholarly revision, preserves very ancient readings. The discovery of P75 resolved a long-standing debate by demonstrating that the text of Vaticanus was not the product of fourth-century editorial activity but reflected an ancient Egyptian textual tradition.

3.3 Significant Textual Variants in the New Testament

3.3.1 The Longer Ending of Mark (Mark 16:9–20)

The Gospel of Mark in the manuscripts presents a remarkable textual problem. The two oldest and most reliable manuscripts — Codex Sinaiticus (aleph) and Codex Vaticanus (B), both dating to the fourth century — end the Gospel at 16:8, with the women fleeing the empty tomb in fear and saying nothing to anyone. The familiar longer ending (16:9–20), which includes the risen Jesus appearing to Mary Magdalene, the command to go into all the world, the promise of speaking in tongues, handling serpents and drinking poison, and the ascension, is absent from these manuscripts. It is also absent from several early Syriac manuscripts, the Armenian version, the Eusebius sections, and is flagged as suspicious by early fathers including Eusebius and Jerome.

Metzger, in A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (2nd edition, 1994), concludes with the confidence of the critical committee that the longer ending is a later addition, composed by a scribe who found the abrupt ending at 16:8 unsatisfactory and supplemented it with a harmonistic compilation drawn from the other Gospels and Acts. The shorter ending — a single sentence found in some manuscripts before or after the longer ending — is also secondary. The text of Mark 16:9–20 that appears in the King James Bible and many traditional translations is almost certainly not original. This matters enormously: the longer ending is the sole Markan authority for the practice of glossolalia and the specific signs of healing as marks of true belief, and it provided scriptural warrant for the snake-handling practiced in some Appalachian Pentecostal communities.

3.3.2 The Pericope Adulterae (John 7:53–8:11)

The famous story of the woman caught in adultery, in which Jesus writes in the dust and declares 'Let him who is without sin cast the first stone,' is absent from the earliest and most reliable manuscripts of John, including

P66, P75, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and numerous other important witnesses. It is absent from the earliest commentaries on John, and when it does appear in manuscripts — beginning in the fifth century — it is found in different locations: after John 7:36, after John 21:25, and even after Luke 21:38 in some manuscripts, suggesting scribal uncertainty about where it belonged. The pericope adulterae exhibits a distinctive vocabulary unlike that of the surrounding text of John and is almost unanimously regarded by textual critics as a later addition, though it may preserve an authentic tradition about Jesus.

Ehrman, in Misquoting Jesus, uses this passage as a prime example of a text that entered the canonical Gospel tradition as a scribal addition and became so beloved and so well established through liturgical use and the authority of the Vulgate that it was treated as canonical long after textual criticism recognized its secondary character.

3.3.3 The Comma Johanneum (1 John 5:7–8)

Perhaps no textual variant in the New Testament has as direct a doctrinal significance as the Comma Johanneum, the Trinitarian formula in 1 John 5:7–8 that reads (in the KJV): 'For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.' The italicized portion — the only explicit Trinitarian formula in the entire New Testament — is absent from virtually every Greek manuscript. It appears in no Greek manuscript before the tenth century, is absent from the Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Slavonic versions, and is unquoted by any Greek church father, including those engaged in the Arian controversy of the fourth century, for whom such a verse would have been invaluable had they known it.

The Comma Johanneum entered the Greek manuscript tradition through back-translation from Latin — it appears in a few late medieval

Spanish Latin manuscripts — and was inserted into Erasmus's third edition of the Greek New Testament in 1522 under pressure from ecclesiastical authorities despite Erasmus's correct recognition that it was absent from the Greek manuscripts. Metzger's verdict in A Textual Commentary is unambiguous: 'That these words are spurious and have no right to stand in the New Testament is certain.' The King James Version, based on Erasmus's later editions, includes the Comma Johanneum; the NRSV, NIV, ESV, and virtually every modern translation based on the Critical Text do not.

3.3.4 The Baptismal Formula (Matthew 28:19)

The Great Commission in Matthew 28:19, with its Trinitarian baptismal formula — 'baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit' — is present in all Greek manuscripts. However, scholars have noted that the baptismal practice described in the book of Acts uniformly uses a christological formula: baptism 'in the name of Jesus Christ' (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5). This discrepancy has led some scholars, following the work of Adolf von Harnack and more recently Huub van de Sandt and David Flusser in The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and Its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity (2002), to suggest that the Trinitarian formula in Matthew 28:19 may reflect liturgical development rather than an original dominical saying. The early church historian Eusebius of Caesarea, in many of his pre-Nicene writings, quotes Matthew 28:19 in an apparently shortened form — 'in my name' — a fact that has generated scholarly discussion about whether the Trinitarian formula was part of the original text or was expanded in the tradition.

