

1

INTRODUCTION

“A man who possesses common sense and the use of reason must not expect to learn from treatises or lectures on textual criticism anything that he could not, with leisure and industry, find out for himself. What the lectures and treatises can do for him is to save him time and trouble by presenting to him immediately considerations which would in any case occur to him sooner or later.” (A.E. Housman, “The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism,” *Proceedings of the Classical Association* 18 [1922] 67–84 [67]).

General Bibliography

Ap-Thomas, *Primer*; D. Barthélemy, “Text, Hebrew, History of,” *IDBSup*, 878–84 = *Études*, 341–64; id., *Critique textuelle* 1982–2005; Brotzman, *Textual Criticism*; Cappellus, *Critica Sacra* (1650); Deist, *Text*; id., *Witnesses*; Eichhorn, *Einleitung*; Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, 669–719; Fischer, *Text*; Gentry, “Text”; D.C. Greetham, *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction* (New York/London: Garland Publishing, 1992); Y. Grintz, *mbw 'y mqr'* (Tel Aviv: Yavneh, 1972); Hendel, *Genesis 1–11*; Klein, *Textual Criticism*; van der Kooij, *Textzeugen*; McCarter, *Textual Criticism*; Kreuzer, “Text”; id., “Textkritik”; Mulder, *Mikra*; Noth, *Old Testament World*, 301–63; S. Pisano, S.J., *Introduzione alla critica testuale dell' Antico e del Nuovo Testamento* (5th ed.; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2008); Reynolds–Wilson, *Scribes & Scholars*, 207–41; Roberts, *OTTV*; M.Z. Segal, *mbw 'hmqr'*, IV.842–977; Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, 19–85; Talmon, “Old Testament Text”; J.A. Thompson, “Textual Criticism, Old Testament,” *IDBSup*, 886–91; Trebelle, *Biblia*; Wegner, *Textual Criticism*; Weingreen, *Introduction*; Würthwein, *Text*; id., *Text (English)*.

Electronic tools: → ch. 10 and the textual sources described in chapters 2, 4, 8, 9

Textual criticism¹ deals with the nature and origin of all the witnesses of a composition or text, in our case the biblical books. This analysis often involves an attempt to discover the original form of details in a composition, or even of large stretches of text, although what exactly constitutes (an) “original text(s)” is subject to much debate. → ch. 3b. In the course of such an inquiry, attempts are made to describe how the texts were written, changed, and transmitted from one generation to the next. Those scholars who express a view on the originality of readings do so while evaluating their comparative value. This comparison—the central area of the textual praxis—refers to the value of the readings⁺

¹ Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, XXII (1810–1812) uses the term *Wortkritik* (word criticism).

included in the textual witnesses. However, not all differences should be subjected to a textual evaluation. In our view, (groups of) readings that were produced at the literary growth stage of the biblical books (literary or editorial variants⁺) should not be subjected to textual evaluation, since they were not produced during the course of the transmission of texts. → category II on p. 268. At the same time, the difficulty in recognizing readings of this type complicates the textual evaluation to such an extent that some scholars tend to avoid textual evaluation altogether. The attentive reader will note that this definition does not refer specifically to the traditional text of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, the so-called Masoretic Text (MT = מ), but rather to all forms of Scripture.

The aims of textual criticism have not changed with the discovery of important new evidence in the Judean Desert. However, the quantity and nature of the new evidence aids us in better understanding the sources known before 1947 as well as in better defining the cross-fertilization between textual criticism, exegesis, and literary criticism.

One of the practical results of the analysis of textual data is that it creates tools for the exegesis of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture. Exegetical activity is based on a text or texts and can only proceed if the nature of that text has been determined. By the same token, all other disciplines, such as the historical, geographical, and linguistic analysis of Scripture, operate from a text base. In each case, the scholar has to define the text base for the exegesis, and by necessity this involves the analysis of all textual data. However, too often these disciplines are based mainly on מ because the extant text editions and commentaries focus on that version. → pp. 364–5

The aims and procedures of textual criticism of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture are further defined in ch. 5A. The remainder of the present chapter deals with additional introductory issues, among them “text, canon, and sacred status” and “subjectivity of this book” (sections D and E). In section A, we attempt to demonstrate that involvement in textual criticism is imperative, not only in a comparative analysis of the various textual sources of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture (A1, 2) but also when we consult the so-called Masoretic Text (A3, 4) alone.

A. The Need for Textual Criticism of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture

Several factors require the involvement of textual criticism within the discipline of biblical studies. In view of the focus on the Masoretic Text⁺ by most scholars → pp. 364–5, the examination of all the textual variants is now more than ever relevant.

1. Differences among the Many Textual Witnesses

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

It is not only the differences among the various textual witnesses that require involvement in textual criticism. Textual differences of a similar nature are reflected in the various attestations of a single textual tradition of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, namely \aleph , often described as the main textual tradition of Scripture. Such internal differences are visible in all attestations of \aleph , ancient and medieval, and even in its printed editions and modern translations → § j,² since they are based on different sources (→ pp. 70–74). We shall first turn to these editions (see pp. xx–xxii for bibliographical references), as they are easily accessible.

Possibly, one would not have expected differences between the printed editions of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, for if a fully unified textual tradition had been possible at any one given period, it would certainly seem to have been after the invention of printing. However, such is not the case since all printed editions of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, which actually are editions of \aleph , go back to different medieval manuscripts of that tradition, or combinations thereof (→ pp. 70–74), and therefore the editions also necessarily differ from one another. Moreover, these editions reflect not only the various medieval manuscripts, but also the personal views of their editors. Furthermore, several editions contain a certain number of printing errors. Therefore, there is no single edition in existence that agrees in all its details with another one, except for photographically reproduced editions or editions presenting the same electronic (computer-encoded) text. Most editions even differ from one another in their subsequent printings, without informing the readers. Note, for example, the

² See the following sample of modern renderings of עַד כִּי יָבֹא שִׁילֹה in Gen 49:10:

1. “Until Shiloh come” (KJV) = שִׁילֹה יָבֹא.

2. “So long as tribute is brought to him” (NEB; similarly NJPS and NRSV) = שִׁי לֹ (thus the Midrash collections *Yalkut Shim'oni* and *Lekah Tov*).

3. “Until he receives what is his due” (REB), “until he comes to whom it belongs” (RSV and similarly JB), all based on a reading שִׁי לֹ as in $\Theta \leq \tau^{\text{ON}}$. For a detailed discussion, see Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 67–70. Additional examples are analyzed below, pp. 367–76.

different printing errors in the various printings of the editions of Snaith and *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (*BHS*) mentioned below, and note the editorial decisions in the Adi and Koren editions.³ The *BHS* edition originally appeared in fascicles that were corrected in the final printing, which carried the dates 1967–1977. It was corrected again in the 1984 printing, yet even this contains mistakes, on which see below.

It should be remembered that the number of differences between the various editions is very small. Moreover, all of them concern minimal, or even minute, details in the text, and most affect the meaning of the text in only a very limited way.

