# TWO BIBLES, TWO RELIGIONS

*The Masoretic Text and the Septuagint: Textual Divergence, Ancient Witnesses, and the Formation of Christian and Rabbinic Identity*

Prepared and Researched by Joseph Teixido

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
**Doctor of Philosophy in Biblical Studies and Textual Criticism**

Drawing on the Scholarship of Emanuel Tov, Sidnie White Crawford,
Eugene Ulrich, Frank Moore Cross, and the Dead Sea Scrolls Research Tradition

2025

# ABSTRACT

This dissertation undertakes a comprehensive examination of the divergences between the Masoretic Text (MT) of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint (LXX), the ancient Greek translation of the Jewish scriptures, and argues that these divergences constitute one of the generative conditions for the bifurcation of Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity as distinct religious traditions. Drawing principally upon the textual-critical scholarship of Emanuel Tov, the scriptural composition studies of Sidnie White Crawford, the Qumran biblical manuscript analyses of Eugene Ulrich and Frank Moore Cross, and the patristic and Septuagintal scholarship of Martin Hengel, Natalio Fernández Marcos, and Timothy Michael Law, the study demonstrates that the MT and LXX represent not merely a translation relationship but distinct textual traditions rooted in the genuine plurality of Hebrew scripture in the Second Temple period.

The dissertation proceeds in eight chapters. Chapter One establishes the nature and history of both the MT and LXX as textual and canonical entities. Chapter Two conducts a systematic anatomy of their divergences—differences in length, arrangement, and individual readings—with extended case studies from Jeremiah, Samuel, the Psalms, and Isaiah. Chapter Three analyzes the Dead Sea Scrolls as an independent triangulating witness, demonstrating through Tov's classification of Qumran biblical manuscripts that the Second Temple period harbored a rich plurality of textual traditions, some aligning with the MT, others with the LXX Vorlage, and others standing independent of both. Chapter Four examines the early church's reception and use of the LXX, including the patterns of quotation in the Greek New Testament, the messianic hermeneutic enabled by LXX-specific readings, and the patristic awareness of MT-LXX divergence. Chapter Five traces the history of the Masoretic project—the Tiberian vowel system, the cantillation marks, the Masorah Parva and Magna, and the standardization process following the catastrophes of 70 CE and 135 CE. Chapter Six provides a detailed examination of the Aleppo Codex and the Leningrad Codex as the twin manuscript pillars of the MT tradition. Chapter Seven analyzes the theological implications of key MT-LXX divergences, including divine identity and the κύριος theology, the virgin birth and Isaiah 7:14, the Suffering Servant, and the divine council of Deuteronomy 32:8. Chapter Eight synthesizes these threads into a coherent account of the 'parting of the ways' between Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity, situating the textual bifurcation as an active cause—not merely a symptom—of religious separation.

The dissertation concludes that the choice of different scriptural canons and textual traditions by the two communities was not merely a reflection of prior theological commitments but a constitutive factor in the formation of their distinct religious identities. Two different Bibles produced, in significant measure, two different religions.

*Keywords: Masoretic Text, Septuagint, Dead Sea Scrolls, textual criticism, Hebrew Bible, Vorlage, Emanuel Tov, Sidnie White Crawford, Qumran, LXX Christology, Isaiah 7:14, Deuteronomy 32:8, Jeremiah, Aleppo Codex, Leningrad Codex, parting of the ways, Rabbinic Judaism, patristics.*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract....ii
Table of Contents....iii
Acknowledgments....iv
List of Abbreviations....v
Preface....1

Chapter 1: The Two Bibles—An Introduction to the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint....4
1.1 What is the Masoretic Text?....4
1.2 What is the Septuagint?....8
1.3 The Question of the Vorlage....12
1.4 Methodological Considerations in MT-LXX Comparison....16
Chapter 2: Anatomy of Divergence—Textual Differences Between the MT and LXX....20
2.1 Categories of Divergence....20
2.2 The Book of Jeremiah: A Case Study in Divergent Editions....24
2.3 The Book of Samuel and the LXX Vorlage....30
2.4 Psalms, Proverbs, and the Poetic Books....36
2.5 The Book of Isaiah....42
2.6 Implications for the Concept of an 'Original Text'....48
Chapter 3: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Plurality of Second Temple Texts....52
3.1 The Discovery and Its Significance....52
3.2 Tov's Classification of DSS Biblical Manuscripts....56
3.3 DSS and the MT: Key Divergences....62
3.4 Crawford on the Fluid Scriptural Landscape....68
3.5 DSS, MT, and LXX: A Triangulation....74
Chapter 4: The Early Church and the Septuagint....79
4.1 The LXX as the Bible of the Early Church....79
4.2 Patterns of LXX Quotation in the New Testament....83
4.3 The Messianic Hermeneutic and the LXX....90
4.4 Patristic Awareness of LXX-MT Divergence....96
Chapter 5: The Masoretes and the Standardization of the Hebrew Bible....103
5.1 Who Were the Masoretes?....103
5.2 The Tiberian Vowel System....108
5.3 Cantillation Marks (Te'amim)....113
5.4 The Masorah Parva and Masorah Magna....117
5.5 The Process of Standardization....122
Chapter 6: The Aleppo Codex and the Leningrad Codex....128
6.1 The Aleppo Codex (Keter Aram Tzova)....128
6.2 The Leningrad Codex (Codex Leningradensis)....135
6.3 The Ben Asher Tradition and Its Rivals....140
6.4 Modern Critical Editions....145
Chapter 7: Theological Divergence—How Textual Variants Shape Doctrine....150

7.1 Divine Identity and the Name of God....150
7.2 The Virgin Birth and Isaiah 7:14....157
7.3 The Suffering Servant and Atonement Theology....163
7.4 Monotheism, the Divine Council, and the 'Sons of God'....169
7.5 Eschatology and Psalm 110....175
Chapter 8: The Parting of the Ways....180
8.1 The Scholarly Concept of the 'Parting of the Ways'....180
8.2 The Jewish Rejection of the LXX....186
8.3 Origen, Jerome, and the Question of Hebrew Truth....192
8.4 The Canonical Boundary and the Deuterocanon....198
Conclusion: Two Bibles, Two Religions....204
Bibliography....214
Index of Ancient Sources....230
Index of Modern Authors....240

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation is the product of sustained engagement with one of the most consequential questions in the history of Western religious thought: how did the Bible become two different books, and how did those books become the foundations of two different religions? The question is deceptively simple; the answer, as the pages that follow attempt to demonstrate, reaches into the deepest strata of ancient textual history, scribal practice, theological development, and communal identity.

The author's debts are many and gladly acknowledged. The foundational debt is to Emanuel Tov, whose Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible in its several editions remains the indispensable compass for any scholar navigating the complex terrain of MT-LXX divergence and the textual pluralism of the Second Temple period. Without Tov's meticulous decades-long reconstruction of the textual landscape, this dissertation would not have been possible. Equally essential has been the work of Sidnie White Crawford, whose excavation of the fluid compositional processes of Second Temple scriptural production has permanently altered the way scholars conceive of what it means for a text to be 'biblical.' Eugene Ulrich's contributions to the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls biblical manuscripts and the concept of 'multiple literary editions' have informed every chapter. The broader contributions of Frank Moore Cross, Martin Hengel, Natalio Fernández Marcos, and Timothy Michael Law have been invaluable at every stage.

The author also wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the critical editions that undergird this entire enterprise: the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia and the ongoing Biblia Hebraica Quinta; the Göttingen Septuagint; the Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece; and the Dead Sea Scrolls Reader edited by Donald Parry and Emanuel Tov. These monuments of collaborative scholarship are the bedrock upon which all individual contributions to the field must ultimately rest.

All translations of primary texts, unless otherwise indicated, are the author's own. All errors that remain after careful revision are likewise the author's own.

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

***Texts and Versions***

| | |
|---|---|
| BH | Biblia Hebraica (Kittel, 3rd ed., 1937) |
| BHQ | Biblia Hebraica Quinta (Schenker et al., 2004–present) |
| BHS | Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (Elliger and Rudolph, 1967–77) |
| DSS | Dead Sea Scrolls |
| HUBP | Hebrew University Bible Project |
| LXX | Septuagint (Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures) |
| MT | Masoretic Text |
| NA28 | Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece, 28th ed. (2012) |
| OG | Old Greek (earliest recoverable LXX translation layer) |
| OL | Old Latin (Vetus Latina) |
| SP | Samaritan Pentateuch |
| Vg | Vulgata (Latin Vulgate of Jerome) |

***Journals and Series***

| | |
|---|---|
| BASOR | Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research |
| Bib | Biblica |
| CBQ | Catholic Biblical Quarterly |
| DJD | Discoveries in the Judaean Desert (Oxford: Clarendon) |
| HTR | Harvard Theological Review |
| JBL | Journal of Biblical Literature |
| JSOT | Journal for the Study of the Old Testament |

| | |
|---|---|
| JTS | Journal of Theological Studies |
| RdQ | Revue de Qumran |
| SDSSRL | Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature |
| STDJ | Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah |
| VT | Vetus Testamentum |
| VTSup | Vetus Testamentum Supplements |
| ZAW | Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft |

***Dead Sea Scrolls Sigla***

| | |
|---|---|
| 1QIsa-a | Great Isaiah Scroll (Cave 1, Qumran) |
| 4QDeut-j | 4QDeuteronomyj (Cave 4, Qumran) |
| 4QJerb/d | 4QJeremiahb and 4QJeremiahd (Cave 4, Qumran) |
| 4QNumb | 4QNumbersb (Cave 4, Qumran) |
| 4QRP | 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q158, 4Q364–367) |
| 4QSama | 4QSamuela (Cave 4, Qumran) |
| 11QT | Temple Scroll (Cave 11, Qumran) |

# PREFACE

The relationship between the Hebrew Masoretic Text (MT) and the Greek Septuagint (LXX) stands as one of the most consequential textual questions in the history of Western religion. These two bodies of scripture, though ostensibly derived from a common ancient Israelite literary tradition, diverge so substantially in wording, structure, theology, and content that serious scholars have characterized them as representing, in significant measure, distinct textual traditions rather than a simple translation relationship.

The stakes of this divergence extend far beyond philological curiosity. Early Christians read the Greek scriptures—the LXX—as their authoritative Bible. Their theology of messianic prophecy, divine identity, atonement, and eschatology was shaped by Greek formulations that in many cases differ markedly from the Hebrew text eventually standardized by Rabbinic Judaism. The Dead Sea Scrolls, discovered between 1947 and 1956, have dramatically illuminated this complexity, demonstrating that the Second Temple period harbored a rich plurality of textual traditions, some of which align with the LXX against the MT, others with the MT against the LXX, and still others that stand independent of both.

This dissertation examines, in doctoral scholarly depth, five interconnected questions: (1) the nature and extent of divergences between the MT and the LXX; (2) how the early church received and used the LXX, particularly in the composition of the Greek New Testament; (3) what the Dead Sea Scrolls reveal about the textual pluralism of the Second Temple period and how they adjudicate between the MT and LXX traditions; (4) the Masoretic process—the history, methods, and codification in the Aleppo and Leningrad Codices; and (5) how the theological implications of MT versus LXX divergence contributed to the parting of the ways between Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism.

Throughout, this study draws substantially on the foundational textual-critical scholarship of Emanuel Tov, whose Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (3rd ed., 2012) remains the indispensable reference work; on Sidnie White Crawford's Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times (2008) and her DSS scholarship; on the Cambridge History of the Bible; and on a broad range of patristic, Septuagintal, and Dead Sea Scrolls studies. All primary sources are cited in their standard critical editions.

A note on method is warranted. This dissertation does not argue that either the MT or the LXX is categorically more original, more authoritative, or more theologically correct than the other. The question of which tradition preserves 'the original text'—or whether that concept is even coherent—is addressed in Chapter Two (§2.6). Rather, the dissertation's argument is descriptive and historical: the two traditions are different, those differences have been consequential, and the nature and mechanism of their consequences for the bifurcation of Judaism and Christianity has been insufficiently theorized in the existing scholarship on the 'parting of the ways.'

This study is addressed to scholars of biblical studies, textual criticism, Second Temple Judaism, early Christianity, and patristics. It presupposes familiarity with the basic tools of biblical scholarship—knowledge of biblical Hebrew and Greek, acquaintance with the standard critical editions, and general familiarity with the Dead Sea Scrolls material. Technical terms are defined at their first occurrence and may be located via the index.

# CHAPTER One

# THE TWO BIBLES: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE MASORETIC TEXT AND THE SEPTUAGINT

## 1.1 What is the Masoretic Text?

The Masoretic Text (MT) is the authoritative Hebrew and Aramaic text of the Tanakh (Hebrew Bible) as preserved and transmitted by the Masoretes, a group of Jewish scribes and scholars active primarily from the sixth through the tenth centuries CE. The designation 'Masoretic' derives from the Hebrew word masorah (מָסוֹרָה), meaning 'tradition,' and refers to the elaborate system of annotations, vowel pointings (niqqud), cantillation marks (te'amim), and marginal notes the Masoretes appended to the consonantal text to ensure its precise, standardized transmission.

The consonantal skeleton (the ketiv) of the MT is far older than the Masoretic scribal apparatus that surrounds it. The proto-Masoretic text—a consonantal Hebrew text that aligns closely with the MT—was already circulating and gaining authority in certain Jewish circles by the first century CE, and represents one among multiple Hebrew textual traditions that coexisted during the Second Temple period. As Emanuel Tov has demonstrated at length across his career, the proto-MT tradition was not simply 'the original text' of the Hebrew Bible but rather one text-type that over time achieved canonical dominance within Rabbinic Judaism, while other traditions survived, albeit marginally, in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Vorlage (underlying Hebrew source) of the Septuagint.

The formal standardization of the MT is conventionally associated with the great Masoretic academies of Tiberias, most especially the ben Asher family, whose work culminated in the Aleppo Codex (ca. 930 CE) and the Leningrad Codex (1008–1009 CE)—the two most authoritative medieval manuscripts of the MT, and the basis for all modern critical Hebrew Bibles, including *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) and *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ). These two codices, and the tradition they embody, are the subject of extended analysis in Chapter Six.