PART FOUR

The Canonization of the Old and New Testaments

Chapter Four: The Formation of the Old Testament Canon

4.1 The Torah: The Earliest Stabilization

The process by which individual writings came to be recognized as authoritative Scripture — and by which collections of authoritative writings came to constitute a canon — was neither swift, uniform, nor uncontested. The Torah, the five books attributed to Moses, achieved something approaching canonical status earliest among Jewish communities, likely by the fifth century BCE, though even here the process was complex. The Samaritan community, which split from Judean Judaism and accepted only the Torah as authoritative Scripture, provides indirect evidence that the authority of the Torah was recognized across this division, though the specific form of the text differed (as the Samaritan Pentateuch demonstrates).

James VanderKam, Professor Emeritus of Hebrew Scriptures at the University of Notre Dame and co-editor of the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series, in his study The Dead Sea Scrolls Today (2nd edition, 2010), reviews the evidence from Qumran for the canonical status of different books. VanderKam notes that the presence of multiple copies of a work at Qumran is an indicator (though not a definitive one) of its perceived authority: Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and Psalms are among the most frequently attested books at Qumran, suggesting their authority, while other books appear in fewer copies.

4.2 The Disputed Boundaries: The Old Testament Canon in Judaism

The Prophets and Writings — the latter two sections of the tripartite Hebrew canon known as Torah, Nevi'im, and Ketuvim (TaNaK) — achieved canonical recognition more gradually and through a more contested process than the Torah. The rabbinic discussions preserved in the Mishnah (c. 200 CE) and Talmud record ongoing disputes about whether certain books 'defiled the hands' — a technical term for canonical status. Song of Songs, Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Ezekiel were all debated. The claim that the Council of Jamnia (c. 90 CE) definitively closed the Hebrew canon has been largely abandoned by modern scholarship, following the critique of Jack P. Lewis and Sid Z. Leiman; the canonical discussions continued well beyond the first century CE.

The canon of the Greek-speaking Jewish diaspora, represented by the LXX tradition, included books not found in the Hebrew Bible: Tobit, Judith, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Baruch, and additions to Daniel and Esther. These books — known variously as the Deuterocanon (in Roman Catholic and Eastern Orthodox usage) or the Apocrypha (in Protestant usage) — were accepted as canonical by the early church, which used the LXX as its Old Testament. The exclusion of these books from the Protestant Old Testament canon at the Reformation was a deliberate return to what reformers identified as the Hebrew canon, though as Tov and others have noted, even this formulation was anachronistic, since the Hebrew canon was still being debated in the first century.

4.3 The New Testament Canon: A Long and Contested Process

The canonization of the New Testament was a gradual, regionally varied, and frequently contested process that was not effectively settled — even approximately — until the fourth century CE, and was not formally defined by an ecumenical council until the Council of Trent in 1546 (for the Roman Catholic Church). Contrary to a common misconception, no

authoritative council of the early church defined the New Testament canon in the first three centuries of Christianity.

The earliest surviving list of New Testament books that matches the modern Protestant and Catholic canon appears in the Festal Letter of Athanasius of Alexandria, written in 367 CE. Before Athanasius, the picture is one of significant diversity. The Muratorian Fragment (c. late 2nd century, though some scholars date it later), one of the earliest lists of authoritative writings, includes the Wisdom of Solomon among New Testament writings and excludes the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1 and 2 Peter, and 3 John. Eusebius of Caesarea, writing his Ecclesiastical History in the early fourth century, carefully distinguishes between books he regards as universally accepted (homologoumena), books that were disputed (antilegomena), and books that were outright rejected. His antilegomena include James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Revelation — books that are canonical in all modern New Testament traditions.

Lee Martin McDonald, whose The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority (2007) provides one of the most comprehensive surveys of the canonization process, emphasizes that the formation of the canon was driven by a complex interplay of apostolic authority claims, liturgical use, doctrinal disputes (particularly with Gnostic and Marcionite groups who proposed their own canons), geographical reach, and episcopal politics. The result was not a discovery of a preexistent canon but a construction achieved through historical processes that excluded some texts that had been widely used (such as 1 Clement, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Didache, and the Epistle of Barnabas) and included others that had been disputed for centuries.

The canon of the Syriac church provides a particularly illuminating case. The Peshitta, the standard Syriac version of the Bible, originally lacked 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation. The Syriac church's New Testament had only twenty-two books for much of its history, and the

Revelation was not broadly accepted in the Syriac tradition until the sixth and seventh centuries. The Ethiopian Orthodox church has the largest biblical canon of any Christian tradition, including not only the books recognized in Catholic and Protestant traditions but also additional books such as 1 Enoch (Ethiopic Enoch) and the Shepherd of Hermas. These canonical divergences among Christian traditions are not peripheral: they demonstrate that the boundaries of the authoritative text were established by historical and ecclesial processes and were never universally agreed upon.

