EMPIRICAL MODELS CHALLENGING BIBLICAL CRITICISM

ANCIENT ISRAEL AND ITS LITERATURE

Thomas C. Römer, General Editor

Editorial Board:
Mark G. Brett
Marc Brettler
Corrine L. Carvalho
Cynthia Edenburg
Konrad Schmid
Gale A. Yee

Number 25

SBL
SBL PRESS

EMPIRICAL MODELS CHALLENGING BIBLICAL CRITICISM

Edited by

Raymond F. Person Jr. and Robert Rezetko

SBL

SBL PRESS

SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Contents

Abbreviations

4QRP	4QReworked Pentateuch (4Q158, 4Q364–367)
AASF	Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible
AB	*Assyriologische Bibliothek*
ABRL	Anchor Bible Reference Library
AfO	*Archiv für Orientforschung*
AIL	Ancient Israel and Its Literature
AMD	Ancient Magic and Divination
ANEM	Ancient Near Eastern Monographs
AnSt	*Anatolian Studies*
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
APB	*Acta Patristica et Byzantina*
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
AUMSR	Andrews University Monograph Studies in Religion
AuOr	*Aula Orientalis*
AuOrSup	Aula Orientalis Supplementa
AYBRL	Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library
b.	Babylonian Talmud
BaF	Baghdader Forschungen
BETL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium
BGE	*The Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic: Introduction, Critical Edition and Cuneiform Texts.* Andrew R. George. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
BH	*Book History*
BH	Biblical Hebrew
BHL	Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia.* Edited by Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983.

BIAAOP	Occasional Publications of the British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara
Bib	*Biblica*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar, Altes Testament
BMS	*Babylonian Magic and Sorcery: "Being The Prayers of the Lifting of the Hand"; The Cuneiform Texts of a Group of Babylonian and Assyrian Incantations and Magical Formulae Edited with Transliterations and Full Vocabulary from Tablets of the Kuyunjik Collections Preserved in the British Museum.* Edited by Leonard W. King. London: Luzac, 1896.
BSalmD	Bibliotheca Salmanticensis Dissertationes
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ca.	circa
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CahTD	Cahiers du Groupe François-Thureau Dangin
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBH	Classical Biblical Hebrew
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CHANE	Culture and History of the Ancient Near East
CM	Cuneiform Monographs
CNIP	Carsten Niebuhr Institute Publications
CP	The Carlsberg Papyri
CQS	Companion to the Qumran Scrolls
CRRAI	Compte Rendu de la Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale
CSASE	Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England
CUSAS	Cornell University Studies in Assyriology and Sumerology
DG	The Death of Gilgamesh
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
DSSSE	*The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition.* Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Leiden: Brill, 1999.
EANEC	Explorations in Ancient Near Eastern Civilizations

EBH	Early Biblical Hebrew
EstBib	*Estudios bíblicos*
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
ExpTim	*Expository Times*
FFC	Folklore Fellows Communications
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GA	Gilgamesh and Agga
GBH	Gilgamesh and the Bull of Heaven
GEN	Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld
GH	Gilgamesh and Huwawa
HBV	Hebrew Bible and Its Versions
HR	*History of Religions*
HS	*Hebrew Studies*
HSCL	Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HThKAT	Herder Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
IBT	Interpreting Biblical Texts
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IEJ	*Israel Exploration Journal*
IIAS	International Institute of Advanced Studies
IOS	Israel Oriental Studies
IRT	Issues in Religion and Theology
ISBL	Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBS	Jerusalem Biblical Studies
JCS	*Journal of Cuneiform Studies*
JCSSup	Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplement Series
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JR	*Journal of Religion*
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römisher Zeit
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*

JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KAL	Keilschrifttexte aus Assur literarischen Inhalts
KHC	Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament
LAI	Library of Ancient Israel
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
LDSS	Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies
LSAWS	Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic
LSS	Leipziger semitische Studien
LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
LXX	Septuagint
MC	Mesopotamian Civilizations
MCAAS	Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts & Sciences
MdB	Le Monde de la Bible
MES	Medieval European Studies
MF	Mandäistische Forschungen
MIFAO	Mémoires publiés par les membres de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale
MS	Mnemosyne Supplementum
MSL	Materialien zum sumerischen Lexikon/Materials for the Sumerian Lexicon
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
n(n).	note(s)
NA	Neo-Assyrian
NABU	*Nouvelles assyriologiques brèves et utilitaires*
Ned.	Nedarim
NETS	*A New English Translation of the Septuagint.* Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NS	New series

NT	New Testament
NTL	New Testament Library
NTT	New Testament Theology
OAC	Orientis Antiqvi Collectio
OB	Old Babylonian
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
obv.	obverse
OCTb	Oxford Centre Textbooks
OG	Old Greek
OHRT	Oxford Handbooks in Religion and Theology
OIS	Oriental Institute Seminars
OL	Old Latin
OPSNKF	Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund
Or	*Orientalia*
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP	*The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983, 1985.
OtSt	Oudtestamentische Studiën
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society in Helsinki
PHSC	Perspectives on Hebrew Scriptures and Its Contexts
PIHANS	Publications de l'Institut historique-archéologique néerlandais de Stamboul
pl(s).	plate(s)
PTSDSSP	Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project
Q	*Quelle* (German for source); the hypothetical written source for the material common to Matthew and Luke but absent from Mark
RA	*Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale*
RB	*Revue biblique*
RBén	*Revue bénédictine*
RBL	*Review of Biblical Literature*
RBS	Resources for Biblical Studies
RelSoc	Religion and Society
repr.	reprint
rev.	reverse
RevQ	*Revue de Qumrân*
RILP	Roehampton Institute London Papers
RlA	*Reallexikon der Assyriologie*. Edited by Erich Ebeling et al. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1928–

RSRS	Routledge Studies in Rhetoric and Stylistics
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAL	Studies in Arabic Literature
SB	Standard Babylonian
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLStBL	Society of Biblical Literature Studies in Biblical Literature
SBS	Stuttgart Bibelstudien
SCL	Sather Classical Lectures
ScrHier	Scripta Hierosolymitana
SCS	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SDSS	Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature
SHBC	Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
SPap	*Studia Papyrologica*
SSLL	Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics
SSN	Studia Semitica Neerlandica
SSU	Studia Semitica Upsaliensia
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
StPohl	Studia Pohl
STT 1	*The Sultantepe Tablets*. Vol. 1. Oliver R. Gurney, and Jacob J. Finkelstein. BIAAOP 3. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1957.
STT 2	*The Sultantepe Tablets*. Vol. 2. Oliver R. Gurney and Peter Hulin. BIAAOP 7. London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1964.
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum
SymS	Symposium Series
TECC	Textos y estudios "Cardenal Cisneros"
Text	*Textus*
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TSHLRS	Texts and Studies in the Hebrew Language and Related Subjects
TZ	*Theologische Zeitschrift*
UAVA	Untersuchungen zur Assyriologie und vorderasiatischen Archäologie
VL	Vetus Latina: Die Reste der Altlateinischen Bibel

VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
VWGTh	Veröffentlichungen der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WC	Westminster Commentaries
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
WVDOG	Wissenschaftliche Veröffentlichungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*

Introduction:
The Importance of Empirical Models to Assess the Efficacy of Source and Redaction Criticism

Raymond F. Person Jr. and Robert Rezetko

1. Introduction

The title of the present book clearly relates to Jeffrey Tigay's influential edited volume, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*,[1] where we have changed *for* to *Challenging*. We view our book as both paying homage to the influence Tigay's volume has had on our own work and others' and correcting the current discussion of the efficacy of source and redaction criticism as is often practiced by biblical scholars, including those who may have been influenced by Tigay's book. In this introduction, we will discuss Tigay's publications concerning empirical models (including some before and after his influential volume) and the influence of Tigay's volume in biblical scholarship. We will then clarify why we think there is a need for reassessing the efficacy of source and redaction criticism on the basis of empirical models, which is the purpose of this volume. We will not only introduce the following chapters in this volume, but also summarize the collective force of the current volume as a whole on the efficacy of source and redaction criticism, arguing that too often biblical scholars make source and redactional arguments based on inappropriate criteria.