It is essential to grasp from the outset that the term 'the Masoretic Text' refers to a tradition of transmission, not to a single manuscript or to a monolithic textual unity. The MT manuscripts, while exhibiting remarkable consistency with one another—a consistency that is itself a testament to the Masoretic scribal achievement—are not identical. Variants exist between the Aleppo Codex

and the Leningrad Codex, and between both of these and other Masoretic manuscripts. Ernst Würthwein's classic introduction to the text of the Old Testament, and more recently the scholarship of Israel Yeivin on the Tiberian Masorah, have documented the nature and extent of inner-Masoretic variation, which, while far less substantial than the MT-LXX divergence, serves as an important reminder that 'the MT' is an abstraction representing a family of related manuscripts rather than a single, perfectly defined text.

The consonantal text underlying the MT appears to have undergone a process of progressive standardization beginning in the first century CE and accelerating after the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70 CE. Prior to this standardization process, as the Dead Sea Scrolls abundantly demonstrate, Hebrew biblical manuscripts circulated in a variety of text-forms. The proto-MT text-form was one of these, but it competed with others. The standardization process—however exactly it occurred, a question to which we return in Chapter Five—resulted in the proto-MT achieving the status of the authoritative text for Rabbinic Judaism, while alternative traditions either perished or survived only in translation (as the LXX) or in marginal communities (as preserved in the DSS).

Scholars have debated the mechanism and agents of this standardization process. Shemaryahu Talmon's 'social location' hypothesis, advanced in his landmark essay in the Cambridge History of the Bible (1970), attributed the proto-MT's dominance to the Pharisaic-Rabbinic social movement that survived the catastrophes of 70 CE and 135 CE and emerged as the dominant form of Judaism in the post-Temple period. Frank Moore Cross's 'local text' theory, first elaborated in 1964 and refined in subsequent decades, posited three families of local text-forms—Babylonian (proto-MT), Alexandrian (LXX Vorlage), and Palestinian (pre-Samaritan and some Qumran texts)—each circulating in a distinct geographical-community setting. Tov, in his most extensive treatment of these questions, rejected the geographical determinism of Cross's model while affirming the reality of textual plurality and offering a non-geographical account of the relationships between text-types. The debate continues, and different positions within it are noted at relevant points throughout this dissertation.

## 1.2 What is the Septuagint?

The Septuagint (LXX) is the Greek translation of the Hebrew scriptures undertaken over a period of several centuries, beginning approximately in the third century BCE in Alexandria, Egypt. The name derives from the legend preserved in the Letter of Aristeas (ca. second century BCE), which describes seventy-two Jewish elders commissioned by Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283–246 BCE) to produce a Greek version of the Torah for the Library of Alexandria. The number seventy-two was conventionally rounded to seventy (Latin: septuaginta), and the designation 'Septuagint' (often abbreviated LXX, the Roman numeral for seventy) came to denote first the Greek Pentateuch, then, by extension, the entire Greek corpus of Jewish scriptures.

The LXX is emphatically not a uniform document. Different books were translated by different translators at different times and places, exhibiting markedly different translation philosophies, linguistic competencies, and relationships to the underlying Hebrew. The Pentateuch is generally regarded as the earliest portion, translated with considerable care and relatively literal fidelity. The books of Job, Proverbs, and Daniel reflect a freer, more expansive approach. Jeremiah in the LXX is approximately one-eighth shorter than the MT and differs substantially in the arrangement of its oracles—a divergence now illuminated by the Hebrew fragments of Jeremiah at Qumran (4QJerb, 4QJerd), which align with the shorter LXX version. Isaiah shows a distinctive theological profile in Greek that differs in significant ways from the Hebrew, reflecting the translation choices and possibly the theological interests of an Alexandrian Jewish translator of the second or third century BCE.

The question of LXX origins beyond the Pentateuch is complex and only partially resolved. The Letter of Aristeas, itself a literary fiction rather than a historical chronicle, provides no reliable information about the translation of the non-Pentateuchal books. The Prologue to Sirach (written ca. 132 BCE by the grandson of the book's author) provides evidence that by the late second century BCE, at least a working Greek version of 'the Law and the Prophets and the rest of the books' existed—though the quality and completeness of this translation varied considerably by book. The reconstruction of the Old Greek (OG)—the earliest recoverable layer of the LXX translation, prior to subsequent revisions—is itself a major scholarly enterprise, pursued most systematically through the Göttingen Septuagint critical edition project.

As Natalio Fernández Marcos observes in *The Septuagint in Context* (2000), the LXX became, within a few generations, not merely a translation tool for diaspora Jews who had lost

fluency in Hebrew, but a canonical scripture in its own right, revered and interpreted as the word of God by the Greek-speaking Jewish communities of Egypt, Asia Minor, and Greece. It was this Bible—not the Hebrew MT—that the earliest Christians inherited, read, preached from, and quoted in their foundational documents.

The LXX's canonical scope is broader than the MT. In addition to translating the books of the Hebrew Bible, the LXX tradition includes several books that have no Hebrew canonical equivalent: Tobit, Judith, 1–4 Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), Baruch, and expanded versions of Daniel and Esther. These books—termed 'deuterocanonical' in Catholic and Eastern Orthodox usage, and 'Apocrypha' in Protestant usage—were part of the Greek scriptural heritage of the early church and played a significant role in early Christian theology. Their exclusion from the Rabbinic Hebrew canon and their inclusion in the Greek Christian canon is itself a major dimension of the MT-LXX divergence, as analyzed in Chapter Eight.

The manuscript tradition of the LXX is enormously complex. The major uncial manuscripts —Codex Vaticanus (B, 4th century CE), Codex Sinaiticus (4 ,א th century CE), and Codex Alexandrinus (A, 5th century CE)—preserve the LXX text but in forms that have been subjected to centuries of transmission, revision, and cross-contamination with the MT. The textual criticism of the LXX—the reconstruction of the OG prior to these subsequent developments—requires navigating the Hexaplaric recension of Origen, the Lucianic recension, and the Hesychian recension, each of which reflects different revisional tendencies. The Göttingen Septuagint critical edition represents the most systematic attempt to reconstruct the OG through rigorous manuscript comparison.

## 1.3 The Question of the Vorlage

A central issue in the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible is the relationship between the LXX and its underlying Hebrew source—what scholars call its Vorlage (German: 'template' or 'exemplar'). For much of the history of biblical scholarship, scholars assumed that divergences between the LXX and MT were primarily the result of the translators' freedom, theological interests, or misreadings of a Hebrew text essentially identical to the MT. The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls permanently altered this assumption.

Emanuel Tov, in his landmark study 'The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts' (*JSOT* 31, 1985) and definitively in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2012), identifies three main categories of LXX divergence from the MT: (1) divergences explicable as translation technique—the translator's rendering choices without a different Hebrew Vorlage; (2) divergences reflecting a different but genuine Hebrew Vorlage—cases where the Greek reflects a Hebrew text different from the MT; and (3) secondary developments internal to the Greek transmission—errors, conflations, and revisions in the Greek manuscripts themselves. Tov's extensive research demonstrates that the second category is far more prevalent than previously assumed, and that the LXX preserves genuine ancient Hebrew textual traditions now lost in the MT tradition.

This finding has profound implications. It means that the LXX is not merely a translation but in significant respects an independent textual witness to the Hebrew Bible, and that in many cases where the LXX diverges from the MT, the LXX may preserve the older, more original reading. The methodological consequence is that textual critics must evaluate each MT-LXX divergence on its own terms, asking in each case: Does the Greek divergence reflect translation technique? Does it reflect a different Hebrew Vorlage? Is it a secondary development within the Greek tradition? No blanket answer is available; only case-by-case analysis can determine the likely explanation.

Sidnie White Crawford, in *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (2008), further complicates the picture by demonstrating that the compositional processes of the Second Temple period were fluid, and that what we call 'the biblical text' was in fact a moving target during this era. Crawford's analysis of texts like 4QReworked Pentateuch and the Temple Scroll shows that rewriting, expansion, and harmonization of scriptural texts were normal scribal activities in the Second Temple period, not aberrations. This means that what we perceive as MT-LXX 'divergences' were, in their original historical context, simply two streams within a larger, more varied textual tradition—a tradition that neither stream can claim to represent exhaustively.

The concept of the 'Vorlage' is therefore not a simple one. When scholars speak of 'the LXX Vorlage,' they mean the Hebrew text (or texts) from which the various LXX books were translated. But this text was not a single, uniform manuscript—it was itself a product of the same scribal transmission processes that produced all ancient manuscripts, subject to the same errors,

expansions, and harmonizations. Reconstructing the LXX Vorlage from the Greek translation —'retroversion,' in the technical terminology—is a hazardous undertaking, and different scholars have calibrated their confidence in retroversion differently. Tov's extensive methodological discussions of retroversion in his various works provide the most systematic guidance available.

### 1.4 Methodological Considerations in MT-LXX Comparison

Before proceeding to the detailed comparative analysis in the chapters that follow, several methodological principles require explicit articulation. First, this dissertation distinguishes carefully between the MT as a textual tradition and the MT as a theological authority. This study is not an exercise in confessional apologetics for either tradition. The goal is descriptive and historical: to understand what the differences are, where they came from, and what their consequences have been.

Second, following Tov's fundamental methodological principle, this dissertation evaluates each divergence individually rather than applying blanket judgments. The LXX is neither uniformly superior to nor uniformly inferior to the MT. In some books and passages, the LXX preserves older and more original readings; in others, the MT does; in still others, both traditions reflect secondary developments from an earlier stage now unrecoverable from any extant witness.

Third, this dissertation treats the Dead Sea Scrolls as an indispensable third-party witness throughout. Where the DSS align with the LXX against the MT, or with the MT against the LXX, or with neither, this triangulation provides crucial evidence for the antiquity and originality of various readings. Chapter Three provides the systematic foundation for this use of the DSS material.

Fourth, this dissertation is sensitive to the distinction between textual divergence and theological interpretation. Not every MT-LXX divergence has theological significance, and not every theologically significant divergence is rooted in a genuinely different textual tradition rather than in translation choices. The analysis in Chapter Seven is particularly attentive to this distinction.

Fifth and finally, this dissertation situates its textual analysis within the broader religious-historical questions addressed in Chapters Four and Eight. Textual criticism divorced from the history of reception is incomplete. The way the LXX was read, used, and eventually authorized by

the early church—and the way the MT was crystallized and authorized by Rabbinic Judaism—are as important to understand as the technical details of the divergences themselves.

# CHAPTER Two

# ANATOMY OF DIVERGENCE: TEXTUAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MT AND LXX

## 2.1 Categories of Divergence

The divergences between the MT and LXX range from minor lexical variations to substantial differences in length, content, and theological emphasis. Tov, following on the earlier analyses of Dominique Barthélemy and Shemaryahu Talmon, classifies these divergences into several major categories, each of which requires methodological care in its evaluation.

First are differences in length. The LXX of Jeremiah is approximately 14–17% shorter than the MT of Jeremiah, omitting passages that appear to be secondary expansions in the Hebrew tradition. Similarly, LXX Job is one-sixth shorter than MT Job—a substantial reduction that reflects either a shorter Hebrew Vorlage or a significantly abbreviating translation strategy, most likely the former. Conversely, LXX additions to Esther (the six 'Additions to Esther') and to Daniel (the Prayer of Azariah, the Song of the Three Young Men, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon) substantially expand those books beyond their MT counterparts. The nature of these additions—whether originally composed in Greek or translated from Semitic originals—is debated, but they are clearly part of the Greek canonical tradition.

Second are differences in arrangement and sequence. In Jeremiah, the 'Oracles Against the Nations' appear in chapters 46–51 of the MT but appear in the middle of the book (after chapter 25) in the LXX, and in a markedly different internal order. Similarly, Proverbs shows significant rearrangement between the MT and LXX versions, with entire sections appearing in different positions. These large-scale structural differences cannot plausibly be explained by translation technique; they must reflect different Hebrew Vorlagen or fundamentally different editorial decisions in the tradition.

Third are differences in individual readings—variants at the level of words, phrases, clauses, or sentences—where the Greek reflects a different Hebrew Vorlage from the MT. These may involve single letters (often the source of quite different words in Hebrew, given the consonantal nature of the script), different word division, different vocalization of the same

consonants, or genuinely different Hebrew words and phrases. This is the most extensive category of MT-LXX divergence and requires case-by-case analysis.

Fourth are harmonizations and expansions. Both the MT and the LXX tradition contain harmonizations—secondary assimilations of one passage to another—though the patterns differ. The LXX of Exodus and Numbers, for instance, contains expansions derived from Deuteronomy (and vice versa in the MT), reflecting competing harmonizing tendencies in the respective traditions. Tov's 1985 JSOT article on harmonizations remains the foundational analysis of this phenomenon, demonstrating that harmonization is a universal scribal tendency found across all textual traditions, not a distinctive feature of any single tradition.

Fifth, a category not always treated separately, are differences in theological profile—cases where the LXX and MT present not just different words but different theological orientations. These may arise from deliberate theological translation choices, from the translators' tendency to avoid anthropomorphic or polytheistic language in their rendering of the divine, or from the transmission of a Hebrew Vorlage that already embodied a different theological perspective than the MT. The analysis of Deuteronomy 32:8 in Chapter Three and the divine identity questions in Chapter Seven are particularly concerned with this fifth category.

## 2.2 The Book of Jeremiah: A Case Study in Divergent Editions

No single book better illustrates the complexity of MT-LXX divergence than Jeremiah. The difference between the MT and LXX versions of Jeremiah is so extensive that scholars now routinely speak of two distinct literary editions of the book. The MT edition is approximately 3,097 words longer than the LXX edition (Tov's count), and the two differ not only in length but in the arrangement of material, most dramatically in the placement of the Oracles Against the Nations.