PART FIVE

Translation, Transmission, and the Latin West

Chapter Five: From Greek to Latin — Jerome, the Vulgate, and the Choice of a Hebrew Text

5.1 The Old Latin Versions and the Textual Chaos Jerome Inherited

Before Jerome, the Christian West used a collection of Latin translations known collectively as the Vetus Latina (Old Latin), which were not a unified translation but a heterogeneous assortment of local translations of varying quality made from the LXX beginning in the second century CE. By the late fourth century, the proliferation of Old Latin translations in varying degrees of revision and accuracy had created what Augustine described as a chaotic situation: every reader who obtained a Greek manuscript and thought himself possessed of some knowledge of the two languages rushed into the work of translation. The textual diversity of the Old Latin tradition was enormous, reflecting both the diversity of the LXX tradition from which translations were made and the independent variations introduced by successive generations of translators and copyists.

Pope Damasus I commissioned Jerome (Eusebius Sophronius Hieronymus, c. 347–420 CE), the greatest biblical scholar of the Latin West, to produce a standard Latin Bible. Jerome's work, completed over several decades, became known as the Vulgate (from editio vulgata, 'common edition'), which served as the authoritative biblical text of the Western church for over a millennium and was formally defined as authoritative for the Roman Catholic Church at the Council of Trent.

5.2 Jerome's Hebraica Veritas and His Rejection of the LXX

Jerome's most consequential and most controversial decision was his choice of text basis for his translation of the Old Testament. Rather than following the LXX — which was the Bible of the early church, which was quoted throughout the New Testament, and which had been used by the Vetus Latina traditions — Jerome turned to what he called the Hebraica veritas, the 'Hebrew truth,' by which he meant the Hebrew text as transmitted in the Jewish tradition. This was a radical move that met with fierce opposition from Augustine, among others, who argued that the LXX itself carried divine authority through its miraculous production (as narrated in the Letter of Aristeas) and through its adoption by the apostles and the church.

Jerome's preference for the Hebrew text had several grounds: his conviction that the apostles had used a Hebrew Old Testament, his learning of Hebrew from Jewish teachers in Palestine, and his sense that the Hebrew text was more ancient and authentic than the Greek. These instincts were not entirely wrong — the Hebrew text does represent an ancient tradition — but Jerome lacked the tools to know that the Hebrew text he was using was itself one tradition among several and that the LXX was, in many cases, a witness to equally ancient if different Hebrew Vorlagen.

Furthermore, Jerome's attitude toward the books of the Deuterocanon was dismissive. He knew they were not in the Hebrew canon he was using and labeled them apocryphal — not authoritative Scripture — though he translated most of them under pressure from the church. This decision planted the seed of the later Protestant rejection of the Deuterocanon, though ironically the Council of Trent, in defining the Vulgate as authoritative, also defined the Deuterocanonical books as canonical.

5.3 The Vulgate's Errors, Revisions, and Centuries of Transmission

The Vulgate itself underwent substantial variation in transmission. Jerome's original text was modified, corrected, and corrupted through centuries of copying. Local revisions — including those of Alcuin of York (c. 800 CE), made at the direction of Charlemagne to produce a standard text — introduced further changes. By the time of the Council of Trent, there were thousands of variant readings among Vulgate manuscripts, and the Council's decree that the Vulgate was authentic did not specify which manuscript tradition of the Vulgate was authoritative. The Clementine Vulgate of 1592, produced under Pope Clement VIII, became the standard text but incorporated editorial decisions and corrections that deviated from Jerome's original at numerous points.

The irony is precise: the Latin Bible declared authoritative by the Council of Trent and used by the Western church for over fifteen hundred years was neither Jerome's original translation nor an accurate representation of any single ancient manuscript tradition. It was, like every other authoritative text in this history, an eclectic reconstruction.

5.4 The English Bible Tradition: A History of Translations and Controversies

5.4.1 Wycliffe to Tyndale

The history of the English Bible is a history of textual and political controversy inseparable from the question of which text was being translated and for what ecclesiastical purpose. John Wycliffe (c. 1320–1384) produced the first complete English Bible, translated from the Latin Vulgate, between 1382 and 1395. This translation was condemned by the Church of Rome, and Wycliffe was posthumously declared a heretic; copies of his Bible were burned.

William Tyndale (c. 1494–1536) produced the first English New Testament translated directly from the Greek — specifically, from Erasmus's printed Greek New Testament — and portions of the Old Testament from

Hebrew, beginning in 1525. Tyndale's translation was also condemned; he was executed in 1536. Yet Tyndale's English prose was so felicitous that approximately eighty percent of the King James Version of 1611 is traceable to Tyndale's language, a fact that underscores the degree to which all subsequent English translations were built upon his work.