---

1. Jeffrey H. Tigay, ed., *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985; repr. with a new foreword by Richard Elliott Friedman, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005).

2. Jeffrey Tigay and His "Empirical Models"

Tigay begins his 1975 *Journal of Biblical Literature* article "An Empirical Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis"[2] with a tribute to the 1890 *Journal of Biblical Literature* article by George Foot Moore, "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch."[3] Moore was explicitly responding to critics of the Documentary Hypothesis who insisted that we have no evidence of such composite texts in the ancient world by showing how the four sources of the canonical gospels were combined in the Diatessaron analogous to the composite Pentateuch made up of JEDP.[4] Tigay wrote: "Although the *Diatessaron* has been ruled out of court because of its lateness, Moore's method in analyzing it was exemplary. He was able to demonstrate its literary background empirically because he had its sources as well as its final form before him."[5] Tigay adopted Moore's empirical method in his analysis of the Masoretic Text (MT) and the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP) and concluded as follows: "[W]e find that the documentary hypothesis presumes a method of composition which is empirically attested in ancient Israel, from a time close to that in which most of the biblical books attained their present form. The evidence here reviewed constitutes a type of documentary composition unfolding before our very eyes."[6] Thus Tigay understood that, like Moore but on the basis of earlier comparative data, he had defended the Documentary Hypothesis from its critics by providing "An Empirical Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis."

---

2. Jeffrey H. Tigay, "An Empirical Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis," *JBL* 94 (1975): 329–42; rev. Hebrew version, Tigay, "The Samaritan Pentateuch as an Empirical Model for Biblical Criticism," *BM* 22 (1977): 348–61; rev. English version, Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, 53–95.

3. George Foot Moore, "Tatian's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch," *JBL* 9 (1890): 201–15.

4. The Diatessaron was produced by Tatian, an early Christian theologian, around the year 170 CE in Syriac or Greek. JEDP refers to the hypothesis that the first five books of the Bible, Genesis to Deuteronomy, developed into their present form from four sources of different dates and authorship which were gradually joined together (J = Jahwist or Yahwist, E = Elohist, D = Deuteronomist, P = Priestly source).

5. Tigay, "Empirical Basis for the Documentary Hypothesis," 330.

6. Ibid., 342.

A decade later in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*,[7] Tigay's concern for providing an empirical basis for the Documentary Hypothesis against the criticism of the "harmonizers"[8]—that is, those who insisted