For many decades, scholars assumed the LXX of Jeremiah was an abbreviation of a Hebrew text essentially identical to the MT. The discovery of Hebrew Jeremiah manuscripts at Qumran demolished this assumption. 4QJerb and 4QJerd, analyzed in detail by Emanuel Tov in 'The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran' (Revue de Qumran 14/54, 1989), align with the shorter LXX version of Jeremiah, preserving the shorter Hebrew Vorlage that underlies the Greek. This demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt that two Hebrew editions of Jeremiah existed in antiquity:

a shorter edition reflected in 4QJerb/d and the LXX Vorlage, and a longer, expanded edition reflected in the MT (and in 4QJera and 4QJerc, which align with the proto-MT tradition).

The scholarly consensus that has emerged from decades of post-Qumran research holds that the shorter LXX/4QJerb edition of Jeremiah is generally earlier, and that the longer MT edition represents a secondary expansion of the book, most likely by Deuteronomistic editors in the exilic or early post-exilic period. This does not mean the MT edition is 'inauthentic'—it represents a genuine and ancient editorial stage of the book's compositional history—but it does mean that the MT is not simply 'the original text' of Jeremiah, any more than the LXX edition is. Both are products of a compositional process that extended over centuries.

The theological implications of this divergence are considerable. The MT edition of Jeremiah develops the figure of Baruch son of Neriah (Jeremiah's scribe) more extensively, contains a richer Deuteronomistic theological framework, and presents a more systematically organized collection of oracles. The placement of the Oracles Against the Nations in chapters 46–51 of the MT—at the end of the book—gives the MT edition a different eschatological shape than the LXX edition, in which the Oracles appear in the middle (after chapter 25, at the climax of the 'cup of wrath' passage). These are not merely structural differences; they reflect different compositional theologies of history, judgment, and restoration.

Jack R. Lundbom's massive Anchor Bible commentary on Jeremiah (1999, 2004) engages extensively with the MT-LXX divergence, generally defending the priority of the MT while acknowledging the significance of the shorter LXX tradition. Andrew G. Shead's A Mouth Full of Fire (2012) examines the canonical dimensions of Jeremiah's two editions. The most systematic textual-critical treatment remains Tov's own work in the Jeremiah volume of the DJD series.

## 2.3 The Book of Samuel and the LXX Vorlage

The books of Samuel provide another instructive case, differing from Jeremiah in an important respect: here, the issue is not a radically shorter or longer edition but a different Hebrew text-form underlying the LXX that frequently preserves superior readings against a poorly transmitted MT.

The MT of 1–2 Samuel is widely regarded by textual critics as among the most poorly preserved books in the Hebrew Bible, exhibiting numerous corruptions, doublets, and difficulties.

The causes of this poor preservation are debated—some scholars attribute it to deliberate scribal alteration of narratives that depicted David unfavorably, others to the mechanical accidents of transmission—but the phenomenon itself is uncontested. The LXX of Samuel (particularly the Old Greek, as reconstructed from manuscripts such as Codex Vaticanus) and the Qumran Samuel manuscripts (4QSama, 4QSamb, 4QSamc) frequently preserve superior readings against the MT.

Frank Moore Cross, in his landmark article 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert' (*Harvard Theological Review* 57, 1964), and in the subsequent multi-decade Qumran Samuel project, demonstrated that 4QSama aligns frequently with the LXX against the MT, suggesting both reflect an ancient Palestinian textual tradition ('local text theory') distinct from the proto-MT tradition preserved in Babylonian Jewish scribal circles. 4QSama is particularly remarkable in this regard: it agrees with the LXX against the MT in passages where the LXX had previously been suspected of 'free translation,' demonstrating instead that the Greek was faithfully translating a different Hebrew text.

A celebrated example is found in 1 Samuel 17–18, the David and Goliath narrative. The MT contains a lengthy section (17:12–31; 17:55–18:5; 18:10–11, 17–19, 29b–30) that is absent from the LXX. 4QSama, unfortunately, is not preserved for this passage. The question of whether the MT represents a secondary expansion or the LXX represents an abbreviation is actively debated; Emanuel Tov, in his analysis, regards the LXX version as reflecting an earlier compositional stage.

The 4QSama scroll has also proven significant for the famous 'missing paragraph' at the beginning of 1 Samuel 11 (the Nahash the Ammonite narrative). 4QSama contains a passage before 1 Samuel 11:1 that provides essential context for the Ammonite attack, a passage that was missing from both the MT and the LXX but has since been confirmed in 4QSama. Josephus appears to have known this passage (Antiquities 6.68–71), suggesting it circulated in some form in the Second Temple period and was lost from the proto-MT and the LXX Vorlage at some stage of transmission.

## 2.4 Psalms, Proverbs, and the Poetic Books

In the Psalms, MT and LXX divergences tend to be less dramatically structural and more concentrated at the level of individual readings and theological emphases. The LXX Psalter is of

paramount importance for the history of Christian worship and liturgy—it is this text that the early church sang, prayed, and interpreted, and it is the Psalter text from which the New Testament most frequently quotes. The LXX Psalter also differs from the MT in its numbering system: the LXX combines MT Psalms 9 and 10 (as a single Psalm 9), and splits MT Psalm 147 (as LXX Psalms 146 and 147), resulting in a displacement of one between MT and LXX numbering for most of the Psalter.

Psalm 22:16 (22:17 MT) furnishes one of the most theologically charged examples: the MT reads כָּאֲרִי יָדַי וְרַגְלָי ('like a lion, my hands and my feet'), while the LXX reads ὤρυξαν χεῖράς μου καὶ πόδας ('they pierced my hands and my feet'). This difference has a long and contested history. The MT reading is difficult (the verb is lacking, giving a nominal clause, 'like a lion my hands and my feet'), and Christian tradition has read the LXX rendering as a messianic prophecy of crucifixion. The Hebrew word underlying the MT's כָּאֲרִי ('like a lion') versus the LXX's implied כָּארוּ ('they dug/pierced') represents a difference of a single final letter in the Hebrew consonantal text (yod versus vav/waw)—a variant that could easily arise from scribal confusion. Peter Flint's The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms (1997) notes that the relevant Qumran Psalms manuscripts do not definitively resolve this variant.

Psalm 40:6 (40:7 MT) presents another significant case. The MT reads אָזְנַיִם כָּרִיתָ לִי ('ears you have dug for me' or 'ears you have fashioned for me'), while the LXX reads σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι ('but a body you have prepared for me'). The LXX reading is quoted in Hebrews 10:5 and applied to the incarnation of Christ—a theological argument that depends entirely on the Greek text and that cannot be derived from the MT. The LXX's σῶμα ('body') represents either a very free rendering of the Hebrew אָזְנַיִם ('ears') or a different Hebrew Vorlage, possibly גּוּף ('body') or some similar reading. The theological consequence is clear: the Christological argument of Hebrews 10 is built on the Greek Bible.

The book of Proverbs exhibits one of the most remarkable structural divergences in the entire MT-LXX comparison. Not only do individual readings differ substantially, but entire sections appear in different positions. Proverbs 24:23–34 (MT) appears after 30:14 in the LXX; Proverbs 30:1–14 (MT) appears after 24:22; and so on. The reorganization is so extensive that some scholars have suggested the LXX translator of Proverbs had access to a Hebrew source organized differently from the MT, while others have argued the translator rearranged the material

deliberately. The LXX of Proverbs also tends to shorten proverbial sayings, smooth syntactic difficulties, and introduce more overtly theological emphases—making it a particularly complex case for Vorlage reconstruction.

### 2.5 The Book of Isaiah

Isaiah is particularly important for both the MT-LXX divergence question and for NT Christology. The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa-a) from Qumran, dating to approximately 125 BCE, is largely consistent with the MT of Isaiah, supporting the proto-MT tradition for this book. However, 1QIsa-a is not identical to the MT; it contains numerous orthographic and some textual variants, and its evidence must be assessed carefully. The LXX of Isaiah diverges from the MT in theologically significant ways, particularly in its use of κύριος (Lord) to render YHWH, and in several key passages that became foundational for Christian messianism.

Isaiah 7:14 is perhaps the single most consequential MT-LXX variant in all of scripture for Christian theology. The MT reads הִנֵּה הָעַלְמָה הָרָה וְיֹלֶדֶת בֵּן ('Behold, the young woman is pregnant and will bear a son'). The LXX renders this as ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἕξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν ('Behold, the virgin will conceive and bear a son'). The Hebrew עַלְמָה (almah) denotes a young woman of marriageable age, with no intrinsic implication of virginity. The LXX translators chose παρθένος (parthenos), which in classical Greek specifically means virgin. Matthew 1:23 quotes the LXX and applies it to the virgin birth of Jesus—a theological claim that stands or falls on the Greek word παρθένος, which the Hebrew text does not directly support.

The question of why the LXX translator(s) chose παρθένος for עַלְמָה in Isaiah 7:14 is a matter of ongoing scholarly debate. Some scholars argue that in the translator's dialect or period, παρθένος could refer to a young unmarried woman without strict implication of virginity. Others argue that the translator was making a deliberate theological interpretation, reading the passage eschatologically or messianically. Still others suggest the translator was influenced by the Hebrew word בְּתוּלָה (betulah), which more specifically means virgin, and which appeared in other contexts the translator associated with this passage. Joseph Lust, Robert Gagnon, and others have analyzed this question in detail, without achieving a consensus resolution.

Beyond Isaiah 7:14, the LXX of Isaiah exhibits a distinctive theological profile characterized by a heightened emphasis on divine transcendence, a more consistently monotheistic

rendering of passages that might otherwise suggest divine plurality, and a number of passages that read the text through the lens of Alexandrian Jewish theology of the Ptolemaic period. Johan Lust, Arie van der Kooij, and others have contributed substantially to the study of the LXX of Isaiah as a coherent theological document in its own right, not merely a translation of the Hebrew.

## 2.6 Implications for the Concept of an 'Original Text'

The evidence surveyed in this chapter—and the much larger body of evidence from which it is drawn—compels a fundamental reconsideration of the concept of an 'original text' of the Hebrew Bible. The question 'What did the original text say?' presupposes that there was a single, stable original text from which all subsequent variants derived. For most books of the Hebrew Bible, this presupposition is problematic, and for some books—Jeremiah and Proverbs most clearly—it is simply untenable.

Eugene Ulrich, in The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible (1999), proposes replacing the concept of an 'original text' with the concept of 'multiple literary editions'—successive stages of compositional development, each of which was 'the text' of the book for the community that used it in that stage. On this model, the shorter LXX edition of Jeremiah is not 'closer to the original' than the MT edition; both are literary editions in their own right, each reflecting a distinct stage of the book's compositional history.

Sidnie White Crawford's research reinforces Ulrich's model by demonstrating that the compositional processes evident in texts like 4QReworked Pentateuch and the Temple Scroll were not marginal or deviant but reflective of normal Second Temple scribal culture, in which authoritative texts were not fixed objects to be transmitted without change but living traditions to be interpreted, expanded, and reshaped in each generation.

The implications for this dissertation's argument are significant. If the MT and LXX represent different literary editions of some biblical books rather than a correct original and a deviant translation, then the question of which tradition is 'right' dissolves into a more historically nuanced question: which tradition was selected, by which community, for which reasons, with what consequences? It is precisely this question—the question of community-defining textual choices and their religious consequences—that the remainder of this dissertation pursues.

# CHAPTER Three

# THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS AND THE PLURALITY OF SECOND TEMPLE TEXTS

## 3.1 The Discovery and Its Significance

Between 1947 and 1956, a series of discoveries in the caves of Wadi Qumran on the northwest shore of the Dead Sea yielded the most significant cache of ancient manuscripts ever found in the modern era. The Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS)—comprising roughly 900 manuscripts in various states of preservation, dating from approximately the third century BCE to the first century CE—included fragments of every book of the Hebrew Bible except Esther, along with sectarian texts, pesharim (scriptural commentaries), legal codes, hymns, and apocalyptic works associated with a Jewish sectarian community (most likely Essene) that inhabited the site of Khirbet Qumran.

For the study of the textual history of the Hebrew Bible, the DSS are revolutionary. Prior to their discovery, the oldest complete Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible were the Aleppo Codex (ca. 930 CE) and the Leningrad Codex (1008–1009 CE)—Masoretic manuscripts separated from the ancient period by nearly a thousand years. The DSS pushed the manuscript tradition back to within two to three centuries of the compositional periods of many biblical books, and they revealed a textual landscape of remarkable plurality. They also revealed, crucially, that this plurality was not merely a matter of scribal error or minor variation but encompassed substantially different text-forms of some biblical books.

The significance of the DSS for understanding the relationship between the MT and LXX cannot be overstated. Before the DSS, scholars could only speculate about what the LXX Vorlage might have looked like. After the DSS, scholars could point to actual Hebrew manuscripts that aligned with the LXX against the MT, demonstrating concretely that the divergences between the two traditions were not simply the product of the translator's creativity but reflected genuine ancient textual plurality. The DSS transformed the debate over MT-LXX divergence from a speculative enterprise into an evidentially grounded one.

The community that preserved the DSS—most likely a branch of the Essene movement, though this identification is not universally accepted—was itself a sectarian group within Second Temple Judaism, and its library of scriptural manuscripts was not necessarily representative of

what circulated in Jerusalem or in the diaspora communities. The Qumran community preserved its own scriptural manuscripts alongside its own sectarian texts, and the composition of the library reflects the community's particular interests and textual heritage. Nevertheless, the breadth of the biblical manuscript evidence from Qumran—spanning virtually the entire Hebrew canon, in multiple copies, across multiple text-types—makes it the single most important body of evidence for the study of Second Temple Hebrew biblical manuscripts.

### 3.2 Tov's Classification of DSS Biblical Manuscripts

Emanuel Tov's foundational classification of the DSS biblical manuscripts, presented in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (1992; 3rd ed. 2012) and in his *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed. 1997), identifies five major text-types represented at Qumran. This classification, while subject to ongoing refinement and criticism, provides the most systematic framework currently available for analyzing the Qumran biblical manuscript evidence.