The following are examples of the differences between the most frequently used editions of מ.

a. *Sequence of Books*

The sequence of certain books differs in relation to the others in the various editions. This concerns the position of Chronicles and the internal sequence of the ח"מ"א books (acronymic for Job, Proverbs, and Psalms), and the Five Scrolls.⁴ In most editions (e.g. RB1–2⁺ [*Miqra'ot G'dolat*], Letteris, Ginsburg, Sinai, Cassuto, Snaith, Koren, Adi, *BH*, *BHS*), Chronicles appears as the last book of the Hagiographa, while in Breuer's edition (1977–1982) it is the first book of that collection, reflecting its position in codices A⁺ and L⁺. The internal sequence of the ח"מ"א books differs in Breuer 1977–1982, *BH*, *BHS* (Psalms, Job, Proverbs [thus *b. B. Bat.* 14b]) from that of RB1–2⁺, Letteris, Ginsburg, Sinai, Cassuto, Snaith, Koren, Adi (Psalms, Proverbs, Job). For the Five Scrolls, one finds the following arrangements: Ruth, Canticles, Qoheleth, Lamentations, Esther (Breuer 1977–1982, *BH*, *BHS*); Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Qoheleth, Esther (some printings of RB1–2⁺, Letteris, Ginsburg, Sinai, Cassuto, Snaith, Adi). In other printings of RB1–2⁺, individual books of the Five Scrolls follow the books of the Torah.

b. *Chapter Division*

The chapters were determined only in the Middle Ages, differing slightly among the various editions. → p. 49. In an editor's view, the last verse of a chapter sometimes made more sense as the first verse of the following chapter, or *vice versa*, and the verse numbering differs accordingly.

³ Thus the Hebrew Koren edition differs from its Hebrew-English edition in the numbering of the verses in the transitions between Genesis 31 and 32 and Ezekiel 13 and 14. See below concerning other differences between the various printings of the Adi and Koren editions.

⁴ On the differences between the manuscripts and editions in this regard, see especially N.M. Sarna, "Bible," *EncJud* (Jerusalem: Keter, 1971) 4.827–30.

For example, the verse starting with the words “At that time, declares the LORD, I will be...” appears in some editions as the last verse of Jeremiah 30, 30:25 (e.g. Letteris, Sinai, Breuer, Koren 1962, Adi 1973–1976), and in other ones as the first verse of ch. 31 (Cassuto, Snaith, *BH*, *BHS*). These two representations of the biblical text are based on different understandings of the verse in its context.

“Certain elders of Israel came to me” forms the first verse of Ezekiel 14 in the editions of Letteris, Sinai, Snaith, Koren 1962, Adi 1973–1976, Breuer 1977–1997, *BH*, and *BHS*, but in the edition of Cassuto it appears as the last verse of ch. 13 (13:24), indicated by a closed section⁺ after this verse. Ginsburg’s edition presents it as the last verse of ch. 13, but names it 14:1.

Likewise, the verse beginning with the words “Early in the morning Laban arose...” appears as the last verse of Genesis 31 (31:55) in the Koren 1962 edition, but as the first verse of ch. 32 in the editions of Letteris, Sinai, Snaith, Adi 1973–1976, Breuer 1977–1997, *BH*, and *BHS*.⁵

c. Layout of the Text

Since the layout of the text as either poetry or prose depends on the editor’s views, in this detail, too, the various editions differ from one another.

The majority of the editions present the text of most biblical books as prose with a few passages as poetry. The editions of Letteris (in most of its printings) and Cassuto, however, present the *תנכ* books (Job, Proverbs, and Psalms) as poetry. → p. 61. Against this tradition, *NJPS* 1999 presents the poetry with “line breaks, in the manner of poetry in more recent centuries” (p. xiv). *BH* tends to present texts as poetry more than the other editions, including *BHS*. See, for example, the song of Lamech (Gen 4:23-24) and the words of God to Rebekah (Gen 25:23). Ginsburg and *BHS*, as opposed to the other editions, present the priestly blessing in Num 6:23-26 as poetry.

The presentation of the text as either prose or poetry reflects exegesis. Thus most editions, including the *BH* series, present Jeremiah 7 as prose, while only the *BH* series presents v 29 of that chapter as poetry.

d. Verse Division

The scope of the verses sometimes differs from one edition to another. For example, in Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth commandments are recorded in some editions as one verse (Exod 20:12 or 13; Deut 5:17), but in other editions as four different verses (Exod 20:13-16; Deut 5:17-20). These discrepancies account for the

⁵ For additional examples of problematic chapter divisions, see P. Finfer, *Massoret Ha-Torah Ve-ha-Nebi'im* (Vilna: Graber, 1906; repr. [Tel Aviv?], 1970) 45–83; J.S. Penkower, “Verse Divisions in the Hebrew Bible,” *VT* 50 (2000) 378–93 (388–93).

differences in verse numbering in these chapters among the various editions. The editions of Letteris, Sinai, Snaith, *BH*, and *BHS* record these four commandments in Exodus 20 as separate verses, while the editions of Cassuto, Adi 1973–1976, Koren 1962, and Breuer 1977–1997 present them as one verse. Not every edition treats the Ten Commandments in Deuteronomy 5 in the same way, but the picture is similar. In the editions of Letteris, Sinai, Adi 1976, Koren 1962, and Breuer 1977–1997, the sixth through ninth commandments are treated as one verse, but in the editions of Cassuto, Snaith, *BH*, and *BHS* they are treated as four distinct verses because of their special (upper) accentuation. In Deuteronomy, the situation is even more complicated, since the second commandment (“You shall have no other gods beside Me.”) sometimes starts a new verse, viz., 5:7 (in the editions of Sinai, Cassuto, Snaith, Koren 1962, Adi 1976, Breuer 1977–1997, *BH*, and *BHS*), while in the Adi 1973 edition it appears as v 6b.⁶

e. Single Letters and Words

The number of differences in single letters is relatively small, with most of them concerning minute details, such as *matres lectionis*. → pp. 208–18. For example:

Deut 23:2	פצוּעַ (פְּצֹא)	Cassuto, Snaith, Adi 1973–1976, Breuer 1977–1997, <i>BH</i> , <i>BHS</i>
	פְּצֹה (פְּצֹה)	RB2, Koren 1962
1 Sam 30:30	כְּבוֹר-עֵשָׂן	Cassuto, Snaith, Adi 1973–1976, Breuer 1977–1997, <i>BHS</i>
	כְּכוֹר-עֵשָׂן	Letteris, Koren 1962
Gen 14:1	כְּדַר-לַעֲמֹר	RB2, Ginsburg 1926, Koren 1962, Adi 1973–1976, Breuer 1977–1997, <i>BH</i> , <i>BHS</i>
	כְּדַר-לַעֲמֹר	Ginsburg 1926–, Letteris

A few differences, however, concern complete words, such as:

Prov 8:16	שֹׁפְטֵי אֶרֶץ	judges of <i>the earth</i> Ginsburg, Koren 1977
	שֹׁפְטֵי צְדָקָה	<i>righteous</i> judges Letteris, Cassuto, Adi 1973–1976, Koren 1962, 1979, Breuer 1977–1997, <i>BH</i> , <i>BHS</i>

⁶ On other aspects of the different writing traditions for the Decalogue, see M. Breuer, “The Division of the Decalogue into Verses and Commandments,” *The Ten Commandments as Reflected in Tradition and Literature throughout the Ages* (ed. B.-Z. Segal; Heb.; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1985) 223–54.