---

7. For the benefit of the reader who may be unfamiliar with Tigay's edited volume—others may skip this note—we summarize its basic content here as objectively as possible. It contains an introduction (1–20) and conclusion (239–41) by Tigay and eight other chapters by five scholars, three by Tigay (21–52, 53–95, 149–73), two by Emanuel Tov (97–130, 211–37), and one each by Alexander Rofé (131–47), Yair Zakovitch (175–96), and Mordechai Cogan (197–209). There is also an "Appendix: Tatian's Diatessaron and the Analysis of the Pentateuch" by George Foot Moore (243–56), and illustrations are inserted between 130 and 131. Most of the chapters were presented orally and/or published previously elsewhere (unnumbered page near the front and unnumbered notes on 1, 53, 131, 149, 197, 211, 243). Each chapter is preceded by a brief "Editor's Note" by Tigay that summarizes its content and significance (21–22, 53, 97–98, 131, 149–50, 175–76, 197, 211–12). The chapters cover a range of texts and topics, which are conveniently summarized in Tigay's introduction, editorial notes, and conclusion (19–22, 53, 97–98, 131, 149–50, 175–76, 197, 211–12, 239–40). We would outline those as follows: The *texts* come from Mesopotamian literature (Gilgamesh Epic, Laws of Hammurabi, etc.), biblical literature (Pentateuch, Josh 20, 1 Sam 16–18, Jeremiah, Chronicles, etc.) in the Bible's various textual traditions (MT, SP, biblical Dead Sea Scrolls [DSS], Septuagint [LXX]), and postbiblical Jewish and Christian literature (Jubilees, Temple Scroll, Talmudic literature, Tatian's Diatessaron, etc.). The principal *topics* are literary development; source and redaction criticism; composite documents, especially the Documentary Hypothesis; editorial techniques, including conflation, supplementation, and assimilation; phenomena such as anachronisms, inconsistencies, contradictions, repetitions, doublets, and thematic and stylistic variations; external or extrabiblical analogues or comparisons (e.g., Gilgamesh Epic); and internal or biblical duplicates or parallels (e.g., Samuel–Kings // Chronicles). The primary *objective* of his book relates to the phrase "empirical models." In its context that refers to the *analogues* and *duplicates* just mentioned. The aim is to offer tangible, observable, *empirical* evidence—versus hypotheses and theories—from ancient Near Eastern literature, nonbiblical and biblical, which illustrate and support—not prove— the assumptions, methods, and conclusions of critical scholarship about the literary formation of the Bible. In Tigay's own words: "Together these studies, based on texts whose evolution can be documented by copies from several stages in the course of their development—in other words, on *empirical models*—show that many literary works from ancient Israel and cognate cultures were demonstrably produced in the way critics believe that biblical literature was produced" (xi–xii, emphasis original). "The present volume brings together a number of studies that illuminate aspects of the development of the Hebrew Bible by means of comparison with analogues" (19).

8. Jeffrey H. Tigay, "The Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern and Postbiblical Literature," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, 149, 154; rev. from Tigay, "The Stylistic Criteria of Source-Criticism in

on the literary unity of the Pentateuch such as Umberto Cassuto, Cyrus Gordon, and Kenneth Kitchen—continued strongly as he not only provided *empirical models* but insisted that the nature of the Pentateuch itself is such that source criticism is efficacious. For example, in his "Editor's Note" to his own chapter "The Evolution of the Pentateuch Narratives in the Light of the Evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic*," he wrote the following:

> Although we can see now that the epic was so extensively revised that no amount of critical acumen could have led critics to reconstruct its sources and early stages as they really were, we can also see that the general outline of development presumed by M. Jastrow on the basis of nineteenth-century critical suppositions was not very wide of the mark. The larger number of inconsistencies in the Torah indicates that it was not extensively revised; that is why it is more amenable to source criticism than is *Gilgamesh*.[9]

Later in the chapter "The Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern and Postbiblical Literature," he described two types of redactors, (1) those "who showed great deference toward their sources" and (2) those who "showed a greater willingness to revise the wording of their sources, and thereby produced smoother compositions."[10] He then concluded as follows:

> [T]he unevenness within the Torah shows its redactors to have been largely of the first type [that is, redactors who showed great deference toward their sources]. But even redactors who revised their sources extensively left some traces of the original wording, and where those traces occur in telltale combinations with each other or in association with other signs of compositeness, they can help guide the critic in identifying the components.[11]

---

the Light of Ancient Near Eastern Literature," in *Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume: Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World*, vol. 3: *Non-Hebrew Section*, ed. Alexander Rofé and Yair Zakovitch (Jerusalem: Rubinstein, 1983), 67–91. All subsequent references are to the 1985 version of the article from Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*.

9. Jeffrey H. Tigay, "The Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives in the Light of the Evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic*," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, 21–22.