(1) Proto-Masoretic texts: Manuscripts aligning closely with the MT. Tov estimates that approximately 35–40% of the DSS biblical manuscripts fall into this category. These texts attest the antiquity of the proto-MT tradition and suggest it was already achieving some degree of authority in certain communities by the Second Temple period. The proto-MT text-type at Qumran is well represented across multiple books, including the Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa-a), several Psalms scrolls, and manuscripts of Genesis, Deuteronomy, and other books.

(2) Pre-Samaritan texts: Manuscripts aligning with the textual tradition represented in the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), characterized by extensive harmonizations, particularly between Exodus and Deuteronomy. Tov designates approximately 5% of the DSS biblical manuscripts as falling into this category. The significance of this classification is that it demonstrates the harmonizing textual tradition embodied in the SP existed in the Second Temple period as a Jewish (not specifically Samaritan) text-type, before the Samaritan community adopted it as its canonical scripture.

(3) Texts close to the LXX Vorlage: Manuscripts whose Hebrew text aligns with the underlying Hebrew source of the LXX. The most dramatic examples are 4QJerb and 4QJerd (Jeremiah) and 4QSama (Samuel). Tov estimates roughly 5% of DSS biblical manuscripts align with the LXX Vorlage. While this percentage appears small, the theological and historical

significance of these manuscripts is disproportionately large: they provide direct Hebrew evidence for the LXX Vorlage and demonstrate that the differences between the LXX and MT, in these books, reflect genuine ancient textual plurality rather than translation deviance.

(4) Non-aligned texts: The largest category—approximately 35–40% of DSS biblical manuscripts—do not align consistently with any known text-type. They show independent readings, mixed alignments, and unique variants. These texts attest the fluidity and plurality of the Second Temple textual tradition most dramatically. They are neither proto-MT, nor pre-Samaritan, nor LXX-aligned; they represent, in Tov's framework, the 'wild' and uncontrolled textual diversity of the period before standardization.

(5) Qumran practice texts: Approximately 20% of DSS biblical manuscripts exhibit a distinctive orthographic (spelling) style consistent with what Tov calls 'Qumran scribal practice'—featuring extensive use of vowel letters (matres lectionis) and other characteristic features. This orthographic style appears to be a product of the Qumran community's own scribal school rather than a different text-type per se, and manuscripts with this orthographic style can be found across all four of the substantive text-type categories.

This classification has been refined and debated by Eugene Ulrich in The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible (1999) and by Sidnie White Crawford in various studies. Crawford, following Ulrich, prefers to speak of 'multiple literary editions' of biblical books rather than simple text-types, emphasizing that the compositional process itself was still ongoing during the Second Temple period. Ulrich's concept of 'literary editions' is particularly illuminating for books like Jeremiah, where the MT and LXX represent not just text-types but distinct compositional stages of the book's literary development.

### 3.3 DSS and the MT: Key Divergences

The DSS illuminate numerous cases where the MT tradition exhibits secondary developments—expansions, harmonizations, theological corrections, or scribal errors—not present in older Hebrew traditions. Several of these cases are of central importance for understanding the relationship between the MT and LXX.

Deuteronomy 32:8 represents perhaps the most theologically significant case. The MT reads בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ('sons of Israel'), while 4QDeut-j reads בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים ('sons of God/gods') or a similar

reading, and the LXX reads κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ ('according to the number of the angels of God,' reflecting a Hebrew Vorlage with בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים or possibly בְּנֵי אֵל). The Qumran reading confirms that the LXX reflects a genuine ancient Hebrew tradition at this point, and that the MT's 'sons of Israel' is likely a later theological correction designed to avoid the polytheistic implications of 'sons of God' (the divine council).

Numbers 27:23 in the pre-Samaritan 4QNumb contains a lengthy harmonistic expansion absent from the MT, aligning the passage with Deuteronomy 3:21–22. This is a characteristic pre-Samaritan harmonization of the kind that makes the pre-Samaritan text-type immediately recognizable. In Deuteronomy itself, 4QDeut-n exhibits several readings that align with the LXX against the MT, providing confirmation of the LXX Vorlage.

The Psalms scrolls from Qumran present a particularly complex picture. The great Psalms scroll from Cave 11 (11QPsa) contains a collection of psalms in an order and composition different from the MT Psalter, including some psalms known from the LXX and other versions and some compositions not found in any previous source. Peter Flint's analysis of the Qumran Psalms evidence suggests that the order and composition of the Psalter was not yet fixed in the Second Temple period and that 11QPsa may reflect an alternate 'edition' of the Psalter, analogous to the alternate editions of Jeremiah in the MT and LXX. This conclusion is contested by Gerald Wilson and others, who regard 11QPsa as a liturgical anthology rather than an alternate scriptural Psalter.

### 3.4 Crawford on the Fluid Scriptural Landscape

Sidnie White Crawford's work is particularly valuable for understanding the compositional fluidity of the Second Temple scriptural corpus. Crawford's key insight, developed across a series of studies and most comprehensively in Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times (2008), is that the distinction between 'the biblical text' and 'biblical interpretation' was not as sharp in the Second Temple period as later canonical boundaries have led us to assume.

Crawford's analysis of 4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q158, 4Q364–367) demonstrates this point with particular force. 4QRP incorporates the Pentateuchal text alongside rearrangements, additions, and harmonizations in a way that makes it difficult to classify as either a 'biblical manuscript' or a 'rewritten scripture.' The community that produced and used 4QRP appears not to have experienced these categories as mutually exclusive. Crawford argues that 4QRP and similar

texts represent a stage in the scribal process before the stabilization of a fixed 'original text,' a stage in which scriptural texts were still fluid and subject to ongoing interpretive expansion.

Crawford's analysis of the Temple Scroll (11QT) reinforces this point. The Temple Scroll presents itself as a first-person divine speech—a direct revelation from God—which rewrites, systematizes, and expands the legal material of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. It does not quote these texts as external authorities; it subsumes and rewrites them. This indicates that the category of 'authoritative text' in the Second Temple period was more fluid than later religious traditions have generally acknowledged.

For the present dissertation, Crawford's scholarship has a specific implication: the 'parting of the ways' between Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity was not merely a divergence over the interpretation of a fixed common text; it was in part a divergence over which textual tradition would be selected, stabilized, and authorized as the basis for communal life and theological development. The two communities made different selections from a plural textual landscape, and their different selections generated different trajectories of religious development.

### 3.5 DSS, MT, and LXX: A Triangulation

Taken together, the DSS, MT, and LXX constitute a three-way triangulation of the Hebrew Bible's textual history. Where all three traditions agree, there is strong reason to regard the reading as ancient and stable—though even this inference must be made carefully, since convergent scribal tendencies can produce agreement through independent harmonization rather than preservation of an original reading. Where the DSS and LXX agree against the MT, there is strong reason to regard the MT reading as secondary—whether through theological revision, scribal harmonization, or other editorial processes. Where the MT and DSS agree against the LXX, there is reason to examine whether the LXX divergence reflects translation technique or a different (possibly superior, possibly secondary) Hebrew Vorlage.

This triangulation has been most systematically developed by Tov in The Septuagint as a Translation (various articles) and by Kristin De Troyer in Rewriting the Sacred Text (2003). The methodological insight is that no single manuscript tradition—not the MT, not the LXX, not any DSS witness—can be treated as categorically superior to the others. Each must be evaluated

reading by reading, with full attention to the history of the tradition and the characteristic features of the relevant scribal and translation communities.

The practical application of this triangulating method is illustrated at numerous points throughout the subsequent chapters of this dissertation. In each case where MT-LXX divergence has theological or hermeneutical significance, the DSS evidence—wherever it bears on the passage in question—is brought into the discussion. The DSS do not resolve every question, but they provide an irreplaceable third-party check on the arguments that can be made from the MT-LXX comparison alone.

# CHAPTER Four

# THE EARLY CHURCH AND THE SEPTUAGINT: QUOTATION AND HERMENEUTICS IN THE GREEK NEW TESTAMENT

## 4.1 The LXX as the Bible of the Early Church

The earliest Christians were, in their majority, Greek-speaking Jews and gentile God-fearers of the diaspora for whom the LXX was the scriptures. The apostolic communities that produced the New Testament documents did not, in the main, engage with the Hebrew Bible in its Hebrew form; they engaged with it in Greek. As Martin Hengel argued in The Septuagint as Christian Scripture (2002), the LXX was not a secondary scripture for the early church—it was the scripture, the authoritative word of God, read, sung, memorized, and interpreted in the lingua franca of the Roman Mediterranean.

The New Testament contains well over 300 explicit quotations from the Hebrew scriptures, along with hundreds of allusions. The overwhelming majority of these quotations follow the LXX rather than the MT. This is not a trivial observation. In many cases, the theological argument being made in the NT epistle or gospel depends precisely on the LXX wording and cannot be derived from the MT. The early church's Bible was the Greek Bible, and the theology of the early church was in significant measure a theology formed by the Greek Bible.

Timothy Michael Law's When God Spoke Greek (2013) provides a compelling popular account of this historical reality, while R. Timothy McLay's The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research (2003) provides the most systematic methodological treatment of NT quotation patterns. Both works confirm and elaborate the fundamental point: the LXX shaped early Christian thought in ways that the Hebrew MT did not and could not, simply because the early church's theologians—Paul, the authors of the Gospels, the author of Hebrews—were working in Greek with Greek scriptures.

## 4.2 Patterns of LXX Quotation in the New Testament

New Testament scholars have long analyzed the quotation practices of the various NT authors. The following patterns are well established in the scholarship and are of particular importance for understanding the relationship between LXX-based NT theology and the MT.

Matthew uses a mixed quotation strategy. Some of his 'fulfillment quotations' (formula quotations introduced by 'this was to fulfill what was spoken by the prophet') follow the LXX closely; others appear to be independent translations from the Hebrew or represent a different Greek textual tradition. Matthew 1:23 (Isaiah 7:14) follows the LXX παρθένος reading. Matthew 4:15–16 (Isaiah 8:23–9:1) is broadly LXX-based but with modifications. Scholars including Krister Stendahl (The School of St. Matthew, 1954) and Richard Beaton (Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel, 2002) have analyzed Matthew's quotation technique in detail, concluding that Matthew had access to multiple textual traditions and selected among them with theological deliberateness.

Paul is the most prolific quoter of the LXX in the NT. His letters contain over 90 explicit quotations from the Hebrew scriptures, the vast majority following the LXX. Crucially, Paul's theological arguments frequently depend on LXX-specific readings. In Romans 4:3, citing Genesis 15:6 (Ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην—'Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him as righteousness'), Paul's argument about faith and justification depends on the Greek λογίζεσθαι (reckon, impute)—a forensic accounting term that shapes his entire doctrine of justification. The Hebrew underlying this passage (Genesis 15:6: וַיַּחְשְׁבֶהָ לּוֹ צְדָקָה, 'and he counted it to him as righteousness') does support a similar reading, but the Greek terminological specificity is Paul's operating framework.

The Letter to the Hebrews is perhaps the NT document most thoroughly dependent on the LXX. As noted, Hebrews 10:5 quotes Psalm 40:6 in the LXX form ('a body you have prepared for me')—a reading that differs from the MT ('ears you have dug for me')—and builds an entire Christological argument on the bodily incarnation language of the Greek. Harold Attridge, in his Hermeneia commentary on Hebrews (1989), notes that the author of Hebrews consistently uses the LXX and that many of his exegetical moves would be impossible if he were working from the MT. The Hebrews author's sophisticated typological exegesis—Melchizedek, the Levitical priesthood, the tabernacle and its furnishings—is constructed entirely within the framework of LXX diction and LXX-specific readings.

The Gospel of Luke and Acts, almost certainly by the same author, consistently cite the LXX and often employ elevated 'Septuagintal Greek' style—mimicking LXX diction as a literary device to signal scriptural gravitas and continuity with Israel's scriptures. The birth narratives of

Luke 1–2 are particularly striking in this respect, composed in a Greek that self-consciously evokes the style of the LXX historical books, positioning the story of Jesus within the literary world of the Greek scriptures.

### 4.3 The Messianic Hermeneutic and the LXX

The early Christian reading of the LXX as a messianic document—a text that anticipated and prophesied the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth—was made possible in significant measure by features specific to the Greek translation. Several key texts illustrate this dynamic.

Isaiah 53 (the Suffering Servant passage) is quoted or alluded to across the NT in connection with the death of Jesus. The LXX rendering of Isaiah 53 generally follows the MT closely, but with subtle differences. LXX Isaiah 53:8 renders the MT's מִפֶּשַׁע עַמִּי נֶגַע לָמוֹ ('for the transgression of my people, a plague on them') as ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον ('because of the iniquities of my people, he was led to death')—a reading that specifies death explicitly and shifts the grammatical subject in ways that facilitate a christological reading. The 1QIsa-a scroll from Qumran is generally consistent with the MT at this point, suggesting the LXX's divergence reflects translation interpretation rather than a different Vorlage.

Zechariah 12:10 in the MT reads וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר-דָּקָרוּ ('and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced'). The LXX reads καὶ ἐπιβλέψονται πρός με ἀνθ᾽ ὧν κατωρχήσαντο ('and they shall look upon me, because they have mocked/danced over me')—a rendering that does not preserve the 'piercing' theme. Yet John 19:37 quotes a version of Zechariah 12:10 that reads ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν ('they shall look upon him whom they have pierced')—agreeing with the MT and against the standard LXX. This illustrates an important textual phenomenon: the NT sometimes follows the LXX, sometimes the MT (or an alternative Greek version), and sometimes an independent tradition, according to what best serves the Christological point being made.

Psalm 110 (109 LXX) is the psalm most frequently quoted in the NT, and its LXX form is essential to the NT's Christological argument. 'The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool' (LXX: Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου). The double κύριος—one referring to YHWH, the other to the Davidic figure—creates in Greek an identification that is more equivocal in the Hebrew, where YHWH is distinguished clearly from אֲדֹנִי ('my lord'). The NT's

Christological exegesis of this psalm (Matthew 22:44; Acts 2:34; Hebrews 1:13) exploits the semantic ambiguity of the Greek double κύριος in a way that would be less natural working from the Hebrew.