A full list of such differences relating to the Koren edition is appended to the edition.

f. *Vocalization and Accentuation*

The relatively numerous differences in vocalization (vowel signs) and accents⁺ usually do not affect the meaning of the text. Most of the differences in this group pertain to the *ga'yah* (secondary stress). → pp. 62–5

The following is an example of one that does alter the meaning.

Jer 11:2	וְדַבַּרְתֶּם	and you (plural) shall say Letteris, Sinai, Snaith, Koren 1962, Breuer 1977–1997, <i>HUB</i>
	וְדַבֵּרְתֶּם	and you (singular) shall recite them Adi 1973–1976, <i>BH, BHS</i>

g. *Notes of the Masorah*

Scripture editions include from the Masorah⁺ mainly the *Qere*⁺ and *Sebirin*⁺ notes and the notation of sections in the text as either open⁺ or closed⁺. The editions differ from one another in all these details. For example, Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 9–24 criticizes the imprecise notations of the sections in the earlier edition of Baer–Delitzsch. → p. 73

h. *Different Editions Based on the Same Manuscript*

Since the manuscripts of מ were handwritten, and therefore sometimes difficult to decipher, it is not surprising that they are sometimes read in different ways by the editors of Scripture editions. Five different editions (which actually represent only two editions) of the important codex Leningrad B19^A (L), *BH* and its revised versions, *BHS* and *BHQ*, → ch. 9B, as well as the Adi edition (1973) and Dotan 2001, each claim that they faithfully present this codex. However, these editions differ from one another in many details, partly as a result of the difficulties in deciphering details (especially vowels and accents) and partly due to different editorial principles (see the introductions to the last two editions mentioned). Furthermore, some of these editions contain printing errors.

j. *Differences Due to Printing Errors*

Printing errors are found in both earlier and later editions. The very first editions preceding RB1 and RB2 contain many mistakes involving the

omission or duplication of words or entire verses.⁷ → p. 71. However, later editions also contain multiple mistakes.⁸ For example, in the Snaith edition (London, 1958) one finds:

Exod 10:3	אֵד מְהִי which should read: עַד מְהִי
Esth 7:7	עַל instead of: אֶל
Esth 7:8	וּבְנֵי instead of: וּפְנֵי
Esth 8:5	כֻּלָּל instead of: בְּכָל

Many of the printing errors found in the early printings of *BH* (e.g. 1949) were corrected in *BHS*—for example, Isa 35:1 בַּחֲבַצְלָה (which should read כַּחֲבַצְלָה)⁹—but some misprints and inaccuracies remain even in the 1984 printing of *BHS* (1967–1977).¹⁰ For example,

Gen 35:27	הַבְּרוּן which should read: הַבְּרוּן
2 Sam 14:30 Q	יְהִצִּיתוּהָ instead of: וְהִצִּיתוּהָ
Dan 11:8	הַצִּפּוֹן instead of: הַצִּפּוֹן

These small but material differences between the modern editions of ׀, as well as the various printing errors and many additional factors, necessitate the involvement of textual criticism. When examining the origin of the differences between the various modern editions of ׀, we soon discover that most of them go back to differences between the medieval manuscripts on which they are based. Indeed, the analysis in ch. 2 shows that medieval manuscripts and scrolls from the Second Temple period differ in numerous details, ranging from single letters and whole words to entire verses. Medieval Masoretic manuscripts differ in these details as well as in vocalization, accentuation, and details of the Masorah⁺ (*Ketib–Qere*⁺ readings and section divisions⁺).

The differences between the various textual witnesses, some of which involve details in content, are exemplified in ch. 4c.

⁷ See J.G. Bidermannus, *Programma de mendis librorum et nominatim bibliorum hebraicorum diligentius cavendis* (Freiburg: Matthaeanis, 1752); Kennicott, *Dissertation* (1753), *Part the Second*, 620–21 (lists the mistakes of the Naples 1487 edition); Ginsburg, *Introduction*, 779–976 (extensive review of the mistakes in all early editions).

⁸ For example, see Cohen–Freedman, “Snaith.”

⁹ See I. Yeivin, “The New Edition of the Biblia Hebraica: Its Text and Massorah,” *Textus* 7 (1969) 114–23. Dotan 2001, X (→ p. xxi) discusses such mistakes in *BH* and *BHS*.

¹⁰ Cf. Wonneberger, *Understanding BHS*, 74–5. All these errors have been corrected in subsequent printings of *BHS*.

2. Mistakes, Corrections, and Changes in the Texts, Including מ

Most texts—ancient and modern—that are transmitted from one generation to the next get *corrupted* in one way or another. For modern compositions, the process of textual transmission from the writing of the autographs⁺ until their printing is relatively short, thus limiting the possibilities of them becoming corrupted.¹¹ In ancient texts, however, such as Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, these corruptions (the technical term for various forms of “mistakes”) were more frequent as a result of the complexities of the writing on papyrus and leather and the length of the transmission process, conditions that prevailed until the advent of printing. The number of factors that could have created corruptions is large: the transition from the early Hebrew⁺ to the square script⁺, unclear handwriting, unevenness in the surface of the leather or papyrus, graphically similar letters which were often confused, the lack of vocalization⁺, unclear boundaries between words leading to wrong word divisions⁺, scribal corrections not understood by the next generation of scribes, etc.

Corruptions as well as various forms of scribal intervention (changes, corrections, etc.) are evidenced in all textual witnesses of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, including the group of texts now called the medieval Masoretic Text as well as in its predecessors, the proto-Masoretic⁺ (also named proto-rabbinic) texts.¹² Those who are unaware of the details of textual criticism may think that one should not expect corruptions in מ, or any other sacred text, assuming that these texts were meticulously written and transmitted. The scrupulous approach of the *soferim* and Masoretes is indeed manifest in some of their techniques. They even counted all the letters and words of מ. → p. 66. Therefore, one would not expect corruptions to have been inserted into the text through their work, or corrections to have been made. Yet, in spite of their precision, even the manuscripts that were written and vocalized by the Masoretes contain corruptions, changes, and erasures. More importantly, the Masoretes, and before them the *soferim*, made their contribution at a relatively late

¹¹ However, note the many mistakes that were inserted into all the editions of *Ulysses* by James Joyce as a result of misunderstandings of the author’s corrections in the proof sheets of his book. These mistakes were corrected in a critical edition at a relatively late stage: *James Joyce, Ulysses: Student’s Edition, The Corrected Text* (ed. H.W. Gabler et al.; Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1986).