10. Tigay, "Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism," 172.

11. Ibid.

Thus it seems obvious that one of Tigay's objectives for his volume was to provide an empirical basis for the Documentary Hypothesis against its critics.[12] This appears to influence even his "Editor's Note[s]" introducing chapters that do not concern the Pentateuch. For example, he described Emanuel Tov's chapter "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version" as "[a]nother example of conflation,"[13] implying that Tov's chapter provides additional support to the examples in his own immediately preceding chapter "Conflation as a Redactional Technique" that is explicitly a defense of the Documentary Hypothesis.[14] In a similar fashion, he wrote the following in his "Editor's Note" to Alexander Rofé's chapter "Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated": "Rofé shows that the linguistic and conceptual inconsistencies in the chapter reflect differences between the two strata, thus validating the critical methods which take such differences as source-critical clues."[15] Significantly, Rofé's chapter immediately precedes Tigay's "The Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism in the Light of Ancient Near Eastern and Postbiblical Literature" and in this way also prepares for Tigay's defense of the Documentary Hypothesis.[16]

When these conclusions are combined, the rhetorical force of *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* asserts the validity of the methods of source and redaction criticism. The ambiguity in the title itself—*Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*—may have contributed to this influence. That is, although we will see below that Tigay may have understood the title to mean that biblical criticism should take more seriously the limitations that the empirical models place on the methods of biblical criticism (*Empirical Models for* [*Placing Limits on*] *Biblical Criticism*), the title has often been read as *Empirical Models for* [*the Validity of*] *Biblical Criticism*

---

12. Tigay himself states: "My interest in the subject of this volume derives ultimately from an early fascination with the documentary hypothesis" (Jeffrey H. Tigay, "Preface and Acknowledgements," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, xi).

13. Emanuel Tov, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, 97.

14. Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique."

15. Alexander Rofé, "Joshua 20: Historico-Literary Criticism Illustrated," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, 131. Furthermore, although Rofé's chapter does not deal with the Documentary Hypothesis per se, there is nevertheless a substantial discussion of the hypothesis in a section of his chapter, "Relevance for the Documentary Hypothesis" (143–47).

16. Tigay, "Stylistic Criterion of Source Criticism."

[*as Commonly Practiced by Source and Redaction Critics*]. As we have seen above, Tigay's earlier *Journal of Biblical Literature* article, his conclusions in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* in his own chapters, and his "Editor's Note[s]" introducing others' chapters all seem to support this latter interpretation of the title.

However, in his introduction and conclusion, Tigay was somewhat more cautious. On the one hand, in his introduction he wrote the following, which is consistent with the above conclusions:

> Concrete analogues would enable the literary critic to base his work on something more than hypotheses about ancient literary techniques. They could function as models of literary development, providing the critic firsthand experience with compilers' and redactors' techniques, lending his observations a refinement they could never have so long as they were based entirely on hypotheses devoid of external controls.[17]

If one emphasizes only this conclusion, then one could easily conclude that the title should be read as *Empirical Models for* [*the Validity of*] *Biblical Criticism* [*as Commonly Practiced by Source and Redaction Critics*]. However, on the other hand, Tigay balanced this conclusion concerning such "external controls" for biblical criticism by cautioning against such a misreading in both his introduction and his conclusion as follows:

> This would be a fatal flaw in the use of such analogues if we imagined that analogues can confirm any particular theory about the development of an Israelite composition. That, however, is not the function of an analogue. Even another text by the same author cannot prove how a text was produced. Analogues can only serve to show what is *plausible* or *realistic* by showing what has happened elsewhere. Such a demonstration, if compatible with the evidence from within the biblical text being studied, can help critics evaluate the *realism* of an existing theory about the development of that text or it can suggest a new theory about it.[18]

> The preceding chapters have shown that many of the central hypotheses of biblical criticism are *realistic*. They do not prove that these hypotheses are correct, but they show that the processes of literary development

---

17. Jeffrey H. Tigay, "Introduction," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, 3.
18. Ibid., 17 (emphasis added).

which critics inferred from clues within biblical literature are real phe-
nomena, attested in the history of literature from ancient times down to
our own. This conclusion is based on case studies of texts whose earlier
stages are known and do not have to be hypothetically reconstructed; it
is based, in other words, on empirical models.[19]

Tigay also noted that empirical models have potential "disadvantages"[20]
and "might yield results at variance with certain critical hypotheses about
biblical literature"[21] or "suggest explanations better than those currently
preferred by critics."[22] Consequently, since empirical models only dem-
onstrate what in general is "reasonable" or "plausible"[23] and cannot prove
specific hypotheses or theories, there is also some justification in the book
for giving it an alternative title along the lines of *Empirical Models for
[Placing Limits on] Biblical Criticism*.