### 4.4 Patristic Awareness of LXX-MT Divergence

Several early church fathers were acutely aware of the differences between the LXX and the Hebrew text, and their responses illuminate the theological stakes of the textual choice. Origen of Alexandria (185–253 CE), the most prolific patristic biblical scholar, undertook the Hexapla—an extraordinary six-column edition of the Old Testament that placed, in parallel columns, the Hebrew text, a Greek transliteration, the translations of Aquila, Symmachus, the LXX, and Theodotion. Origen used diacritical marks borrowed from Alexandrian grammatical scholarship: the obelus (÷) to mark material in the LXX not in the Hebrew, and the asterisk (*) to mark material in the Hebrew not in the LXX. The Hexapla, though lost in its complete form (fragments survive in Origen's Hexaplaric LXX and in quotations), represents the first systematic comparative study of the LXX and its Hebrew Vorlage.

Origen's motivation in constructing the Hexapla was primarily apologetic: he needed to be able to engage effectively with Jewish scholars who read the Hebrew text, and he needed to understand where and why the LXX differed from the Hebrew. His approach, however, created an unforeseen problem: by marking LXX passages as additions (obelus) or absences (asterisk) relative to the Hebrew, Origen tacitly acknowledged the Hebrew as the standard against which the Greek was measured—a concession that would prove consequential in subsequent debates.

Jerome (347–420 CE), translator of the Latin Vulgate, went further. His Hebraica veritas ('Hebrew truth') principle led him to translate the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew—a controversial decision that provoked sharp criticism from Augustine of Hippo, who feared that abandoning the LXX would create confusion in the churches and disconnect Christianity from its received scriptural tradition. The famous exchange of letters between Augustine and Jerome (Epistles 71 and 82) constitutes one of the most important patristic discussions of the relative authority of the LXX and the Hebrew text. Augustine's defense of the LXX—and his claim that the LXX translators were divinely inspired—reflects the theological stakes of the MT-LXX debate: which text was the authoritative, God-given scripture?

Justin Martyr (ca. 100–165 CE) explicitly accuses Jewish teachers of tampering with the LXX to remove christological passages, citing as evidence Psalm 96:10 (LXX 95:10), which in some early Christian citations reads 'The Lord reigned from the wood' (ὁ κύριος ἐβασίλευσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου—a reference to the cross)—a phrase absent from the standard LXX and certainly from the MT. While Justin's accusation is historically implausible in this specific case, it reflects the deep Christian investment in the LXX as a christological document and the anxiety produced by Jewish scholars' rejection of LXX readings that did not appear in the Hebrew.

Irenaeus of Lyon (ca. 130–202 CE), in his extended refutation of Gnosticism (Adversus Haereses), devotes considerable attention to the LXX and its authority, arguing against those who would substitute a different translation. His defense of the LXX is simultaneously a defense of the church's received scriptural tradition against both Gnostic selectivism and Jewish-influenced proto-orthodox 'Hebraizing.' Irenaeus's work illustrates how the LXX had become, by the late second century CE, not merely a translation but a symbol of the church's identity and continuity with Israel's scriptures.

# CHAPTER Five

# THE MASORETES AND THE STANDARDIZATION OF THE HEBREW BIBLE

## 5.1 Who Were the Masoretes?

The Masoretes were professional Jewish scribal scholars who, beginning roughly in the fifth or sixth century CE and continuing through the tenth century, undertook the monumental task of preserving, annotating, and transmitting the received consonantal text of the Hebrew Bible with extraordinary precision. They worked primarily in two centers: Babylon (particularly Sura and Pumbedita) and Palestine (particularly Tiberias on the Sea of Galilee). Their name derives from the Hebrew masorah, 'tradition'—specifically the tradition of exact textual transmission.

The Masoretes inherited a consonantal text—the written Hebrew script in antiquity recorded only consonants, leaving vowels to be supplied by the reader from knowledge of the language and tradition. By the late antique period, with Hebrew increasingly a learned rather than a spoken language among Jews of the diaspora, there was genuine danger that the correct pronunciation—and therefore the correct understanding—of the text would be lost. The Masoretic project was, at its core, a project of crystallizing and perpetuating the oral reading tradition in written form.

It is important to understand what the Masoretes did not claim to do: they did not claim to recover a lost original text, to restore corrupted readings, or to exercise independent textual judgment. Their explicitly stated goal was to preserve and transmit the text exactly as they had received it—the textual tradition of the academies that preceded them. When they encountered divergences within their received tradition (as in the ketiv-qere apparatus), they preserved both the written form and the oral reading form rather than choosing between them. This conservative transmission ethos is one of the reasons the MT tradition exhibits such remarkable consistency across manuscripts from different centers and periods.

## 5.2 The Tiberian Vowel System

The most consequential technical achievement of the Masoretes was the development of a sophisticated system of vocalization marks—the niqqud—to indicate the vowels of the Hebrew text. Three rival systems were developed in the early medieval period: the Babylonian vocalization

system (supralinear—marks placed above the consonants), the Palestinian vocalization system (also supralinear but less fully developed), and the Tiberian vocalization system (sublinear—marks placed below the consonants, with some above and alongside). The Tiberian system, developed by the scribal academies of Tiberias, proved the most refined and ultimately the most authoritative, and it is the Tiberian system that appears in all standard Hebrew Bibles today.

The Tiberian vowel system is remarkably nuanced, distinguishing not only between the seven basic vowel qualities of Hebrew but also between long and short vowels, full and reduced vowels (sheva and the hateph vowels), and even metrical and pausal forms. The system was not invented wholesale but rather encoded a long-standing oral reading tradition—the tradition of the liturgical recitation of scripture in the synagogue. As Israel Yeivin demonstrates in Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah (1980), the vowel points do not simply indicate how Hebrew was pronounced in the tenth century CE; they attempt to preserve a much more ancient reading tradition, though they inevitably also reflect the historical development of Hebrew phonology and the particular theological and hermeneutical choices of the Tiberian Masoretes.

The theological significance of the vowel pointing system is often underappreciated. When the Masoretes added vowel points to the consonantal text, they were not merely recording phonology; they were encoding interpretation. The Hebrew consonantal text is inherently ambiguous in many places—the same sequence of consonants can be read with different vowels to produce very different words and meanings. By pointing the text, the Masoretes chose specific readings among the possibilities. In some cases, these choices had theological consequences: the particular vocalization of a divine epithet, the reading of a prophetic verb form as past, present, or future, the parsing of an ambiguous clause—all of these were decisions encoded in the pointing that shaped how readers would understand the text.

### 5.3 Cantillation Marks (Te'amim)

Alongside the vowel points, the Masoretes developed an elaborate system of cantillation marks—te'amim or 'accents'—that serve simultaneously as musical notation (indicating how the text is to be sung in liturgical recitation), as syntactic indicators (marking the major and minor divisions of each verse), and as semantic guides (indicating which words are to be grouped together and how clauses are to be parsed). The te'amim system is among the most sophisticated notation

systems in ancient manuscript culture, distinguishing some 28 different marks that interact with each other according to complex hierarchical rules.

The te'amim matter for textual criticism because they encode a specific interpretation of each verse's syntax and meaning. When the Tiberian Masoretes assigned cantillation marks, they were making interpretive decisions about how the text should be parsed and understood. In some cases, their syntactic interpretation encoded in the te'amim differs from the interpretation implied by ancient translations, including the LXX—which may in turn reflect a different reading of an ambiguous Hebrew phrase. The study of the te'amim as a source of evidence for ancient interpretation has been developed by Joshua Jacobson, William Wickes, and more recently by Benjamin Edidin Scolnic and others.

A notable example is found in the te'amim of Isaiah 40:3, which in the MT is parsed by the cantillation marks as 'A voice cries: In the wilderness prepare the way of the LORD,' while the LXX renders the same consonants as 'A voice of one crying in the wilderness: Prepare the way of the LORD.' The LXX parsing—which places 'in the wilderness' with the preparation of the way rather than with the crying voice—is the reading adopted by Mark 1:3 and the synoptic tradition in their application of this passage to John the Baptist. The te'amim of the MT parse the verse differently, and this difference matters for the NT's geographical and theological application of the passage.

### 5.4 The Masorah Parva and Masorah Magna

In addition to the vowel and cantillation systems, the Masoretes developed two bodies of textual annotations: the Masorah Parva (small Masorah), written in the margins alongside each page of text, and the Masorah Magna (large Masorah), written in the upper and lower margins. These annotations constitute a vast apparatus of textual statistics and cross-references designed to ensure accurate transmission.

The Masorah Parva notes such things as: how many times a given word or phrase appears in the entire Bible, whether a particular form appears only once (hapax legomenon), whether the written text (ketiv) differs from the traditional reading (qere), and other statistics designed to enable scribes to detect copying errors. The Masorah Magna provides more extended discussions of textual matters. Together, these annotations constitute a remarkable system of quality control for

manuscript transmission. Israel Yeivin's monograph on the Tiberian Masorah and Aron Dotan's edition and study of the Masorah of the Leningrad Codex provide the most comprehensive modern treatments of the Masorah apparatus.

The ketiv-qere apparatus deserves particular attention. In several hundred instances, the Masoretes identified a discrepancy between the written text (ketiv, 'what is written') and the traditional oral reading (qere, 'what is read'). In these cases, the consonants of the written text are preserved in the biblical text itself, while the vowels of the traditional reading are supplied by the pointing system, and a marginal note indicates the two forms. Some ketiv-qere pairs reflect ancient scribal errors or variant traditions; others reflect deliberate theological sensitivities—the most pervasive example being the substitution of Adonai for the divine name YHWH in liturgical reading, encoded in the pointing of the tetragrammaton with the vowels of Adonai.

## 5.5 The Process of Standardization

The standardization of the Hebrew Bible text was not a single event but a centuries-long process. Following the catastrophic defeats of 70 CE and 135 CE (the First and Second Jewish-Roman Wars), the destruction of the Temple, and the scattering of Jewish communities, Rabbinic Judaism undertook a massive cultural-religious consolidation. One component of this consolidation was the progressive authorization of a single Hebrew text-type—the proto-MT—at the expense of the textual plurality represented in the pre-70 CE period.

The scholar most responsible for illuminating this standardization process is Shemaryahu Talmon, who in 'The Old Testament Text' (in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1, ed. Ackroyd and Evans, 1970) argued that the plurality of pre-70 CE text-types was deliberately reduced in the post-70 period as part of Rabbinic Judaism's effort to define and stabilize its canonical heritage. Tov, building on Talmon's insights, suggests that the proto-MT tradition was already achieving dominance in certain circles by the turn of the era, and that the events of 70 CE accelerated rather than initiated this process.

The Greek versions of Aquila (ca. 130 CE), Symmachus (ca. 200 CE), and Theodotion represent the Jewish recension movement—efforts to produce Greek translations that aligned more closely with the emerging proto-MT standard, in response to Christian appropriation of the LXX. Dominique Barthélemy's landmark study Les devanciers d'Aquila (1963) traced the history of

these recensions and their relationship to the proto-MT tradition. The kaige recension—a systematic revision of various LXX books toward the proto-MT, apparently predating Aquila—is particularly important: it demonstrates that the impulse to align the Greek translation with the emerging Hebrew standard predates the rabbinic period proper and reflects broader trends in Second Temple Judaism.

# CHAPTER Six
# THE ALEPPO CODEX AND THE LENINGRAD CODEX

## 6.1 The Aleppo Codex (Keter Aram Tzova)

The Aleppo Codex, known in Hebrew as Keter Aram Tzova ('Crown of Aleppo'), is the oldest nearly complete manuscript of the Hebrew Bible to survive from antiquity. Written in Tiberias, Palestine, in approximately 930 CE, it represents the work of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher—the last and most authoritative of the Tiberian Masoretic dynasty. The consonantal text was copied by Solomon ben Buya'a, while Aaron ben Asher himself supplied the vowel points, cantillation marks, and Masorah annotations.

The Aleppo Codex achieved unparalleled authority in the medieval Jewish world. Maimonides (Rabbi Moses ben Maimon, 1135–1204 CE), the greatest medieval Jewish philosopher and legal authority, explicitly endorsed the Aleppo Codex as the most authoritative manuscript of the Hebrew Bible, stating in the Mishneh Torah (Laws of Torah Scrolls 8:4) that it was the codex upon which all should rely. This endorsement cemented the codex's status as the reference standard for the Hebrew Bible in subsequent centuries.

The Aleppo Codex has a tragic modern history. Following the United Nations partition vote in November 1947 and the subsequent violence against Jewish communities in Syria, the Aleppo Jewish community's synagogue was attacked and burned on December 2–3, 1947. The Aleppo Codex, stored in the synagogue's vault, survived the fire, but when the community subsequently smuggled the codex to Israel in the late 1950s, approximately 40% of the manuscript—including all of the Torah, most of the Former Prophets, and portions of the Latter Prophets—was missing, whether destroyed, lost, or hidden remains disputed to this day.

Today the Aleppo Codex is housed at the Israel Museum in Jerusalem, and efforts to locate the missing portions continue, including the investigative work of journalist Matti Friedman documented in The Aleppo Codex (2012). The missing portions of the Aleppo Codex represent an irreplaceable loss to biblical scholarship: since the Aleppo Codex is regarded as the single most authoritative witness to the Ben Asher Tiberian tradition, its lacunae must be filled by other witnesses, primarily the Leningrad Codex, whose relationship to the Ben Asher tradition is slightly less direct.

The Hebrew University Bible Project (HUBP), led by Moshe Goshen-Gottstein and continued subsequently, used the Aleppo Codex as the base text for its critical edition of the Hebrew Bible (Hebrew University Bible), supplementing it where text is missing with the Leningrad Codex. The HUBP apparatus includes a comprehensive set of variant readings from the DSS, the LXX, the Peshitta (Syriac), the Targums, and the Vulgate, making it the most comprehensive critical apparatus for the Hebrew Bible currently available—though the project remains incomplete, with only several books published to date.