¹² On the face of it, tradition has preserved corrections of this type: Tradition ascribes 8, 11, or 18 such “corrections”⁺ in מ to the *soferim* (“Scribes”) → pp. 59–61, but many of these transmitted corrections are questionable. Nevertheless, the assumption of corrections does not depend on the tradition of the Masorah, since many similar ones are evidenced elsewhere. → pp. 242–56

stage in the development of the biblical text; at that time the text already contained corruptions and had been tampered with before the scribes began to treat it with such reverence and before they put their meticulous principles into practice. Therefore, paradoxically, the *soferim* and Masoretes carefully preserved a text that was already corrupted. The discussion in the following chapters will expand on the subject of these corruptions that occurred in all manuscripts of the Hebrew–Aramaic Bible, including the manuscripts of ם.

It is not easy to provide convincing proof of errors in ם, but we believe that some of the examples in § 4 provide partial proof. As was already recognized in the Middle Ages by R. David Kimh̄li (RaDaK), two pairs of similar letters (*daleth/resh* and *waw/yod*) were sometimes interchanged. → p. 16. In our terminology, the similarity of these letters may lead to textual corruption. In such situations there is no escape from the view that often one of any two similar readings, occurring in parallel texts, is “correct” or “original”+ and the other a corruption. This assumption pertains, for example, to such pairs of readings as םׁׁׁׁׁ/ׁׁׁׁׁ and ׁׁׁׁׁ/ׁׁׁׁׁ. → Table 1

The assumption of corruptions in the biblical text pervades many of the examples in this book. Such corruptions are found in Qumran scrolls when compared with ם and other texts,¹³ and likewise in ם when compared with other texts.¹⁴ In all these cases, the comparison of ם and the Qumran texts is based on objective textual data and recognized scribal phenomena.

Other corruptions in ם are evident not through the comparison of different manuscripts, but through the occurrence of problematical details.

1 Sam 13:1 ם בן שנה שאול במלכו ושתי שנים מלך על ישראל (= ט; ≈ ט) literally:
Saul was *one year* old when he began to reign; and he reigned
two years over Israel.
NRSV Saul was ... years old when he began to reign; and he
reigned ... *and two* years over Israel.

The problematical aspects of this unusual text are indicated in the NRSV¹⁵ by dots to which the following footnotes are added for the first and the second instance respectively: “The number is lacking in the Heb text”; “*Two* is not the entire number; something has dropped out.” As a result of these mistakes, a literal understanding or translation of ם yields a very difficult meaning. We are thus left with the assumption that the received text contains a textual error and

¹³ E.g. 1QIsa^a in Isa 13:19 → p. 233; 26:3-4 → p. 222; 30:30 → p. 224; 40:7-8 → pp. 223-4.

¹⁴ E.g. 1 Sam 1:24 → p. 236; 4:21-22 → p. 226; 2 Sam 23:31 → p. 233; 2 Kgs 11:13 → p. 226; Jer 23:33 → p. 276; 29:26 → p. 238; 41:9 → p. 276.

¹⁵ NJPS and McCarter, *I Samuel*, 222 use the same technique.

that the earlier (correct?) text probably mentioned realistic numbers for Saul's age at the beginning of his reign, such as 30 years in Ⓞ^{Luc (b-mg oe2)} (accepted by the *REB*) or 50 years suggested by the *NEB*.

The following are two additional examples of such mistakes.

Judg 16:2 מ נ לעותים לאמר בא שמשון הנה
 To the Gazites as follows: "Samson has come here"
 Ⓞ καὶ ἀνηγγέλη (MS B: ἀπηγγέλη) τοῖς Γαζαοῖς λέγοντες
 The Gazites were told as follows (= Ⓞ; ≈ Ⓟ Ⓠ)

The only reading that is understandable is that of Ⓞ and the other versions, which was followed by the *NRSV* ("The Gazites were told") and *NJPS* ("The Gazites [learned] that..."). Both modern translations reflect the verb in Ⓞ.

Jer 27:1 מ נ בראשית ממלכת יהויקים בן יאשיהו מלך יהודה היה הדבר הזה אל ירמיה
 (= Ⓟ Ⓞ) מאת ה' לאמר

NJPS At the beginning of the reign of king *Jehoiakim* son of Josiah of Judah, this word came to Jeremiah from the LORD.

This verse serves as the heading of ch. 27, which speaks of actions taking place in the time of Zedekiah. → vv 3, 12; 28:1. Therefore, the mentioning of Jehoiakim in the heading does not suit the contents of the chapter and v 1 probably erroneously repeats the first verse of the previous chapter, 26. The heading of ch. 27 was probably added in the forerunner of most textual witnesses at a later stage in the development of the book, while the earlier stage, in which it was lacking, is represented by Ⓞ. → p. 289. זדקיא (Zedekiah) of Ⓠ (= *NRSV*) should probably be understood as a contextual correction.¹⁶

3. מ Does Not Reflect the "Original Text" of the Biblical Books

One of the postulates of biblical research is that many details in the text preserved in the various representatives (manuscripts, editions) of what is commonly called the Masoretic Text, do *not* reflect the "original text" of the biblical books.¹⁷ Even though the concept of an "original text" necessarily remains vague → ch. 3B, differences between מ and the other textual witnesses will continue to be recognized. Scholars will constantly hesitate regarding the originality of the readings of either מ or one of the other sources. However, one thing is clear, it should not be postulated that מ better or more frequently reflects the original text of the biblical books than any other text. Furthermore, even were we to surmise that מ reflects the "original" form of Scripture, we would still have to decide

¹⁶ As a conclusion to this paragraph it is appropriate to quote the words of Kennicott, *Dissertation* (1753), Part the First, 269: "And now, if there certainly are Errors in the printed Text of the Old Testament, may we not be permitted to discover them?"