5.4.2 The King James Version and Its Textual Basis

The Authorized Version of 1611, known as the King James Bible, was produced by a committee of fifty-four scholars working from the Bishops' Bible (1568) but instructed to consult other translations and the original languages. For the New Testament, the base text was the Textus Receptus in the edition of Beza (1598). For the Old Testament, the translators used the 1524–25 Bomberg Rabbinic Bible, which contained the Masoretic Text with the commentary of David Kimhi (RaDaK). Neither of these source texts is equivalent to what modern textual criticism regards as the best attainable text.

The KJV thus translates a particular version of the TR for the New Testament — a late medieval Byzantine text type — and a particular edition of the MT for the Old Testament. It does not translate the LXX except where the MT was obscure to the translators. The textual basis of the KJV was, by the standards of modern textual criticism, inferior in many ways to what would have been available even then in better manuscripts, and profoundly inferior to what became available with the Qumran discoveries and the systematic analysis of papyri in the twentieth century.

5.4.3 Modern Translations and the Textual Divide

The publication of Westcott and Hort's critical edition of the Greek New Testament in 1881 — a landmark in the history of New Testament textual criticism — and the production of the American Standard Version (1901), the Revised Standard Version (1952), the New Revised Standard Version (1989), and the explosion of modern translations have all been based on the Critical

Text, departing substantially from the TR in numerous passages. Modern translations routinely include marginal notes or footnotes indicating textual variants, effectively making the eclectic character of the underlying text transparent to the informed reader.

For the Old Testament, modern translations have increasingly incorporated the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the LXX as witnesses to the Hebrew text. The NRSV, for instance, adopts readings from the DSS in passages where the Qumran manuscripts appear to preserve a superior text, as at 1 Samuel 10:27 and 11:1, where the NRSV (following 4QSam-a and Josephus) includes a paragraph absent from the MT about Nahash the Ammonite that many scholars believe was accidentally omitted from the MT tradition.

PART SIX

Theological Divergences Across Textual Traditions

Chapter Six: When the Texts Disagree — Theological Significance of Textual Variation

6.1 The Divergent Canons and Their Theological Implications

A comparison of the biblical canons of different communities reveals that the disagreements are not merely peripheral but strike at the heart of theological systems. The following represents the major canonical traditions and their divergences:

The Hebrew Bible (TaNaK) as defined by Rabbinic Judaism contains twenty-four books (which map onto thirty-nine books in Protestant enumeration due to differences in counting). The Roman Catholic Old Testament contains these plus seven Deuterocanonical books (Tobit, Judith, 1–2 Maccabees, Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch) and additions to Daniel and Esther. The Eastern Orthodox Old Testament adds Psalm 151, 3 Maccabees, 1 Esdras (Esdras A), and the Prayer of Manasseh. The Ethiopian Orthodox Tewahedo Church accepts a still larger canon, including 1 Enoch and Jubilees as canonical Scripture — works known to have been authoritative at Qumran and deeply influential on the New Testament but excluded from all Western canons. The Syriac Peshitta Old Testament, produced from a combination of Hebrew and Aramaic sources beginning in the first centuries CE, presents its own textual tradition with distinctive readings.

These divergences have direct theological consequences. The doctrine of Purgatory in Roman Catholicism relies in part on 2 Maccabees 12:39–45, which describes prayer and sacrifice for the dead. This passage is canonical for Catholics but apocryphal for Protestants. The extended doxology in the

Lord's Prayer ('For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory, forever, Amen,' Matthew 6:13) appears in the KJV but is absent from the Critical Text, which regards it as a later liturgical addition. The prayer's presence or absence in Scripture affects the tradition's relationship to the liturgical practice.

6.2 Messianic Passages: The LXX and MT Compared

The theological divergence between the LXX and the MT is most acute in passages that the New Testament applies to Jesus. Several of the most important messianic citations in the New Testament are drawn from the LXX in forms that diverge from the MT, and in several cases the messianic reading depends precisely on the LXX's divergence from the MT.

Hebrews 10:5–7 quotes Psalm 40:6 (LXX 39:7) as: 'Sacrifices and offerings you did not desire, but a body you prepared for me.' The author applies this to the incarnation of Christ. The MT of Psalm 40:6 reads: 'Sacrifice and offering you did not desire; my ears you have opened' (or 'pierced'). The 'body' of the LXX is a substantial interpretive expansion absent from the Hebrew. The entire theological argument of Hebrews 10:1–10 depends on the LXX reading.