This tension in Tigay's edited volume continues in his more recent
work. For example, in his 2012 essay "The Documentary Hypothesis,
Empirical Models and Interpretations of Ancient Texts," he clearly con-
tinues to support the Documentary Hypothesis by referring to "empiri-
cal models":

> The examples we have reviewed here show that the process of redac-
> tion reconstructed by Biblical critics is realistic, that is, the redactorial
> combination of pre-existing written sources does indeed, at least some-
> times, produce inconsistencies of fact and vocabulary, digression and
> non-sequiturs, of the type that provide the primary evidence for source
> criticism.… The examples reviewed above answer this question by
> demonstrating that redactors did not always allow themselves the free-
> dom to rewrite their texts in order to resolve inconsistencies. Even if
> they resolved the inconsistencies exegetically in their own minds, in the
> written text they did not allow themselves to do much more than jux-
> tapose or interweave the sources and add some transitional phrases.[24]

---

19. Jeffrey H. Tigay, "Summary and Conclusions," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for
Biblical Criticism*, 239 (emphasis added).

20. Tigay, "Introduction," 15; see further 15–17.

21. Ibid., 9.

22. Tigay, "Summary and Conclusions," 240.

23. See also Tigay, "Introduction," 19–20; Tigay, "Evolution of the Pentateuchal
Narratives," 26–27, 52.

24. Jeffrey H. Tigay, "The Documentary Hypothesis, Empirical Models and Holis-
tic Interpretation," in *Modernity and Interpretations of Ancient Texts: The Collapse and*

There are hints in this essay, similar to his cautionary comments in the introduction and conclusion to his edited volume, that Tigay understands that empirical models cannot prove the Documentary Hypothesis. For example, in the quote above he includes "at least sometimes" and "did not always" as hedges. Furthermore, he identified three "difficulties and questions" raised by empirical models. First, "empirical models don't always explain themselves," which he illustrated by the debate between Tov and Rofé concerning whether or not the LXX of 1 Sam 16–18 represented the earliest source text that was conflated with another source to produce the MT of 1 Sam 16–18 (Tov) or the LXX was an abridgement of a (proto-) MT *Vorlage* (Rofé).[25] Second, "various versions of a text do not necessarily stand in a lineal relationship to each other. The earlier versions are not necessarily the direct or even indirect prototypes (*Vorlagen*) of the later ones."[26] Third, he acknowledged that there is some question about the appropriateness of using ancient Mesopotamian literature for the purpose of understanding the literary history of the Bible, "since we have no idea whether Israelite scribes had any knowledge at all of how scribe-authors worked in Mesopotamia, including how they edited and revised texts."[27] However, even after identifying these "difficulties and questions," he still understood empirical models to support the plausibility of the Documentary Hypothesis: "While the absence of a known analogue for a particular theory is not *ipso facto* an argument against its plausibility (what is unique is not implausible), the existence of an analogue can enhance the plausibility of a theory by showing that it is not out of line with types of literary development attested in other cases."[28] Thus, recently Tigay not only continued to insist that empirical models support the efficacy of source and redaction criticism as applied to (some) biblical texts but suggested that the empirical models support the plausibility of a specific theory, the Documentary Hypothesis.

Remaking of Traditions, ed. Jun Ikeda, IIAS Reports 1102 (Kyoto: International Institute of Advanced Studies, 2012), 125–26.

    25. Ibid., 126. Tigay is referring to Tov, "Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18," and Alexander Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, ed. Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine, and Ernest S. Frerichs (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 117–51.