¹⁷ This perception goes back to Cappellus* (1650) 384–5. Also Eichhorn, *Einleitung* (4th ed., 1823) 1278–83 described in detail why the "oldest manuscripts were not without mistakes" (title of the section).

which form of מ reflects this “original text,” since מ itself is represented by many witnesses that differ in small details. → ch. 2IA

4. Differences between Inner-Biblical Parallel Texts in מ

The textual witnesses of the biblical books, including מ, contain several parallel versions of the same unit. Some of these reflect different formulations of the same psalm (Psalm 18 // 2 Samuel 22; Psalm 14 // Psalm 53), a genealogical list (Ezra 2 // Neh 7:6-72), segments of books (Jeremiah 52 // 2 Kgs 24:18–25:30; ***Isa 36:1–39:8 // 2 Kgs 18:13–20:19), and even large segments of a complete book, viz., Chronicles, large sections of which run parallel to the books of Samuel and Kings. Some of these parallel sources are based on ancient extra-biblical texts that already differed from one another before they were incorporated into the biblical books, and which additionally underwent changes after they were transmitted separately from one generation to the next. In some instances, textual differences between parallel sources in מ can easily be located, as in the texts presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Gen 10:1-29 מ Compared with the Parallel Text 1 Chr 1:4-23 מ

ואלה תולדת בני נח שם חם ויולדו להם בנים אחר המבול² בני יפת נמר ומנוג
ומדי ויון ותבל ומשך ותירס³ ובני נמר אשכנז וריפת ותגרמה⁴ ובני יון אלישה ותרישיש
כתים ודדנים⁵ מאלה נפרדו איי הגוים בארצתם איש ללשנו למשפחתם בנויהם⁶ ובני
חם כוש ומצרים ופוט וכנען⁷ ובני כוש סבא וחזילה וסבתה ורעמה וסבתכא ובני רעמה
שבא ודרן⁸ וכוש ילד את נמרד הוא החל להיות גבר בארץ⁹ הוא היה גבר ציד לפני
יהוה על כן יאמר כנמרד גבור ציד לפני יהוה¹⁰ ותהי ראשית ממלכתו בבל וארץ
ואכד וכלנה בארץ שנער¹¹ מן הארץ ההוא יצא אשור ויבן את נינוה ואת רחבת
עיר ואת כלל¹² ואת רסן בין נינוה ובין כלח הוא העיר הגדלה¹³ ומצרים ילד את
לודים ואת ענמים ואת להבים ואת נפתחים¹⁴ ואת פתרסים ואת כסלחים אשר יצאו
משם פלשתים ואת כפתרים¹⁵ וכנען ילד את צידן בכרו ואת חת¹⁶ ואת היבוסים ואת
האמרי ואת הגרנשי¹⁷ ואת החוי ואת הערקי ואת הסיני¹⁸ ואת הארודי ואת הצמרי
ואת החמתי ואחר נפצו משפחות הכנעני¹⁹ ויהי גבול הכנעני מצידן באכה גררה עד
עזה באכה סדמה ועמרה ואדמה וצבים עד לשע²⁰ אלה בני חם למשפחתם ללשנתם
בארצתם בנויהם²¹ ולשם ילד גם הוא אבי כל בני עבר אחי יפת הגדול²² בני שם
עילם ואשור וארפכשד ולוד וארם²³ ובני ארם עוין וחול ונתר ומש²⁴ וארפכשד ילד
את שלח ושלח ילד את עבר²⁵ ולעבר ילד שני בניו שם האחד פלג כי בימיו נפלגה
הארץ ושם אחיו יקטן²⁶ ויקטן ילד את אלמורד ואת שלף ואת חצרמות ואת ירח
²⁷ ואת הדורם ואת אוול ואת דקלה²⁸ ואת עובל ואת אבימאל ואת שבא²⁹ ואת אופר
ואת חזילה ואת יובב כל אלה בני יקטן

Differences between Gen 10:1-29 ו and 1 Chr 1:4-23 ו in the overlapping sections:

- 3 וריפת] וריפת 1 Chr 1:6
 ותגרמה] ותגרמה 1 Chr 1:6
- 4 ותרשיש] ותרשיש 1 Chr 1:7
 ורודנים] ורודנים 1 Chr 1:7
- 7 וסבתה ורעמא וסבתכא...רעמא] וסבתה ורעמה וסבתכא ... רעמה 1 Chr 1:9
- 8 נמרוד] נמרוד 1 Chr 1:10
 גבור] גבור 1 Chr 1:10
- 13 לודים] לודים Chr^{Ketib} 1 Chr 1:11 (Qere: לודים)
- 15 צידון] צידון 1 Chr 1:13
- 23 ולוד וארם] ובני ארם 1 Chr 1:17
 ועוין] עוין 1 Chr 1:17
 ומשך] ומשך 1 Chr 1:17
- 28 עיבל] עיבל 1 Chr 1:22
- 29 אופיר] אופיר 1 Chr 1:23

This table presents the text of Gen 10:1-29 ו in which the overlaps with the parallel text in 1 Chr 1:4-23 in ו (including some differences in details) are underlined, while the non-overlapping text is not. The high level of agreement between the two texts clearly shows that the lists in Genesis and Chronicles are closely related.¹⁸ In this case, it is not difficult to distinguish between textual and other differences.¹⁹

The list in 1 Chr 1:4-23 reproduces the genealogical data of Genesis as well as a few narrative segments. The agreement between the two lists in ו involves the smallest details, implying that little textual corruption occurred in these units, neither when the Chronicler copied the list from his source, which must have been very close to the present text of ו in Genesis, nor during the course of the textual transmission in the ensuing centuries. The only differences between the two texts are in spelling (11 x),²⁰ a different linguistic form (v 4), an added *waw* (v 23), and a few scribal interchanges, undoubtedly representing errors in one of the two texts (vv 3, 4, 23, 28). The nature of one case remains unresolved,²¹ but

¹⁸ 1 Chronicles 1 contains summaries of genealogies in Genesis 5, 10–11, 25, 35–36. Also within the sections from Genesis 10, the Chronicler presented a summary of his source, since he left out some segments (Gen 10:5, 9-12, 18 end, 19-21). Furthermore, the reworking of the Chronicler included the removal of headings and conclusions in Genesis.

¹⁹ When the texts differ, we may correct details in one text to those in the parallel text (see the discussion of vv 4 and 28 on p. 16), but the basic dichotomy between the texts should be maintained since they were composed by different authors.

²⁰ Chronicles always presents a fuller orthography⁺. → p. 213

²¹ Gen 10:22 mentions the five sons of Shem, among them Aram, while the next verse lists Aram's four sons. However, in 1 Chr 1:17, the words "the sons of Aram" are missing in ו+, a *waw* is added before Uz, and as a result Shem is presented as having nine children. The difference between the two texts was probably caused by a textual error. Alternatively, the difference may have been intentional, involving a different view of the source of the Arameans. Japhet, *Chronicles*, 59 is undecided.

all other differences fall under the heading of scribal transmission such as described in ch. 4.

The relation between the parallel Psalms 14 and 53 (Table 2) is more complicated than between the texts presented in Table 1, but they represent the same Psalm transmitted in two different versions.