Romans 3:10–18 is a catena of Old Testament quotations that Paul uses to demonstrate universal human sinfulness. Some of the quotations in this passage are drawn from the LXX in forms not found in the MT, including lines from Psalms 5, 10, 36, 140, and Proverbs 1. The MT lacks several of the verses Paul quotes at Romans 3:13–14.

Acts 15:16–18 quotes Amos 9:11–12 in the LXX form ('that the rest of mankind may seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles'), which James uses to justify the inclusion of Gentiles in the Christian community. The MT of Amos 9:12 reads: 'that they may possess the remnant of Edom.' The LXX's reading of 'Gentiles seeking the Lord' — which underlies the entire argument for Gentile mission at the Jerusalem Council — represents either a textual divergence

from the MT or an interpretive translation. Either way, the theological argument in Acts 15 depends on the LXX, not the MT.

6.3 The Dead Sea Scrolls and Theological Variation

The scrolls from Qumran exhibit theological readings that differ from both the MT and the LXX. The Temple Scroll (11QT), the longest scroll found at Qumran, presents a version of the legal material in the Pentateuch with substantial modifications that the community behind the scroll presented as direct divine revelation, not as a commentary on earlier Scripture. The sectarian documents — the Community Rule (1QS), the Damascus Document (CD), the Hodayot (1QH) — quote and interpret Scripture in ways that sometimes presuppose textual readings different from the MT, suggesting that the community's scriptural text was not yet fixed in the form the MT preserves.

The Pesher commentaries from Qumran — particularly the Pesher on Habakkuk (1QpHab) and the Pesher on Nahum (4QpNah) — apply prophetic texts to the community's own historical situation through an interpretive method that updates the referents of prophecy. This technique presupposes a fluid relationship between the text and its meaning, and in several cases the Pesher quotes a biblical text in a form that differs from the MT, raising the question of whether the divergence is textual or interpretive.

6.4 The Peshitta and Its Distinctive Tradition

The Peshitta (from the Syriac word for 'simple' or 'common') is the standard version of the Bible in the Syriac-speaking Christian churches. The Old Testament Peshitta was translated primarily from Hebrew, with influence from Aramaic targums and in some books from the LXX. It presents a distinctive textual tradition that sometimes agrees with the MT against the LXX, sometimes agrees with the LXX against the MT, and sometimes presents readings found in neither.

P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder, in The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History (1988), document the ways in which the Peshitta Old Testament represents an independent textual tradition of considerable antiquity. The New Testament Peshitta, as noted, originally lacked five books of the Greek New Testament (2 Peter, 2–3 John, Jude, and Revelation), a fact that demonstrates the existence of a genuine alternative canonical tradition in the Eastern church.

PART SEVEN

Scribal Manipulation and Theological Motivation

Chapter Seven: The Scribal Hand — When Copyists Became Editors

7.1 The Orthodox Corruptions of Scripture

Bart D. Ehrman's The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament (2nd edition, 2011) presents what is arguably the most systematic and documented case for theologically motivated scribal alteration in the history of New Testament textual criticism. Ehrman's thesis, building on earlier work by Gordon Fee, William Petersen, and others, is that a significant category of New Testament textual variants can be explained as deliberate alterations made by orthodox scribes to make the text conform to or support emerging doctrinal positions — particularly positions on the divine and human nature of Christ — over against adoptionist, docetist, and other competing Christologies.

Ehrman's methodology is rigorous: he argues that orthodox corruptions can be identified when (1) the reading is absent from the earliest and most reliable manuscripts, (2) the alternative reading supports an orthodox position against a competing heresy, (3) the change is explicable as a scribal modification of the earlier reading rather than the reverse, and (4) patristic evidence confirms the earlier reading. The volume catalogues dozens of cases meeting these criteria.

7.1.1 Luke 3:22 — The Adoptionist Reading

At the baptism of Jesus in Luke 3:22, the dominant manuscript tradition reads: 'You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased.' This reading

is shared with Mark 1:11 and Matthew 3:17. However, the text of Justin Martyr (mid-second century), Clement of Alexandria, and the Western textual tradition — including Codex Bezae (D) and several Old Latin manuscripts — reads instead: 'You are my Son; today I have begotten you,' a quotation of Psalm 2:7. This reading was the one known to and used by Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, and other early writers. It was suppressed, Ehrman argues, because in the context of adoptionist Christologies — which held that Jesus became the Son of God at his baptism — the words 'today I have begotten you' provided direct scriptural support for the adoptionist position. The substitution of the harmonistic reading ('with you I am well pleased') removed this support and aligned the Lukan baptism account with Matthew and Mark.