    26. Tigay, "Documentary Hypothesis, Empirical Models and Holistic Interpretation," 127.

    27. Ibid.

    28. Ibid., 128.

3. The Influence of Tigay's *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*

Tigay's edited volume has been cited often and widely discussed. Its significance and impact are evident merely by searching and perusing the results on, for example, Amazon or Google Books. Published reviews have generally agreed that the book accomplishes one of its main objectives, showing that the Documentary Hypothesis is "plausible" or "realistic" in the general sense described above.[29] Unsurprisingly, however, some so-called harmonizers and synchronic-readers of biblical literature have reacted less positively. Robert Polzin, for example, believes the book is both "important and trivial" and "[t]he use of external analogues to show how literary-historical research in biblical studies is, generally speaking, realistically motivated is mostly irrelevant, first, to the specific interpretation of specific texts, and, second, to one's ability to choose one specific genetic theory over its rival."[30] In short, the generally favorable response to Tigay's empirical models as well as some of his critics have often emphasized his conclusions concerning the plausibility of the Documentary Hypothesis, thereby to a large degree disregarding Tigay's cautionary comments. This is especially evident in Richard Elliott Friedman's new foreword in the 2005 reprinted edition of Tigay's book.[31]

Friedman is a recognized authority on and vocal proponent of the Documentary Hypothesis, and, indeed, Tigay cited him several times in the original book.[32] Friedman applauds the book, appropriately, for making "a significant contribution to our field in more ways than one when it first appeared" and which "remains now, a valuable response to claims

---

29. Adele Berlin, *JAOS* 107 (1987): 145–46; John A. Emerton, *VT* 37 (1987): 508–9; Richard Elliott Friedman, *JR* 67 (1987): 539–40; G. Lloyd Jones, *ExpTim* 98 (1986): 25; John W. Rogerson, *JTS* 39 (1988): 532–35; Henry W. F. Saggs, *JSS* 32 (1987): 196–99; however, the latter criticizes some examples as being not concerned with "empirical models."

30. Robert Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History*, vol. 2: *1 Samuel*, ISBL (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 228–29 n. 41; see also Robert P. Gordon, "Compositeness, Conflation and the Pentateuch," *JSOT* 51 (1991): 57–69.

31. Richard Elliott Friedman, "Foreword," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* [1–10] (ten unnumbered pages).

32. Tigay, "Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives," 24 n. 12; Tigay, "Conflation as a Redactional Technique," 54 nn. 1, 3; Tigay, "Summary and Conclusions," 241 n. 6.

concerning the Documentary Hypothesis."[33] Furthermore in his view it is "a vindication of the process of the Documentary Hypothesis" and "a sign-post, a contribution to our field's evolution."[34] His specific remarks range over and reiterate a number of topics, such as the general value of empirical models as well as specific issues such as doublets or dual variations of stories. Most of what Friedman says is quite in line with the contents of the chapters themselves, except that one senses that Friedman is more certain about specific facts of the Documentary Hypothesis than Tigay himself was willing to admit. On one point, though, Friedman goes far beyond what any of the authors in the volume actually assert or insinuate. We are referring to the issue of linguistic evidence and its relationship to the dating of biblical writings. Friedman speaks about the "more substantial … demonstrable, quantifiable … pervasive and concrete" linguistic data,[35] "linguistic evidence that [texts] are early," citing the publications of Avi Hurvitz and others,[36] and "linguistic evidence showing that the Hebrew of the texts corresponds to the stages of development of the Hebrew language in the periods in which the hypothesis [i.e., the Documentary Hypothesis] says those respective texts were composed."[37] Friedman may wish the linguistic evidence to carry this weight, but this desire on his part actually contradicts some of the arguments found within Tigay's book that he is supposedly supporting. For example, Rofé argued for a late fourth-century date for the supplements in MT Josh 20 but noted that the scribe that added this material imitated "ancient usage rather than writing in his own Second Commonwealth Hebrew" so that Rofé suggested that this empirical example and others "detract from the value of linguistic considerations in the dating of biblical passages."[38] Even more striking is Tigay's own observations concerning the linguistic evidence in the various versions of the Gilgamesh Epic: "[M]any of the late variants seem to employ language not less ancient than the language they replace."[39] That is, Rofé and Tigay seem to be suggesting the limited efficaciousness of language for the lin-