Table 2

Psalm 14 וז Compared with the Parallel Text of Psalm 53 זז

למנצח לדוד אמר נבל בלבו אין אלהים השחיתו התעיבו עלילה אין עשה טוב¹
יהוה משמים השקיף על בני אדם לראות היש משכיל דרש את אלהים³ הכל סר²
יחדו נאלחו אין עשה טוב אין גם אחד⁴ הלא ידעו כל פעלי און אכלי עמי אכלו לחם
יהוה לא קראו⁵ שם פחדו פחד כי אלהים בדור צדיק⁶ עצת עני תבישו כי יהוה
מחסהו⁷ מי יתן מציון ישועת ישראל בשוב יהוה שבות עמו יגל יעקב ישמח ישראל

Differences between Psalm 14 וז and Psalm 53 זז:

- 1 Ps 53:1 על מחלת משכיל לדוד] לדוד
- Ps 53:2 והתעיבו] התעיבו
Ps 53:2 עול] עלילה
- 2 Ps 53:3 אלהים] יהוה
- 3 Ps 53:4 כלו] הכל
- Ps 53:4 סג] סר
- 4 Ps 53:5 >] כל
Ps 53:5 אלהים] יהוה
- 5 Ps 53:6 +] פחד
Ps 53:6 פור] בדור
Ps 53:6 >] צדיק
- 6 Ps 53:6 עצמות חנך] עצת עני
Ps 53:6 הבישהה] תבישו
Ps 53:6 אלהים] יהוה
Ps 53:6 מאסם] מחסהו
- 7 Ps 53:7 ישועות] ישועת
Ps 53:7 אלהים] יהוה

This table presents the text of Psalm 14 וז in which the overlaps with Psalm 53 are underlined, while the differences are not.

While there are several substantial differences between the two psalms in זז, with the exception of v 6, they share the same ideas and are therefore analyzed in the commentaries as a single psalm. Some scholars attempt to reconstruct the text that was at the base of the two transmitted psalms.²²

²² C.C. Torrey, "The Archetype of Psalms 14 and 53," *JBL* 46 (1927) 186–92; K. Budde, "Psalm 14 und 53," *JBL* 47 (1928) 160–83. In some details, these scholars consider the

In their common text, the two psalms speak out against the nations who deny God's existence and devour His people, and end with a prayer for salvation emanating from Zion. The differences between the two versions were created during the course of their scribal transmission, with additional differences created by separate exegesis. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between these two levels since several of these differences can be explained in different ways.

Most differences were created during the *scribal* transmission: → pp. 219–62

1 עלילה Ps 53:2. After the word pair השחיתו ההעיבו, the general עלילה (deed) is appropriate and not עול, which creates a tautology. The two words are tantalizingly close, and therefore a graphical interchange is likely.

3 סנ Ps 53:4. It is difficult to decide which reading is preferable, but the words clearly developed from one another.

5 פור Ps 53:6. An interchange of פור and בדר (ר) is likely, resulting in words carrying opposite meanings. According to Psalm 14, “God is present in the circle of the righteous” (*NJPS*) including a word צדיק not found in Psalm 53, while according to Psalm 53 “God has scattered the bones of your besiegers.”

6 מאסם Ps 53:6 and עצמות הנך הבישה Ps 53:6. The two psalms display diametrically opposing pictures. The most clearly recognizable difference is that God “rejected” Israel’s enemies in Psalm 53, while in Psalm 14 God serves as the “refuge” of his righteous followers (second group of variants). However, graphically the Hebrew words are very similar. Likewise, the first group of variants (Psalm 14: “You would confound the plans of the poor” [*NRSV*] // Psalm 53: “[God has scattered] the bones of your besiegers. You have put <them> to shame.”) offers two different pictures, while the Hebrew letters are similar as indicated in the printing (in addition, the *aleph* and the *het* are phonetically close). Both formulations have their own internal logic, and because they are graphically similar, one version developed from the other one. → ch. 3B

Other differences between the two versions are *exegetical*.

3 כלו Ps 53:4.

4 כל Ps 53:4.

5 פחד + לא היה פחד Ps 53:6. This additional hemistich⁺ runs parallel to the previous one, and may reflect a double, alternative, reading.

Note further an expanded superscription in Ps 53:1 and the replacement of the Tetragrammata⁺ of Psalm 14 (יהוה) with אלהים (God) in vv 2, 4, 7 in Psalm 53, as usual in the Elohistic⁺ Psalter (Psalms 42–89 [or: 83]). → Tov, “Coincidental Textual Nature,” 164–6

The analysis in Tables 1 and 2 showed that it is often difficult to decide whether a certain variation reflects a scribe’s content exegesis or a textual development. Assuming that such differences often reflect scribal activity, the parallel texts in ׀ provide a major source of information about ancient scribal activity,²³ similar to the differences between ancient scrolls of the same text.

same reading original, usually that of Psalm 14, while in v 5 they go their separate ways.

²³ See the data on pp. 221–39 and Sperber, *Grammar*.

As a result, even though there is no direct, archeological, evidence (that is, ancient scrolls) for the earliest stages of the transmission of most biblical books, indirect evidence does exist for this stage in these parallel texts within \mathfrak{M} itself. Such differences attest to readings developed in one of the first stages of the textual transmission, as, for example, between the two parallel versions of the “Table of the nations” in \mathfrak{M} (Genesis 10 // 1 Chronicles*** 1; → Table 1 above):

Gen 10:4	\mathfrak{M}	וּבְנֵי יוֹן אֱלִישָׁה וְתַרְשִׁישׁ כְּתִים וְדַדַּנִּים (= $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{O P s-J N}}$ \mathfrak{V} and \mathfrak{V} in 1 Chr 1:7) The descendants of Javan: Elishah and Tarshish, the Kittim and <i>Dodanim</i> . ²⁴
1 Chr 1:7	\mathfrak{M}	וּבְנֵי יוֹן אֱלִישָׁה וְתַרְשִׁישָׁה כְּתִים וְרֹדַנִּים (= \mathfrak{M} and \mathfrak{S} וְרֹדַנִּים and $\mathfrak{P} \acute{\omicron} \delta \acute{\iota} \omicron \tau \omicron \iota$ in Gen 10:4) The descendants of Javan: Elishah and Tarshishah, the Kittim and Rodanim.
Gen 10:28	\mathfrak{M}	וְאֵת עֹבַל וְאֵת אַבִּימָאֵל (= \mathfrak{S} , also in Gen 36:23) Obal and Abimael
1 Chr 1:22	\mathfrak{M}	וְאֵת עִיבָל וְאֵת אַבִּימָאֵל (= Gen 10:28 \mathfrak{M} $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{O P s-J N}}$ \mathfrak{V} ; Gen 36:23 \mathfrak{M} \mathfrak{S} $\mathfrak{C}^{\text{O P s-J N}}$ \mathfrak{V}) <i>Ebal</i> and Abimael

Similar internal differences are found in the two versions of the list of David’s mighty men in \mathfrak{M} :

2 Sam 23:28-29	\mathfrak{M}	מַהֲרַי הַנְּטֹפְתִי $\mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{B}$ בֶּן בַּעֲנָה הַנְּטֹפְתִי (= $\mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S}$) Maharai the Netophathite, ²⁹ H \mathfrak{H} eleb son of Ba’anah the Netophathite
1 Chr 11:30	\mathfrak{M}	מַהֲרַי הַנְּטֹפְתִי $\mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{H} \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{D}$ בֶּן בַּעֲנָה הַנְּטֹפְתִי (= $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{V}$; = \mathfrak{V} in Samuel) Maharai the Netophathite, H \mathfrak{H} eled son of Ba’anah the Netophathite

The scribal background of differences of this type was already recognized by R. David Kimh \mathfrak{L} i (RaDaK) in his commentary on “and Rodanim” in 1 Chr 1:7:²⁵

This word is written with a *resh* at the beginning. And in the book of Genesis it is written with two *daleths*: “and *Dodanim*.” Since the *daleth* and *resh* are similar in appearance, and among the readers of the genealogies which were written in ancient times, some read a *daleth* and some read a *resh*, some names were preserved for posterity in two

²⁴ For a similar interchange, see Ezek 27:15 \mathfrak{M} $\mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{V}$ דָּדַן — $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{P} \acute{\omicron} \delta \acute{\iota} \omicron \tau \omicron \iota$. In ancient manuscripts, several modern translations, and some editions (Letteris, Sinai), the differences between these two names have been removed by changing the Chronicles text in accord with that of Genesis. See p. 374 for similar examples.