7.1.2 John 1:18 — The Only Begotten God

John 1:18 presents a textual variant of considerable Christological significance. The majority of later manuscripts read 'the only begotten Son' (monogenes huios), while the earliest and most reliable manuscripts — P66, P75, Codex Sinaiticus, and Codex Vaticanus — read 'the only begotten God' (monogenes theos). The Critical Text adopts the latter. Ehrman argues in The Orthodox Corruption that both readings represent ancient traditions but that the reading 'only begotten Son' is more likely to be a scribal modification, since 'only begotten God' is the harder reading — harder to interpret and more theologically provocative — and thus less likely to have been introduced by a scribe. The reading 'only begotten God' explicitly identifies the Logos of the prologue as God and was important in anti-adoptionist Christological debates.

7.1.3 Hebrews 2:9 — By the Grace of God

Hebrews 2:9 in the standard text reads that Jesus tasted death 'by the grace of God' (chariti theou) for everyone. A variant reading, attested in a small number of manuscripts and known to Origen and other early fathers,

reads 'apart from God' (choris theou). The latter is grammatically difficult and theologically startling — it could be interpreted as saying that on the cross Jesus was separated from God, a reading that could support docetist interpretations. Origen discusses this variant seriously; Ehrman argues that the orthodox reading 'by the grace of God' replaced the more difficult 'apart from God' to remove a potentially embarrassing text.

7.2 Scribal Alteration in the Old Testament Tradition

The phenomenon of theologically motivated textual alteration is not confined to the New Testament. Tov, in Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, devotes substantial attention to what he calls 'deliberate changes' in the manuscript tradition of the Hebrew Bible. These include the Tiqqune Sopherim — the eighteen emendations of the scribes recorded in rabbinic tradition as having been made to the text for reasons of reverence or theological propriety. In Genesis 18:22, for example, the text as it stands reads that 'Abraham was still standing before the LORD,' but the rabbinic tradition records that the original read 'the LORD was still standing before Abraham' — and the text was reversed because having God stand before a human seemed disrespectful. The original reading survives in the rabbinic memory of the change even as the altered text was transmitted.

Sidnie White Crawford, in Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times (2008), examines the phenomenon of rewritten scripture — texts that substantially modify, expand, or rearrange biblical material for theological or interpretive purposes. The Temple Scroll, the Genesis Apocryphon (1QapGen), the Jubilees, and the Pseudo-Philo Biblical Antiquities are all examples of texts that present modified versions of biblical narratives, often attributing their modifications to divine authority. Crawford argues that the line between rewritten scripture and variant textual tradition was not always sharp in the Second Temple period, and that some of what appear in the

manuscript tradition as textual variants may represent deliberate theological modifications that entered the transmission stream.

7.3 The Ketiv-Qere Tradition: Acknowledged Textual Divergence Within the Masoretic System

One of the most remarkable features of the Masoretic Text is its built-in acknowledgment of textual divergence through the system of Ketiv-Qere. In hundreds of places in the Hebrew Bible, the Masoretes noted that the consonants written in the text (Ketiv, 'what is written') differed from what was to be read aloud (Qere, 'what is read'). The vowel points in the text are those of the Qere reading, not the Ketiv. This system preserves, within the very structure of the authoritative text, evidence of scribal uncertainty and textual divergence — an acknowledgment by the scribes themselves that the written text and the authorized reading were not always identical.

The most theologically significant Ketiv-Qere is the Tetragrammaton, the divine name YHWH. The Masoretes pointed the divine name with the vowels of Adonai ('Lord') or Elohim ('God') as a signal to substitute the substitute title in reading, an ancient Jewish practice of reverently avoiding the pronunciation of the divine name. The resulting hybrid form, incorporating the consonants of YHWH with the vowels of Adonai, was read by Christian scholars of the Renaissance as 'Jehovah' — a pronunciation that never existed in the ancient world and was itself the product of a misunderstanding of the Masoretic system. The name 'Jehovah,' enshrined in many traditional translations and in the theology of certain communities (including Jehovah's Witnesses), is thus a textual artifact — a product of the Ketiv-Qere system misunderstood.

7.4 The Harmonistic Tendency: Scribes as Theologians

One of the most frequently documented patterns of scribal alteration identified by textual critics in both Old and New Testaments is harmonization — the tendency of scribes to make one passage agree with a parallel passage,

or to resolve apparent tensions between related texts. In the New Testament, this tendency is particularly visible in the Synoptic Gospels, where scribes who knew Matthew's more familiar wording sometimes altered Mark or Luke to conform.

Metzger's A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament records dozens of harmonistic additions in later manuscripts. The Lord's Prayer in Luke 11:2–4, for example, is shorter in the oldest manuscripts than in the Matthean version (Matthew 6:9–13). Later manuscripts of Luke expand the prayer to conform more closely to Matthew's version, including the addition of the doxology not found in any early manuscript. The harmonistic scribal tradition effectively made Luke's prayer into a copy of Matthew's, erasing the genuine Lukan form.