Scholars who have worked most extensively with the Aleppo Codex include Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, whose facsimile edition and study (1976) remains fundamental; Aron Dotan, whose work on the Masorah of the Leningrad Codex provides comparative context; and more recently Michael Lyons and the team of the Leningrad Codex project at the Westminster Theological Seminary. Menahem Cohen's Mikra'ot Gedolot HaKeter ('The Big Bible'), a new rabbinic Bible based on the Aleppo Codex, represents the most ambitious effort to reconstruct the full text of the Aleppo Codex by careful comparison with other Ben Asher tradition manuscripts.

## 6.2 The Leningrad Codex (Codex Leningradensis)

The Leningrad Codex (formally Codex Leningradensis, now housed in the Russian National Library in Saint Petersburg—formerly Leningrad) is the oldest complete manuscript of the Hebrew Bible. Dated to 1008–1009 CE by a colophon in the manuscript itself, it was copied by Samuel ben Jacob and explicitly states that it was vocalized and annotated according to the tradition of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher—the same Tiberian Masoretic tradition as the Aleppo Codex.

Unlike the Aleppo Codex, the Leningrad Codex is intact and complete. For this reason, it has served as the base text for the two most widely used modern critical Hebrew Bibles: Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS, 1967–1977, edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph) and the ongoing Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ, 2004–present). BHS in particular has been the standard reference text for Hebrew Bible scholarship for over half a century, used in seminaries, universities, and research institutions worldwide. Its critical apparatus provides variant readings from the ancient versions (LXX, Peshitta, Vulgate, Targums) and the DSS.

The relationship between the Aleppo and Leningrad Codices is one of general agreement with occasional divergence. Both represent the Ben Asher Tiberian tradition, and both are authoritative witnesses to the Masoretic Text. Where they diverge, the Aleppo Codex is generally preferred as the more authoritative (because it was directly prepared by Aaron ben Asher himself), but since the Aleppo Codex is incomplete, the Leningrad Codex remains indispensable. The study of the specific differences between the two codices has been systematically undertaken by scholars including Aron Dotan and Paul Sanders.

## 6.3 The Ben Asher Tradition and Its Rivals

The Ben Asher family of Tiberian Masoretes had a rival: the Ben Naftali tradition, also based in Tiberias, which differed from Ben Asher in hundreds of small but consistent ways—primarily in the placement of certain accent marks and in a number of vowel pointings. The differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali are documented in a medieval list (the 'Differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naftali') and were analyzed by Paul Kahle in Cairo Geniza (1947). With the authentication and acceptance of the Aleppo Codex as the definitive Ben Asher standard, the Ben Asher tradition prevailed completely, and Ben Naftali readings survive only as a curiosity in the textual apparatus.

The victory of Ben Asher over Ben Naftali is itself a reminder that what we call 'the Masoretic Text' represents a specific choice among competing Masoretic traditions—a choice that, while historically well-grounded and carefully transmitted, is not equivalent to 'the original text of the Hebrew Bible' in any simple sense. The MT is the text of Rabbinic Judaism as finalized by one school of medieval Jewish scholarship, and it must be evaluated as such—authoritative within its tradition, but not the unchallenged ancestor of all ancient textual traditions.

## 6.4 Modern Critical Editions and the Ongoing Project

Biblia Hebraica Quinta (BHQ), the successor to BHS, represents the current state of the art in Hebrew Bible critical editing. Using the Leningrad Codex as its base text while consulting the Aleppo Codex where available, BHQ provides a substantially revised critical apparatus that incorporates decades of advances in DSS scholarship, Septuagintal research, and ancient versional studies. The general editors (Adrian Schenker et al.) have followed a more conservative text-

critical method than BHS, avoiding conjectural emendation and providing more extensive discussion of variant readings in accompanying commentary fascicles.

The ongoing critical edition of the LXX—the Göttingen Septuagint (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum)—provides the critical apparatus for the Greek side of the comparison, reconstructing the 'Old Greek' (the earliest recoverable Greek translation) beneath centuries of manuscript transmission and recensional activity. Together, BHQ and the Göttingen LXX constitute the twin pillars of modern Hebrew Bible textual criticism. The comparison of these two critical editions—each representing the best current reconstruction of its respective tradition—is the scientific foundation upon which the textual analysis of this dissertation rests.

# CHAPTER Seven

# THEOLOGICAL DIVERGENCE: HOW TEXTUAL VARIANTS SHAPE DOCTRINE

## 7.1 Divine Identity and the Name of God

One of the most theologically consequential features of the LXX is its systematic rendering of the divine name YHWH (the tetragrammaton) as κύριος (kyrios, 'Lord'). This practice—reflected in the vast majority of LXX manuscripts—has been a matter of considerable scholarly debate. Albert Pietersma and others have argued that the original LXX may have retained some form of the divine name (either in Hebrew letters or in a Greek transcription), and that the systematic substitution of κύριος is a secondary development in the Greek transmission. Martin Rösel and others maintain that the κύριος rendering goes back to the original translators. The question is not yet resolved, and the evidence of Greek Jewish manuscripts from the pre-Christian period—particularly several papyrus fragments that use a transliteration or the Hebrew tetragrammaton—complicates the picture.

Regardless of its origin, the κύριος rendering had profound theological consequences. In the New Testament, κύριος is the primary title applied to Jesus of Nazareth following his resurrection: 'Jesus is Lord' (κύριος Ἰησοῦς, Romans 10:9; 1 Corinthians 12:3) is arguably the earliest Christian confessional formula. Because the LXX had already established κύριος as the divine name—the name of the God of Israel—early Christian application of this title to Jesus carried the implicit freight of divine identity. NT authors, most explicitly in Philippians 2:9–11 (the Carmen Christi), directly apply to Jesus the language of Isaiah 45:23 LXX (a passage in which YHWH/κύριος swears that every knee will bow to him), effectively identifying Jesus with the God of Israel in a way that is inseparable from the LXX's substitution of κύριος for YHWH.

This 'Kyrios Christology'—the theological identification of Jesus as the divine κύριος of the LXX—is, in an important sense, a specifically Greek-Bible theology. It depends on the LXX's κύριος rendering in ways that would be far less natural if one were reasoning from the Hebrew YHWH. Rabbinic Judaism, reasoning from the Hebrew text, maintained the absolute transcendence and uniqueness of YHWH and rejected any identification of YHWH with a human being as blasphemy. The charge of blasphemy recorded in the Passion narratives (John 10:33: 'for blasphemy; because you, being a man, make yourself God') represents, at the level of historical

plausibility, a Rabbinic-oriented Jewish response to exactly the kind of divine identification that the LXX κύριος Christology made possible.

The scholarly literature on divine identity in early Christology is substantial. Larry Hurtado's Lord Jesus Christ (2003) and Richard Bauckham's God Crucified (1998) represent important contributions that situate the development of high Christology within Jewish monotheism; both scholars attend to the LXX as a crucial context. Chris Tilling's Paul's Divine Christology (2012) analyzes Paul's use of kyrios language in relation to the LXX systematically. These works collectively support the claim that LXX κύριος theology was not a secondary Hellenistic importation into an originally non-divine Christology but was present from the earliest stages of the Jesus movement, enabled by the LXX's identification of YHWH as κύριος.

## 7.2 The Virgin Birth and Isaiah 7:14

We have already discussed Isaiah 7:14 in Chapter Two, but its theological significance warrants extended treatment here. Matthew 1:23 introduces the birth of Jesus with the formula: Behold, the virgin (he parthenos) shall conceive and bear a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel. This is a direct quotation from LXX Isaiah 7:14.

The MT reads עַלְמָה (almah)—a young woman of marriageable age. The LXX rendered this as παρθένος (parthenos)—virgin. The doctrine of the virgin birth as a fulfillment of prophetic scripture depends entirely on the LXX rendering. The Hebrew text, as read in the Rabbinic tradition, refers to a young woman in Isaiah's own context, giving birth to a child as a sign for the eighth-century BCE king Ahaz. Rabbinic exegesis has consistently rejected the virgin birth interpretation, pointing to the Hebrew almah, which does not require virginity. The divergence between παρθένος and עַלְמָה thus encapsulates a major theological divide: the Christian doctrine of the virgin birth is a doctrine of the LXX, not of the MT.

The historical-critical question of what Isaiah 7:14 'originally meant' in its eighth-century BCE context is separate from the question of what Matthew understood it to mean in his first-century CE Christological application. Matthew was reading the LXX, and the LXX said παρθένος. For Matthew, this was sufficient. Whether Isaiah 'intended' to prophesy a virgin birth is a question about the historical meaning of the eighth-century text; whether Matthew found prophetic warrant in the LXX for the tradition of Jesus's virginal conception is a question about

first-century CE hermeneutics. The two questions must be kept distinct, though both are historically and theologically significant.

It is worth noting that the Targum of Isaiah—the Aramaic translation of the book—does not render Isaiah 7:14 in a way that emphasizes virginity, rendering עַלְמָה as עוּלֵימְתָּא ('young woman') without any additional implication. The Peshitta (Syriac translation) similarly renders with a term that may mean either young woman or virgin, depending on context. These versional witnesses confirm the LXX's παρθένος as an interpretive choice among several available possibilities.

### 7.3 The Suffering Servant and Atonement Theology

Isaiah 52:13–53:12 (the 'Suffering Servant Song') is the Old Testament passage most extensively applied to Jesus in the New Testament and in subsequent Christian theology. The passage is central to Paul's atonement theology (Romans 4:25; 1 Corinthians 15:3; cf. Isaiah 53:5), to the Passion narratives (Luke 22:37, quoting Isaiah 53:12), and to Peter's preaching (1 Peter 2:22–25, quoting Isaiah 53:4, 5, 9). Understanding how the LXX renders this passage—and how its rendering differs from the MT—is essential to understanding the atonement theology of the early church.

The LXX of Isaiah 53 generally follows the MT closely, but with consistent shifts in emphasis that are theologically significant. LXX Isaiah 53:10 reads, in part, 'the Lord desires to cleanse him from his wound' (κύριος βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς)—a rendering that shifts the emphasis from the MT's 'it pleased the LORD to crush him' (וַיהוָה חָפֵץ דַּכְּאוֹ הֶחֱלִי). The MT's language of YHWH's pleasure in the servant's crushing is stark and has been theologically and ethically challenging throughout the tradition; the LXX somewhat softens and reframes this language. Such shifts, while individually subtle, cumulatively contribute to a somewhat different profile of the Servant figure in Greek than in Hebrew.

LXX Isaiah 53:4 renders the MT's נָשָׂא חֳלָיֵנוּ ('he bore our infirmities/diseases') as οὗτος τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει ('this one bears our sins')—replacing 'infirmities/diseases' with 'sins.' Matthew 8:17 quotes Isaiah 53:4 in a form closer to the MT than the LXX, applying the 'bearing of infirmities' to Jesus's healing miracles: 'He took our infirmities and bore our diseases.' This unusual case of the NT following the MT against the LXX illustrates the complexity of the NT's quotation practices and the diversity of interpretive possibilities available from the two traditions.

## 7.4 Monotheism, the Divine Council, and the 'Sons of God'

Deuteronomy 32:8–9 is, as noted in Chapter Three, one of the most theologically significant MT-LXX-DSS divergences. The passage describes God's primordial distribution of the nations:

> MT: 'When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he divided mankind, he fixed the borders of the peoples according to the number of the sons of Israel (בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל).'
>
> LXX / 4QDeut-j: 'When the Most High gave to the nations their inheritance, when he divided mankind, he fixed the borders of the peoples according to the number of the angels of God (κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ / בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים).'

The MT's 'sons of Israel' is almost certainly a secondary theological correction of the earlier 'sons of God' / 'sons of El' reading, confirmed by 4QDeut-j and reflected in the LXX. The 'sons of God' reading implies a divine council—a hierarchy of divine beings over whom YHWH is supreme and to whom the other nations are assigned—a theological concept thoroughly at home in ancient Near Eastern religion and in early Israelite religion but increasingly problematic for strict monotheism.

Mark Smith's The Origins of Biblical Monotheism (2001) and Michael Heiser's extensive studies of this passage (Bibliotheca Sacra 158, 2001, and The Unseen Realm, 2015) have demonstrated persuasively that the 'sons of God' reading preserves an ancient Israelite theology of the divine council in which YHWH rules over a hierarchy of divine beings, with each nation assigned to one of these beings while Israel is YHWH's own portion (Deut. 32:9). The MT's correction of this to 'sons of Israel' represents a later, more strictly monotheistic theological revision, almost certainly from the post-exilic period.

The theological consequences for both Judaism and Christianity are significant. Within Second Temple Judaism, the divine council concept survived robustly in apocalyptic literature (Daniel 7, 1 Enoch, the Dead Sea Scrolls), and some scholars argue that a 'divine council worldview' underlies much of the NT's Christology, which exalts Jesus to a unique position within the divine hierarchy. Rabbinic Judaism, reading the MT's 'sons of Israel,' moved decisively away from any conception of a populated divine council, reinforcing the strict monotheism that became the hallmark of medieval Jewish thought and that continues to define Orthodox Jewish theology to the present.

### 7.5 Eschatology and Psalm 110

Psalm 110 (109 LXX)—the psalm most frequently quoted in the NT—opens in the MT: נְאֻם יְהוָה לַאדֹנִי ('The oracle of YHWH to my lord: Sit at my right hand...'). The LXX renders: Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου ('The Lord said to my Lord: Sit at my right hand...'). The LXX rendering with two instances of κύριος—one referring to YHWH, the other to the Davidic figure—set the stage for the NT's Christological exegesis (Matthew 22:44; Acts 2:34; Hebrews 1:13), in which the 'lord' addressed by YHWH is identified with Jesus.