²⁵ RaDaK’s explanation continues the view expressed in Gen. Rab. 37.1 (ed. Theodor [Berlin: Ittskovsky, 1903–1929] 344), according to which these forms are two different exegetical variations of the same entity.

forms with either a *daleth* or a *resh*. Thus it <D/Rodanim> is written in the book of Genesis with one of the readings and in this book <1 Chronicles> with the other one. This goes to show that both forms represent one name whether read with a *daleth* or with a *resh*. This applies also to “Riblatah” (2 Kgs 25:6,20; Jer 39:5; 52:9,10,26) written with a *resh* and “Diblatah” (Ezek 6:14) with a *daleth*... Likewise, words with *waw* and *yod* are interchanged as they are similar in appearance.

In ch. 4c, many similar differences between parallel texts are presented.²⁶ The differences between Psalm 18 // 2 Samuel 22 and Isa 36:1–38:8 // 2 Kgs 18:13–20:11 are listed in *Sof.* 8.1–2.

B. A Modern Approach to Textual Criticism

Since the discovery in 1947 of Hebrew and Aramaic texts in the Judean Desert dating from approximately 250 BCE until 135 CE, our knowledge about the Scripture text has increased greatly. → ch. 2IA–C. It should be remembered that until the time of those discoveries no early Hebrew and Aramaic Scripture texts were known, except for a liturgical text that does not witness to the biblical text in the generally accepted sense of the word.²⁷ Therefore, the research before 1947 was based on Hebrew–Aramaic texts that had been copied 1200 years or more after the composition of the biblical books. At the same time, scholars also relied on manuscripts and early papyrus fragments of the ancient translations → ch. 2II, especially of the Septuagint (Ⓞ) and the Vulgate (Ⓟ), which brought them much closer to the time of the composition of the biblical books. All these, however, are translations, and the reconstruction of their Hebrew–Aramaic sources will always remain uncertain. → pp. 122–7. Therefore, the discovery in the Judean Desert of many Hebrew–Aramaic texts dating from two millennia ago has considerably advanced our knowledge of the early witnesses and the procedure of the copying and transmitting of texts.

This new knowledge has necessarily changed our understanding of the Scripture text and, accordingly, our approach to writing an introduction to textual criticism. Such a new approach is *not* reflected in most previously written introductions. The influential introduction of Roberts, *OTTV*, was written in 1951, after the discovery of the first texts

²⁶ It is exactly these parallel biblical passages that prompted the development of textual criticism of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture in earlier centuries, because they necessitated the comparison of texts. See especially Kennicott, *Dissertation, Part the First compares I CHRON. XI with 2 SAM. V and XXIII* (1753); Owen, *Critica Sacra* (1774). Further studies on this topic are listed by I. Kalimi, *Chronicles, The Books of Chronicles: A Classified Bibliography* (Simor Bible Bibliographies; Jerusalem: Simor, 1990) 52–66.

²⁷ The Nash papyrus of the Decalogue. → p. 111

in the Judean Desert, but its author was not able to incorporate the new discoveries in his description. In our view, the introductions of Klein, *Textual Criticism* 1974, Deist, *Text* 1978, id., *Witnesses* 1988, McCarter, *Textual Criticism* 1986, and Würthwein, *Text* 1988 (5th edition) although written at a time when several Judean Desert texts were known, in many respects still reflect the approach of the period before the discovery of the new data. As a matter of fact, the main Judean Desert texts were published after the publication of these introductions. On the other hand, the more recent introductions by Wegner* 2006 and Fischer* 2009 pay much attention to the new discoveries.

In our opinion, the new discoveries have not only added new data that are of major importance, but have also necessitated a new approach to the texts that were known before 1947. → pp. 158–60

The new insights are visible in the different amounts of attention given to the textual sources. Ever since the 17th century, introductory analyses have given equal attention to all Scriptural texts. Scholars regarded the ancient translations, especially the Greek and Latin versions, with esteem, because their manuscripts preceded those of \aleph by many centuries, and also because Greek and Latin sources were highly valued in the Church and in the centers of learning in Europe. Therefore, much attention has been given not only to \aleph but also to the Greek, Latin, and Aramaic versions, including the Peshitta (ξ), and even to the “daughter” (or secondary) versions made from Θ , such as the Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, and Armenian translations. → p. 127. After some time, scholars realized that most of these translations were only of limited value for the textual criticism of the Hebrew–Aramaic Bible, and that their importance was confined mainly to biblical exegesis. Nevertheless, these primary and secondary translations were still given extensive treatment in textual descriptions, commentaries, and even in the *BH* series.²⁸ In our view, this approach is no longer relevant for modern textual criticism. Therefore, the different coverage of the various sources in this introduction reflects our textual outlook. This monograph devotes much attention to texts whose relevance has been proven, that is, \aleph , the Judean Desert texts, the Samaritan Pentateuch (ω), and Θ . It pays less attention to a detailed description of the medieval manuscripts of \aleph and of most of the ancient versions, whose importance for the textual

²⁸ Nevertheless, the *BH* series contains almost no notes referring solely to the Aramaic or Latin translations, or one of the “daughter” translations⁺ of Θ . Such evidence is mainly mentioned in conjunction with that of additional sources. → Tov, “Aramaic”

criticism of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture—as opposed to exegesis—is limited.

The study of the biblical text was initiated as an auxiliary science to biblical exegesis. Therefore, the results of textual investigation have been taken into consideration in critical exegetical analysis, and that practice continues to be followed today. Textual criticism has a distinctly practical aspect for biblical exegesis, but as a rule this feature has not been reflected sufficiently in the extant handbooks on textual criticism. Unlike those handbooks, chapter 7 of this book deal extensively with exegetical aspects. Within this framework, the relevance of textual criticism to literary analysis, a topic that is usually not treated in handbooks such as this, is covered extensively in ch. 7.