In the Old Testament, the parallel accounts in Samuel-Kings and Chronicles present a particularly illuminating case. Chronicles regularly modifies the narratives of Samuel and Kings in ways that omit negative information about David, harmonize theological tensions, and align the narrative with later priestly perspectives. The Chronicler's textual relationship to Samuel and Kings was itself an act of theological editing of existing material — a fact recognized by source critics from Julius Wellhausen onward and confirmed by the Qumran manuscripts of Samuel, which in several cases preserve a text closer to what the Chronicler appears to have known than the MT of Samuel.

Conclusion: The Eclectic Text and the Honest Faith

The evidence reviewed in this volume converges upon a conclusion that the most careful scholars of the biblical text have been drawing for over two centuries: the texts we call the Bible — in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, or English — are eclectic reconstructions, each representing a particular moment in a long and complex history of transmission, translation, canonical decision-making, and scribal activity that was never free from human influence, theological interest, and historical contingency.

The Masoretic Text, the standard Hebrew Old Testament, was stabilized by the Masoretes between 500 and 1000 CE from a proto-Masoretic tradition that was itself one among several competing text families in the Second Temple period, as the Dead Sea Scrolls definitively demonstrate. The Septuagint represents an ancient Greek translation tradition that sometimes preserves Hebrew readings older than those in the MT and that became the Bible of the early church and the primary scriptural source of the New Testament. The New Testament Greek text exists in thousands of manuscripts with hundreds of thousands of variants, and the Critical Text used by modern scholars is a scholarly reconstruction — an eclectic text selected reading by reading from competing manuscript witnesses, none of which preserves the original in its entirety.

Jerome translated the Vulgate from a Hebrew text he believed more authentic than the LXX, but which was itself a single ancient tradition that lacked access to the textual diversity the Qumran scrolls reveal. His decision shaped the Western church's Old Testament for fifteen hundred years and seeded the Protestant rejection of the Deuterocanon. The King James Bible, beloved and culturally magnificent, rests on the Textus Receptus — a printed Greek text compiled from late medieval manuscripts — and an early printed

edition of the Masoretic Text, both of which are demonstrably inferior to the manuscript evidence now available.

Scribal alteration, as Ehrman, Tov, Crawford, and others have demonstrated, was not merely accidental but in some cases deliberate — motivated by theological concerns, harmonistic tendencies, liturgical convention, and reverence. The Orthodox corruptions of Scripture identified by Ehrman in the New Testament tradition, the Tiqqune Sopherim and deliberate changes catalogued by Tov in the Old Testament tradition, and the phenomenon of rewritten scripture examined by Crawford all demonstrate that the texts were regarded by their transmitters not as untouchable sacred objects but as living documents whose meaning could be clarified, improved, and protected through the scribal art.

None of this means that the biblical texts do not carry ancient, authentic, and historically significant traditions. The scholarly consensus is that behind the textual diversity lie genuine ancient voices — the actual proclamations of prophets, the actual letters of Paul, the actual memories of the Gospel communities. But the inerrancy doctrine, in any of its forms, requires not merely the existence of ancient authentic originals but their reliable preservation and transmission to the present day. The evidence does not support this claim. What we have is not a pristine original but a family of witnesses, each imperfect, collectively illuminating — and the work of the textual critic is precisely the work of listening to those witnesses with the greatest possible rigor, honesty, and humility.

The conclusion is not despair but clarity. A faith built upon honest engagement with the text as it actually is — complex, human, divinely inspired in whatever sense one chooses to affirm, and genuinely ancient — is more defensible, more intellectually honest, and ultimately more durable than one built upon a doctrine of mechanical inerrancy that the manuscripts themselves refute.

Bibliography and Scholarly Sources

Primary Text Editions

Biblia Hebraica Quinta. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004–. The critical edition of the Masoretic Text with full apparatus.

Nestle, Eberhard, et al. Novum Testamentum Graece. 28th ed. (NA28). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012. The standard critical edition of the Greek New Testament.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. Septuaginta. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006. The standard critical edition of the Greek Old Testament.

Tov, Emanuel, et al., eds. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. 40 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955–2010. The official editio princeps of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Weber, Robert, and Roger Gryson, eds. Biblia Sacra Vulgata. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007. Critical edition of Jerome's Vulgate.

Textual Criticism — Hebrew Bible / Old Testament

Cross, Frank Moore. Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Cross, Frank Moore, and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975. The foundational study for local text theory.