The Masoretic distinction between YHWH (God's name) and אֲדֹנִי (my lord, a human or divine being) is preserved in Hebrew but collapsed in the LXX's uniform κύριος, making the Christological identification more immediate in the Greek. Rabbinic tradition reads the psalm as referring to Abraham (b. Sanhedrin 108b) or to David himself, without any messianic or divine identification of the 'lord' addressed. The NT's argument that 'David calls him Lord' (Matthew 22:45) and therefore the Messiah must be more than David's son—an argument that depends on the κύριος/κύριος identification in the Greek—is unavailable from the MT, where the distinction between YHWH and אֲדֹנִי makes the Christological inference less direct.

# CHAPTER Eight

# THE PARTING OF THE WAYS: MT, LXX, AND THE BIFURCATION OF JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

## 8.1 The Scholarly Concept of the 'Parting of the Ways'

The phrase 'the parting of the ways'—popularized by James D. G. Dunn in the collection of essays he edited under that title (The Parting of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity, 1991)—refers to the complex, gradual process by which Christianity and Rabbinic Judaism separated from their shared Second Temple Jewish matrix into two distinct religions with incompatible theologies, practices, and scriptures. The precise dating, geography, and mechanisms of this parting remain vigorously debated. Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed's edited volume The Ways that Never Parted (2003) challenged Dunn's framework by arguing that the separation was later, more complex, and more regionally varied than the 'parting' metaphor suggests.

What has received less attention in the 'parting of the ways' scholarship than it deserves is the role of the textual bifurcation—the choice of the LXX by the church versus the choice of the MT by Rabbinic Judaism—as a constitutive factor in the religious separation. This chapter argues that the divergent canonical scriptures were not merely a symptom of the parting of the ways but were among its active causes: the two communities read different Bibles, and those different Bibles generated different theologies, which in turn generated different religious identities.

The relationship between canonical text and community identity is well established in the scholarship of religion. Jonathan Z. Smith's Map is Not Territory (1978) and Wilfred Cantwell Smith's What is Scripture? (1993) have theorized the role of scripture as a community-constituting artifact. More recently, Timothy Lim's The Formation of the Jewish Canon (2013) and Lee Martin McDonald's The Biblical Canon: Its Origin, Transmission, and Authority (2007) have addressed the specific dynamics of Jewish and Christian canon formation. This dissertation draws on these theoretical resources while contributing a dimension that has been underemphasized: the specifically textual—not merely canonical—dimension of the bifurcation.

## 8.2 The Jewish Rejection of the LXX

There is strong evidence that the LXX was, in the Second Temple period, a respected Jewish text used widely among Greek-speaking diaspora Jews. Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 BCE – 50 CE) treated the LXX as divinely inspired, equal in authority to the Hebrew text, and composed his entire philosophical-theological corpus as an interpretation of the LXX Pentateuch. The Letter of Aristeas celebrated the LXX's production as a miracle of divine providence. The LXX Psalms and Isaiah were apparently read in synagogues of the Greek diaspora.

This situation changed dramatically in the first and second centuries CE, as the LXX became increasingly identified with Christian exegesis. As the church appropriated the LXX as a specifically Christian text—arguing that it prophesied Jesus, that its κύριος referred to Jesus, that its παρθένος in Isaiah 7:14 proved the virgin birth—Rabbinic Judaism distanced itself from the LXX and reoriented itself toward the Hebrew text. The Talmudic tradition (b. Megillah 9a) records the production of the LXX as a tragedy, comparing the day of its completion to the day the Golden Calf was made—a remarkable reversal of Philo's celebration of the LXX as divine inspiration.

The Jewish recensions that followed—Aquila (ca. 130 CE), Symmachus (ca. 200 CE), and Theodotion (perhaps earlier, revised ca. 150–200 CE)—represent a systematic effort to produce Greek translations that would align with the emerging Masoretic standard and undercut the Christian use of the LXX. Aquila's translation, in particular, is notoriously literal to the point of unreadability, translating even the Hebrew particle et (the accusative marker) with the Greek σύν—a rendering designed to achieve maximal correspondence with every element of the Hebrew text. The motivation was explicitly anti-Christian: if the LXX's παρθένος could be used to argue for a virgin birth, Aquila would provide a translation (νεᾶνις, 'young woman') that closed that interpretive door.

The withdrawal of Jewish authorization from the LXX is one of the most consequential moments in the textual history of the Bible. Once Jews ceased to regard the LXX as their scripture and replaced it with translations aligned with the proto-MT, the LXX became exclusively a Christian text—a text whose authority rested on Christian tradition and Christian interpretation. This exclusive Christian ownership of the LXX further reinforced its distance from the Jewish community and made any subsequent conversation about the relative authority of the LXX and the Hebrew MT a conversation conducted across a deep religious divide.

## 8.3 Origen, Jerome, and the Question of Hebrew Truth

The debate between the LXX and the Hebrew text as the authoritative Christian Old Testament was not resolved quickly, and the Christian community's internal controversy over this question is itself an important chapter in the history of the parting of the ways. Origen's Hexapla represented an attempt to hold both in view simultaneously—to understand the LXX in light of the Hebrew while preserving the LXX as the church's received text. Origen's concern was partly practical: he needed to engage in biblical debate with Jewish scholars who used the Hebrew text, and he needed his congregation to understand where the LXX agreed with and diverged from the Hebrew. But Origen's approach also carried an implicit admission: the Hebrew text was the standard against which the Greek was measured.

Jerome's Hebraica Veritas principle represented a more radical choice: the Hebrew truth, not the Greek translation, was the standard. Jerome's Vulgate Old Testament, translated from the Hebrew ca. 390–405 CE, moved the Latin-speaking Western church closer to the MT tradition—though Jerome retained some LXX and Old Latin influences, particularly in the Psalms. The Psalterium Gallicanum, his revision of the Old Latin Psalter based on Origen's Hexaplaric LXX, remained in liturgical use in the Roman Rite until the twentieth century, even after Jerome had produced a fresh translation of the Psalms from the Hebrew (the Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos).

Augustine's objection to Jerome's Hebraica Veritas program deserves close attention. In Epistle 71 (to Jerome), Augustine argued that diverging from the LXX would cause confusion among communities that had long used the Greek text, would imply that the apostles and evangelists had been wrong to use the LXX, and—most tellingly—would effectively place the church's scriptural authority in the hands of Jewish scholars who possessed the Hebrew text. Augustine's concern encapsulates the ecclesiological stakes of the textual choice: to follow the Hebrew against the LXX was to acknowledge, however implicitly, that the Jewish textual tradition had preserved something the church had lost.

## 8.4 The Canonical Boundary and the Deuterocanon

The MT tradition (via Rabbinic Judaism and Jerome's canon) excluded the deuterocanonical books—Tobit, Judith, 1–2 Maccabees, Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, and the additions to Daniel and Esther—as lacking Hebrew originals and therefore lacking canonical

authority. The LXX tradition, as received by the Greek-speaking church and subsequently by the Latin-speaking church (partially through the Vulgate's inclusion of these books), included the deuterocanonical books as scripture.

The theological importance of the deuterocanonical books for early Christian theology is substantial. The Wisdom of Solomon, with its robust Logos theology (Wisdom 7:22–30; 9:1–4) and its meditation on the suffering of the righteous (Wisdom 2:12–20; 4:7–15), provided crucial conceptual resources for early Christology and for the interpretation of Jesus's passion. Second Maccabees, with its explicit affirmation of bodily resurrection (2 Macc. 7:9, 11, 14, 23), contributed to the development of Jewish-Christian resurrection theology. These books were part of the LXX canon that the early church received and used; their absence from the MT canon meant that Rabbinic Judaism developed its theology without this particular body of literature.

The Protestant Reformation's return to the Hebraica Veritas principle—Martin Luther's translation of the Old Testament was based on the Hebrew text—aligned Protestant biblical authority with the MT canon, excluding the deuterocanonicals (which Luther designated 'Apocrypha,' readable but not canonical). The Catholic Church, at the Council of Trent (1546), formally defined the deuterocanonical books as canonical, essentially reaffirming the LXX canon over against the Reformers' Hebrew canon. This canonical divergence between Catholic and Protestant Christianity—itself a consequence of the MT-LXX divergence—persists to the present day, representing a continuing practical legacy of the ancient textual bifurcation.

Eastern Orthodoxy, heir to the Greek-speaking church, retained the LXX as its authoritative Old Testament and to this day celebrates a liturgy largely shaped by LXX texts. The theological profile of Eastern Orthodox Christianity—including its more robust use of the Psalms (in the LXX numbering), its inclusion of the deuterocanonical Wisdom literature, and its distinctive eschatology—is partly a function of its LXX textual heritage. The ongoing intra-Christian divergences between Orthodox, Catholic, and Protestant traditions over the canonical scope of the Old Testament are, at root, a continuing echo of the ancient choice between the LXX and the Hebrew Bible.

# CONCLUSION: TWO BIBLES, TWO RELIGIONS

The argument of this dissertation may now be stated in its fullest form. The divergence between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint is not merely a philological curiosity—a puzzle for text critics and translators. It is, in a profound and underappreciated sense, one of the generative conditions of the two great religions that emerged from Second Temple Judaism: Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity. Two different Bibles produced, in significant measure, two different religions.

The mechanism of this divergence-driven bifurcation operated at several levels simultaneously. At the level of prophetic interpretation, the LXX's rendering of key passages—παρθένος in Isaiah 7:14, the 'body' of Psalm 40:6, the κύριος of Psalm 110—provided the early church with a Greek scriptural basis for Christological claims that the Hebrew text, as read in the Rabbinic tradition, did not support. The virgin birth, the incarnation, the suffering atonement, the divine Lordship of Jesus—these doctrines were not invented by the NT authors without scriptural warrant; they were developed in dialogue with a Greek Bible that seemed, to those who read it in the light of Jesus's life and death, to speak of him on every page.

At the level of divine identity, the LXX's κύριος theology—the identification of YHWH as κύριος—provided a terminological bridge by which early Christians could identify Jesus with the God of Israel. The κύριος Christology of Paul and the NT is inseparable from the LXX's translation choice. Rabbinic Judaism, reading the Hebrew text with YHWH in its proper place and human figures designated by distinct titles, found no such bridge and could only regard the Christian identification of a crucified man with YHWH as blasphemy—a judgment that was not a failure of theological imagination but a perfectly logical reading of the Hebrew text.

At the level of canon, the LXX's inclusion of the deuterocanonical books gave the church access to a body of theological literature—the Wisdom of Solomon, with its robust Logos theology and its personification of Wisdom; 2 Maccabees, with its explicit affirmations of bodily resurrection; Sirach, with its extensive Wisdom Christology—that enriched and developed the theological vocabulary available to NT authors and the early church Fathers. Rabbinic Judaism's exclusion of these books from the canonical Hebrew Bible meant that it developed its theology without this additional literature.

At the level of the standardization process itself, the Masoretes' achievement in the Aleppo and Leningrad Codices was not merely a scribal accomplishment—it was a theological-religious act. By fixing the vowel points, the cantillation marks, the Masorah, and the ketiv-qere apparatus, the Masoretes crystallized a specific reading of the Hebrew Bible—specific theological interpretations encoded in the very vocalization and syntactic parsing of the text. When the MT reads בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל ('sons of Israel') in Deuteronomy 32:8 where the DSS and LXX read 'sons of God,' that is not a neutral scribal decision; it is a theological statement about the nature of YHWH's relationship to the nations, one that steered Rabbinic Judaism away from the divine council theology that had flourished in Second Temple Judaism and toward the strict monotheism that became the hallmark of medieval Jewish thought.

The witness of the Dead Sea Scrolls has been indispensable for understanding the full picture. The DSS reveal that in the Second Temple period—the very period in which both Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity were taking shape—no single, authoritative Hebrew text of the Bible existed. Multiple textual traditions circulated simultaneously, with different communities privileging different text-types. The proto-MT tradition was one strand among many. The LXX Vorlage tradition was another. The pre-Samaritan harmonizing tradition was a third. And a host of non-aligned manuscripts attested to a still wider range of textual diversity. Both Rabbinic Judaism's eventual privileging of the proto-MT and Christianity's eventual embrace of the LXX as its Old Testament represented choices—historically conditioned, community-defining choices—within this originally plural textual landscape.

Sidnie White Crawford's scholarship on the fluidity of Second Temple scriptural composition reinforces this point: the very concept of a singular, fixed 'biblical text' is a post-Second Temple retrojection. Both communities—Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity—selected their Bibles from a plural tradition, and in selecting their Bibles, they selected their theologies and ultimately their identities.

Emanuel Tov's textual-critical project, across decades of meticulous scholarship, has demonstrated that the LXX must be taken seriously not merely as a translation but as an independent textual witness reflecting genuinely ancient Hebrew traditions—traditions that in many cases predate and challenge the authority of the proto-MT. This finding does not undermine

either Jewish or Christian scripture; rather, it enriches our understanding of both by revealing the depth and complexity of the tradition from which they both emerged.

The definitive separation between Rabbinic Judaism and Christianity was overdetermined—it had social, political, theological, and institutional causes that extended far beyond any textual question. But the textual bifurcation was among the most consequential of those causes, and it has been insufficiently appreciated in the broader scholarship on the parting of the ways. When Rabbinic Judaism chose the Hebrew text and Christianity chose the Greek text—and when each community subsequently defined, standardized, and transmitted its chosen scripture with authoritative interpretive traditions (the Masorah and Talmud on the one side; the canon lists, commentaries, and liturgical traditions on the other)—the two communities effectively created different literary foundations for their religious worlds. The same stories, psalms, and prophecies, read in different languages with different wording, generated different theologies and different communities.

The ghost of this ancient bifurcation haunts every modern ecumenical encounter between Jews and Christians, every scholarly debate about the 'original text' of the Hebrew Bible, and every translation committee that must decide whether to render Isaiah 7:14 as 'virgin' or 'young woman.' Two Bibles—and two religions—continue to inhabit the same ancient textual heritage, reading it differently, and finding in it the mirrors of their own distinct souls.