C. Beginnings of Critical Inquiry into the Scripture Text

Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle* 1992, *1–*63; B. Chiesa, “Appunti di storia della critica del testo dell’Antico Testamento ebraico,” *Henoah* 12 (1990) 3–14; L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche* (Jena: Mauke, 1869); Eichhorn, *Einleitung*; Goshen-Gottstein, “Biblical Manuscripts”; K.F. Keil, *Manual of Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament*, vol. II (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1892); König, *Einleitung*; H.J. Kraus, *Geschichte der historisch-kritischen Erforschung des Alten Testaments* (3rd ed.; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982); F. Laplanche, *L’Écriture, le sacré et l’histoire: Érudits et politiques protestants devant la Bible en France au XVII^e siècle* (Amsterdam/Maarsse: APA-Holland University Press, 1986); Rosenmüller, *Handbuch*; Steuernagel, *Einleitung*, § 22.

Interest in the text of Scripture began in the first centuries CE when learned church fathers compared the text of Jewish Scripture with its Greek versions. In the 3rd century, Origen prepared a six-column edition (hence its name: Hexapla⁺ [six-column edition]) of Hebrew–Aramaic Scripture, which contained the Hebrew–Aramaic text, its transliteration into Greek characters, and four different Greek versions. → pp. 145–6. Likewise, Jerome⁺ included various notes comparing words in the Hebrew text and their renderings in Greek and Latin translations in his commentaries. → ch. 2, Table 8 (p. 46)

The critical investigation of the relation between the various textual witnesses began in the 16th century with the appearance of the Polyglot text editions⁺, which invited the textual comparison because these editions presented the various witnesses in parallel columns. The first extensive textual treatises are those by Morinus, Cappellus, and Richard Simon, stressing the importance of either \aleph or one or more of the other

versions, usually colored by Catholic–Protestant polemics.²⁹ The reader of Cappellus, *Critica Sacra* (1650) is amazed at the level of knowledge, acumen, and critical insight displayed by this scholar, foreshadowing all modern analyses.

After the middle of the 17th century, a great many critical treatises appeared on the Scriptural text, though it should be recognized that philological analysis and theological discussion often went hand in hand in this and the following century. The three aforementioned studies, as well as many by Buxtorf, Glassius, Hottinger, Houbigant, Kennicott, Rosenmüller, and de Rossi, contributed much to the development of the critical approach to the biblical text.³⁰ The *Einleitung* of Eichhorn* (1780–1823) stands out as a work of immense learning and sophistication in the 18th century, which also had a major influence on subsequent generations.³¹ Among the many names that may be mentioned from the 19th century, see especially de Lagarde, Perles, Cornill, and Wellhausen, who displayed a remarkable insight into textual criticism (→ the general bibliography on pp. xxix–lv). In many areas of textual criticism, it is often best to start with these older works, since an intuitive grasp of the issues underlying divergent texts is just as important in this art as information deriving from recently discovered data (e.g. the Qumran texts). Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis* and the introductions of König* and Steuernagel* exhibited this type of intuition. However, the modern description of textual criticism differs significantly from earlier discussions as a result of the contribution of the newly discovered Qumran texts to almost every area of textual criticism. For many other respects of the history of the investigation of the biblical text, see ch. 3A.

D. Text, Canon, and Sacred Status

The books of Hebrew Scripture were gradually accepted as binding (authoritative) and at some point were integrated into different collections of sacred writings, among them those of ׀, ׆, and ׃. However, scribal and editorial processes started a long time before the books obtained authoritative status, also named canonization⁺ when referring to Scripture as a whole. For example, Jeremiah 36 describes how

²⁹ Cappellus, *Critica Sacra*; Morinus, *Exerc.*; Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament* (Paris: Éditions de Paris, 1680/Rotterdam: Leers, 1685; repr. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1973) = *A Critical History of the Old Testament* (London: Davis, 1682).

³⁰ For bibliographical references, see the general bibliography and ch. 3A1.

³¹ The works of these scholars have been described in detail by Rosenmüller*, Keil*, Barthélemy* 1992, 1*–63*, and Childs, *Introduction*, 89–92.

the prophet dictated the contents of a second scroll to Baruch following the burning of the first one by the king. That scroll thus constituted a second stage of the scribal development and, in a way, of the growing process of the book. → p. 181, n. 66. The contents of the second scroll cannot be reconstructed, let alone the first one, but in other cases we know more about the development stages of the books. Thus, in ch. 7_{B1} we analyze the relation between the \aleph and Θ versions of Jeremiah, suggesting that Θ (together with 4QJer^{b,d}) represents an early stage in the *literary* (editorial) development of that book, which preceded the edition of \aleph that became canonical. Elsewhere in ch. 7_B, we describe many similar examples of literary variants⁺ preserved in non-Masoretic sources. On the basis of this understanding, we therefore submit that writing processes and textual transmission can and should be discussed beyond those seen in the final literary shape of the biblical books, often included in \aleph . This approach involves the opening up of new horizons beyond \aleph .

When opening up new sources that are relevant for textual criticism, we thus should keep an open mind with regard to *different Scripture collections*. → p. 284. When discussing the textual criticism of Hebrew Scripture, in the view of many scholars we should not consider the canonical status of \aleph binding for the analysis since the concept of sacred Scripture was more encompassing than solely that included in \aleph . Since textual criticism deals with all forms of Hebrew Scripture, it also covers the content of other sacred collections, namely those included in Θ , ω , and the Qumran corpus. Some books included in these collections preceded the literary crystallization of \aleph , while others were composed afterwards. In ch. 7_{B21–23}, the reader will therefore find an analysis of such non-Masoretic works as Psalm 151 (Θ and 11QPs^a), the editorial changes inserted in ω , and the exegetical editions of the Torah included in the Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP⁺) scrolls from cave 4.³²

Finally, there is not necessarily a connection between the sacred status of the Scripture books and the nature of the scribal transmission. Even the most sacred Scripture book, the Torah, was not transmitted more carefully than the other books, neither in the proto-Masoretic scrolls nor in other text traditions. → p. 188

³² At the same time, “rewritten Scripture” compositions and abbreviated Qumran scrolls are excluded from textual analysis with regard to their major deviations from \aleph , even though some of these compositions were considered authoritative in antiquity. As remarked on p. 189, deviations from \aleph in these compositions in small details are included in the analysis.

E. Subjectivity of This Book

Subjectivity pervades all chapters of this book, although we try to be as objective as possible. The objective elements pertain to the description of facts and textual sources, but these descriptions also include many subjective components. For example, the recognition of the Qumran Scribal Practice (→ pp. 100–105), the characterization of the textual character of the Qumran scrolls (→ pp. 105–7), and the description of the text-critical value of the various translations (→ pp. 135–40, 146–53) are all subjective. The recognition of variants⁺ in the ancient translations is based on a combination of objective criteria and intuition. In the case of the evaluation of variants⁺ (ch. 6), we stress that objectivity is impossible, and that scholars must develop their own subjective reasoning (→ pp. 279–81). On the whole, something considered a solid fact by one scholar is contested by another. Thus, almost every paragraph in this book attests to subjectivity, which needs to be taken into consideration.