Crawford, Sidnie White. Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008. A definitive study of scribal revision as theological activity. https://www.eerdmans.com/Products/6614/rewriting-scripture-in-second-temple-times.aspx

Crawford, Sidnie White. The Temple Scroll and Related Texts. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Tov, Emanuel. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. 3rd ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012. The standard reference work for Hebrew Bible textual criticism. https://www.fortresspress.com/store/product/9780800696641/Textual-Criticism-of-the-Hebrew-Bible

Tov, Emanuel. The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Tov, Emanuel. Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

Ulrich, Eugene. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999. https://www.eerdmans.com/Products/1076/the-dead-sea-scrolls-and-the-origins-of-the-bible.aspx

Ulrich, Eugene. The Biblical Qumran Scrolls: Transcriptions and Textual Variants. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Würthwein, Ernst. The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica. 2nd ed. Translated by Erroll Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

The Dead Sea Scrolls

Flint, Peter W., and James C. VanderKam, eds. The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998–1999.

García Martínez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997–1998.

VanderKam, James C. The Dead Sea Scrolls Today. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010. https://www.eerdmans.com/Products/5516/the-dead-sea-scrolls-today.aspx

VanderKam, James C., and Peter Flint. The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2002.

Textual Criticism — New Testament

Ehrman, Bart D. Misquoting Jesus: The Story Behind Who Changed the Bible and Why. New York: HarperOne, 2005. https://www.harpercollins.com/products/misquoting-jesus-bart-d-ehrman

Ehrman, Bart D. The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-orthodox-corruption-of-scripture-9780199739783

Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994. The standard commentary on textual decisions in the NA/UBS text.

Metzger, Bruce M., and Bart D. Ehrman. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-text-of-the-new-testament-9780195161229

Wallace, Daniel B. 'The Majority Text Theory: History, Methods, and Critique.' In The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research, 2nd ed., edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Leiden: Brill, 2013. https://brill.com/view/book/9789004249028

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland. The Text of the New Testament. 2nd ed. Translated by Erroll Rhodes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989.

Parker, David C. An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

The Septuagint

Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. Invitation to the Septuagint. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015. https://www.bakeracademic.com/Products/0001441240444/invitation-to-the-septuagint-2nd-edition.aspx

Hengel, Martin. Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period. 2 vols. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Hengel, Martin. The Septuagint as Christian Scripture. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.

Marcos, Natalio Fernández. The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

The Samaritan Pentateuch

Charlesworth, James H., ed. The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. 2 vols. Garden City: Doubleday, 1983–1985.

Pummer, Reinhard. The Samaritans: A Profile. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.

Zsengellér, József, ed. Samaria, Samarians, Samaritans: Studies on Bible, History and Linguistics. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.

The Vulgate, Jerome, and Translation History

Brown, Dennis. Vir Trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of Saint Jerome. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1992.

Kamesar, Adam. Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Kelly, J. N. D. Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies. London: Duckworth, 1975.

Metzger, Bruce M. The Bible in Translation: Ancient and English Versions. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

Canon Formation

Barton, John. Holy Writings, Sacred Text: The Canon in Early Christianity. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

McDonald, Lee Martin. The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007.

McDonald, Lee Martin, and James A. Sanders, eds. The Canon Debate. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002. https://www.hendrickson.com/Books/Canon-Debate

Sundberg, Albert C. The Old Testament of the Early Church. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Scribal Practices and Theological Editing

Crawford, Sidnie White. 'The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text.' In The Dead Sea Scrolls at Sixty, edited by Lawrence Schiffman and Shani Tov. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2008.

Fishbane, Michael. Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985. A foundational study of inner-biblical exegesis and scribal editing.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994.

Inerrancy, Doctrine, and Biblical Authority

Enns, Peter. Inspiration and Incarnation: Evangelicals and the Problem of the Old Testament. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

Geisler, Norman L., ed. Inerrancy. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980. The standard evangelical defense of inerrancy.

Rogers, Jack B., and Donald K. McKim. The Authority and Interpretation of the Bible: A Historical Approach. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1979.

Warfield, Benjamin Breckinridge, and A. A. Hodge. 'Inspiration.' Presbyterian Review 2 (1881): 225–260. The foundational modern statement of the inerrancy doctrine.

Chicago Statement on Biblical Inerrancy. International Council on Biblical Inerrancy, 1978. https://library.dts.edu/Pages/TL/Special/ICBI_1.pdf

Online Scholarly Resources

The STEPS Project (Septuagint, Textual, and Early Jewish Studies): https://www.septuagintstudies.com

Accordance Bible Software — Critical apparatus for MT, LXX, NA28: https://www.accordancebible.com

The Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library: https://www.deadseascrolls.org.il

Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF), Münster — Online resources for NT manuscripts: https://www.uni-muenster.de/INTF

Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts (CSNTM): https://csntm.org

Biblia Hebraica Quinta fascicles and apparatus: https://www.academic-bible.com/en/online-bibles/biblia-hebraica-quinta-bhq

End of Document