Future scholarship will need to pursue several lines of research that this dissertation has opened but not fully developed. First, the patristic reception of the LXX in specific geographical contexts—Syria, Egypt, Asia Minor, Rome—requires more granular analysis to understand how regional variation in LXX text-forms influenced regional theological development. Second, the relationship between the LXX Psalter and the development of specifically Christian liturgical theology—a topic touched on in Chapters Two and Seven—deserves extended monographic treatment. Third, the implications of the ongoing discovery and publication of new DSS fragments for the specific cases analyzed in this dissertation (Jeremiah, Samuel, Deuteronomy 32) will need continuous reassessment as new evidence becomes available. Fourth, the canonical dimensions of the MT-LXX divergence in the context of contemporary Jewish-Christian dialogue deserve engagement by theologians as well as historians.

This dissertation has argued that the question 'Which Bible?' is not merely a text-critical question but a profoundly religious and historical one—a question about community identity, theological imagination, and the hermeneutical choices that shape what a tradition becomes. In addressing this question with the tools of textual criticism, manuscript history, and reception history, the dissertation has sought to contribute to a richer understanding of both traditions—and of the ancient, living, irreducibly plural textual heritage they share.

# NOTES ON SELECTED CHAPTERS

## *Chapter One*

1 The standard treatment of the Masoretes and their work remains Israel Yeivin, Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah, trans. E. J. Revell, Society of Biblical Literature Masoretic Studies 5 (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1980). For a more recent and accessible treatment, see Page H. Kelley, Daniel S. Mynatt, and Timothy G. Crawford, The Masorah of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998).

2 The term 'proto-Masoretic' is Tov's designation for the consonantal text-type underlying the MT, circulating in the Second Temple period before the formal Masoretic vocalization and annotation system was applied. See Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012), 22–79.

3 Fernández Marcos, The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible, trans. Wilfred G. E. Watson (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 1–53, provides the most thorough recent introduction to the LXX's history and character. For the LXX canon and its deuterocanonical books, see Robert Hanhart, 'The Translation of the Septuagint in the Light of Earlier Tradition and Subsequent Influences,' in Septuagint, Scrolls, and Cognate Writings, ed. George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 339–379.

4 The Gottingen Septuagint project, formally the Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1931-present), represents the standard critical edition of the LXX. For a methodological introduction, see Leonard Greenspoon, The Use and Abuse of the Term LXX and Related Terminology in Recent Scholarship, BIOSCS 20 (1987): 21-29.

5 The 'local text' theory of Frank Moore Cross is most fully articulated in Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds., Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 1–41. For critique and refinement, see Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 155–196.

## *Chapter Two*

6 For the full analysis of the two editions of Jeremiah, see Emanuel Tov, 'The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran,' RdQ 14/54 (1989): 189–206; and Tov, 'The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History,' in The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 363–384.

7 The standard analysis of 4QSama in relation to MT and LXX Samuel is Frank Moore Cross, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley, and Eugene Ulrich, Qumran Cave 4, XII: 1–2 Samuel, DJD 17 (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).

8 Peter W. Flint, The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms, STDJ 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1997) provides the definitive analysis of the Psalms scrolls evidence. Gerald H. Wilson, 'The Qumran Psalms Scroll (11QPsa) and the Canonical Psalter: Comparison of Editorial Shaping,' CBQ 59 (1997): 448–464, represents the alternative interpretation of 11QPsa as a liturgical anthology.

## *Chapter Three*

9 Tov's classification of DSS biblical manuscripts is found in Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible, 3rd ed., 95–154. For the specific manuscripts cited, see the entries in Donald W. Parry and Emanuel Tov, eds., The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader, 6 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005).

10 Sidnie White Crawford's analysis of 4QReworked Pentateuch is most fully developed in 'The Rewritten Bible at Qumran,' Hebrew Studies 45 (2004): 107–128, and in Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times, SDSSRL (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 37–100.

11 The seminal study of Deuteronomy 32:8 remains Michael S. Heiser, 'Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God,' Bibliotheca Sacra 158, no. 629 (2001): 52–74. For the broader theological context, see Mark S. Smith, The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 141–166.

### *Chapter Four*

12 Martin Hengel, The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon, trans. Mark E. Biddle (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002), provides the most thorough treatment of the LXX's role in the early church. Timothy Michael Law, When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), presents the argument for a popular audience.

13 R. Timothy McLay, The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), provides the most systematic methodological treatment. For Paul specifically, see Christopher D. Stanley, Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature, SNTSMS 74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

14 Harold W. Attridge, The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 13–14, on the author's consistent use of the LXX.

### *Chapters Seven and Eight*

15 Larry W. Hurtado, Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 108–118, on κύριος Christology and its LXX background. Richard Bauckham, God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 27–42.

16 James D. G. Dunn, ed., The Parting of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity (London: SCM Press, 1991). For the revisionist challenge, see Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages, TSAJ 95 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

17 On the Aquila recension and its anti-Christian motivations, see Dominique Barthélemy, Les devanciers d'Aquila, VTSup 10 (Leiden: Brill, 1963); and Leonard Greenspoon, 'Aquila's Version,' in The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint, ed. Alison G. Salvesen and Timothy Michael Law (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 133–148.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary Sources and Critical Editions

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece (Nestle-Aland). 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

Cohen, Menahem, ed. Mikra'ot Gedolot HaKeter. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1992–present.

Elliger, Karl, and Wilhelm Rudolph, eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1967–1977.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. The Aleppo Codex: Provided with Masoretic Notes and Pointed by Aaron Ben Moses Ben-Asher. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1976.

Parry, Donald W., and Emanuel Tov, eds. The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader. 6 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2004–2005.

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. Septuaginta. Rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.

Schenker, Adrian, et al., eds. Biblia Hebraica Quinta. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004–present.

Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931–present.

Tov, Emanuel, ed. The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library. Rev. ed. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Weber, Robert, and Roger Gryson, eds. Biblia Sacra Vulgata. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2007.

## Secondary Sources

Attridge, Harold W. The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.

Barthélemy, Dominique. Les devanciers d'Aquila. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 10. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Bauckham, Richard. God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.

Beaton, Richard. Isaiah's Christ in Matthew's Gospel. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 123. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Becker, Adam H., and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Brooke, George J. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

Cross, Frank Moore. 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert.' Harvard Theological Review 57 (1964): 281–299.

Cross, Frank Moore, Donald W. Parry, Richard J. Saley, and Eugene Ulrich. Qumran Cave 4, XII: 1–2 Samuel. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 17. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2005.

Cross, Frank Moore, and Shemaryahu Talmon, eds. Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Crawford, Sidnie White. Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.

Crawford, Sidnie White. 'Reworked Pentateuch.' In Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls, edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam, 2:775–777. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Crawford, Sidnie White. 'The Textual Basis of the Septuagint.' In A New English Translation of the Septuagint, edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, xix–xxiv. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

De Troyer, Kristin. Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible. Text-Critical Studies 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Dunn, James D. G., ed. The Parting of the Ways Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity. London: SCM Press, 1991.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Flint, Peter W. The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 17. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Friedman, Matti. The Aleppo Codex: In Pursuit of One of the World's Most Coveted, Sacred, and Mysterious Books. Chapel Hill: Algonquin Books, 2012.

Heiser, Michael S. 'Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God.' Bibliotheca Sacra 158, no. 629 (2001): 52–74.

Heiser, Michael S. The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible. Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015.

Hengel, Martin. The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon. Translated by Mark E. Biddle. Old Testament Studies. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2002.

Hurtado, Larry W. Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. Invitation to the Septuagint. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

Kahle, Paul E. The Cairo Geniza. London: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Law, Timothy Michael. When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Lim, Timothy H. The Formation of the Jewish Canon. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Lundbom, Jack R. Jeremiah 1–20; Jeremiah 21–36; Jeremiah 37–52. Anchor Bible 21A, 21B, 21C. New York: Doubleday, 1999, 2004.

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

McLay, R. Timothy. The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Orlinsky, Harry M. 'The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators.' Hebrew Union College Annual 46 (1975): 89–114.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. A New English Translation of the Septuagint. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Rösel, Martin. 'The Reading and Translation of the Divine Name in the Masoretic Tradition and the Greek Pentateuch.' Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 31 (2007): 411–428.

Salvesen, Alison G., and Timothy Michael Law, eds. The Oxford Handbook of the Septuagint. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994.

Shead, Andrew G. A Mouth Full of Fire: The Word of God in the Words of Jeremiah. New Studies in Biblical Theology 29. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012.

Smith, Jonathan Z. Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religions. Leiden: Brill, 1978.

Smith, Mark S. The Origins of Biblical Monotheism: Israel's Polytheistic Background and the Ugaritic Texts. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Smith, Wilfred Cantwell. What is Scripture? A Comparative Approach. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Stanley, Christopher D. Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1954.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. 'The Old Testament Text.' In The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1: From the Beginnings to Jerome, edited by P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, 159–199. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Tilling, Chris. Paul's Divine Christology. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2/323. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Tov, Emanuel. 'The Jeremiah Scrolls from Qumran.' Revue de Qumran 14, no. 54 (1989): 189–206.

Tov, Emanuel. 'The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts.' Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 31 (1985): 3–29.

Tov, Emanuel. The Septuagint as a Translation: Studies in the Relationship Between the Greek Translation and the Hebrew Text. Jerusalem: Simor, 1999.

Tov, Emanuel. The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research. 2nd ed. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8. Jerusalem: Simor, 1997.

Tov, Emanuel. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. 3rd ed., revised and expanded. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.

Tov, Emanuel. The Texts from the Judaean Desert: Indices and an Introduction to the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert Series. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 39. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.

Ulrich, Eugene. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Ulrich, Eugene. 'The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value.' In Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings, edited by G. J. Brooke and B. Lindars, 49–80. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

VanderKam, James C. The Dead Sea Scrolls Today. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.

Van der Kooij, Arie. The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

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

Yeivin, Israel. Introduction to the Tiberian Masorah. Translated by E. J. Revell. Society of Biblical Literature Masoretic Studies 5. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1980.

# INDEX OF ANCIENT SOURCES

***Hebrew Bible / Old Testament***

Genesis 15:6 — pp. 83

Deuteronomy 32:8–9 — pp. 62, 65, 169, 206

Psalm 22:16 — pp. 36

Psalm 40:6 — pp. 37, 91, 157

Psalm 110:1 — pp. 174, 175, 92

Isaiah 7:14 — pp. 42, 44, 83, 90, 157, 159, 186

Isaiah 40:3 — pp. 113

Isaiah 52:13–53:12 — pp. 91, 163

Isaiah 53:4 — pp. 165

Isaiah 53:8 — pp. 90, 163

Isaiah 53:10 — pp. 164

Jeremiah (book) — pp. 24–29, 62

Zechariah 12:10 — pp. 91

***Dead Sea Scrolls***

1QIsa-a (Great Isaiah Scroll) — pp. 42, 91

4QDeut-j — pp. 62, 65, 169

4QJerb, 4QJerd — pp. 9, 25, 57, 62

4QNumb — pp. 62

4QRP (4Q158, 4Q364–367) — pp. 56, 68

4QSama — pp. 30, 31, 57

11QPsa (Psalms Scroll) — pp. 36, 63

11QT (Temple Scroll) — pp. 56, 69

***New Testament***

Matthew 1:23 — pp. 44, 83, 90, 157

Matthew 4:15–16 — pp. 83

Matthew 8:17 — pp. 165

Matthew 22:44–45 — pp. 92, 175

Romans 4:3 — pp. 84

Romans 10:9 — pp. 151

1 Corinthians 12:3 — pp. 151

1 Corinthians 15:3 — pp. 163

Philippians 2:9–11 — pp. 151

Hebrews 1:13 — pp. 175

Hebrews 10:5 — pp. 37, 85, 157

John 19:37 — pp. 91

***Patristic Sources***

Augustine, Epistle 71 — pp. 97, 192

Irenaeus, Adversus Haereses — pp. 99

Jerome, Epistle 82 — pp. 192

Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho — pp. 97

Origen, Hexapla — pp. 96, 192

***Rabbinic Sources***

b. Megillah 9a — pp. 187

b. Sanhedrin 108b — pp. 175

Maimonides, Mishneh Torah, Laws of Torah Scrolls 8:4 — pp. 128

# INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

Attridge, Harold W. — pp. 85, 217

Barthélemy, Dominique — pp. 20, 122, 219

Bauckham, Richard — pp. 153, 218

Beaton, Richard — pp. 83, 218

Becker, Adam H. — pp. 181, 218

Crawford, Sidnie White — pp. 14, 33, 48, 56, 68, 74, 207, 219

Cross, Frank Moore — pp. 30, 57, 219

De Troyer, Kristin — pp. 74, 219

Dunn, James D. G. — pp. 180, 219

Fernández Marcos, Natalio — pp. 9, 80, 219

Flint, Peter W. — pp. 36, 63, 219

Friedman, Matti — pp. 129, 219

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. — pp. 131, 220

Heiser, Michael S. — pp. 65, 171, 220

Hengel, Martin — pp. 79, 220

Hurtado, Larry W. — pp. 153, 220

Kahle, Paul E. — pp. 141, 220

Law, Timothy Michael — pp. 80, 220

McLay, R. Timothy — pp. 81, 221

Pietersma, Albert — pp. 150, 221

Reed, Annette Yoshiko — pp. 181, 218

Rösel, Martin — pp. 150, 221

Schiffman, Lawrence H. — pp. 221

Shead, Andrew G. — pp. 28, 221

Silva, Moisés — pp. 221

Smith, Mark S. — pp. 65, 171, 221

Stanley, Christopher D. — pp. 84, 221

Stendahl, Krister — pp. 83, 221

Talmon, Shemaryahu — pp. 20, 57, 122, 222

Tilling, Chris — pp. 153, 222

Tov, Emanuel — pp. 12, 20, 24, 25, 53, 55, 56, 57, 62, 74, 208, 222

Ulrich, Eugene — pp. 48, 56, 222

VanderKam, James C. — pp. 222

Van der Kooij, Arie — pp. 45, 222

Wilson, Gerald H. — pp. 64

Würthwein, Ernst — pp. 6, 222

Yeivin, Israel — pp. 108, 117, 222