---

33. Friedman, "Foreword," [1].
34. Ibid., [8].
35. Ibid., [1, 6].
36. Ibid., [7] with n. 5.
37. Ibid., [1].
38. Rofé, "Joshua 20," 146 with n. 29.
39. Tigay, "Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives," 40–41.

guistic dating of biblical writings based on their own empirical evidence (contra Friedman).[40]

Although Tigay's volume has played a special role in discussions concerning pentateuchal sources, it would be a serious mistake to suggest that the volume has not influenced the study of the Bible more broadly. In fact, although as scholars we have tended to avoid discussions of pentateuchal sources, the influence of Tigay's volume has been evident in our own publications from the very beginning. We are confident that the following discussion of Tigay's influence on our own work represents the experience of many scholars of the Bible whose graduate training was contemporary to ours or later.

Person encountered Tigay's book during his doctoral studies and was especially influenced by the text-critical arguments in the volume. His first publication, an article in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* that was a revision of a paper in a doctoral LXX seminar, was methodologically based on and drew from the conclusions of the chapters in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* by Tov and Rofé as well as the work of other text critics.[41] This use of text-critical variants as providing empirical limitations on his redactional arguments continued to have a significant influence on his dissertation and later works.[42] He has also used other empirical models that are not found in Tigay's volume: the comparative study of oral traditions and the social scientific discipline of

---

40. See also the chapters in this volume by Person and by Rezetko.

41. Raymond F. Person Jr., "II Kings 24,18–25,30 and Jeremiah 52: A Text-Critical Case Study in the Redaction History of the Deuteronomistic History," *ZAW* 105 (1993): 174–205. Person referred to Tov, "Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18" (Person, "II Kings," 189 n. 45, 191 n. 51); Emanuel Tov, "The Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah in the Light of Its Textual History," in Tigay, *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, 211–37 (Person, "II Kings," 176 n. 9, 180 n. 19, 186 n. 30, 187 n. 32, 189 n. 49); and Rofé, "Joshua 20" (Person, "II Kings," 175 n. 7, 185 n. 25, 186 n. 30, 189 n. 44, 191 nn. 51–52).

42. Raymond F. Person Jr., *Second Zechariah and the Deuteronomic School*, JSOTSup 167 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1993), esp. 43–54; Person, *The Kings–Isaiah and Kings–Jeremiah Recensions*, BZAW 252 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997); Person, *The Deuteronomic School: History, Social Setting, and Literature*, SBLStBL 2 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), esp. 34–50; and Person, *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World*, AIL 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), esp. 74–78, 87–129, 131–44.

conversation analysis.[43] Based on such empirical models, Person has concluded as follows:

> A new model of the development of literary texts in the ancient world is now necessary. This model should take seriously both the reality of textual plurality and the significant role of multiformity in primarily oral societies. Rather than envisioning one original, authoritative, determinant text, we should envision a collection of coexisting parallel editions, none of which preserves the tradition in its entirety and, therefore, none of which can be authoritative alone.[44]

The new model for which he advocated must include insights similar to empirical models found in Tigay's volume—that is, insights from "the reality of textual plurality"—as well as the empirical models from the study of oral traditions not found in Tigay's volume.

Rezetko also encountered Tigay's volume during his doctoral studies and was especially influenced by its text-critical arguments. In his dissertation, he used text-critical conclusions to inform his redactional arguments.[45] In his publications related to historical linguistics, he has applied analogous empirical models to critique the consensus model of Early Biblical Hebrew and Late Biblical Hebrew.[46] His work in histori-

---

43. For his use of the study of oral traditions, see especially Person, *Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles*. For conversation analysis, see especially Raymond F. Person Jr., *In Conversation with Jonah: Conversation Analysis, Literary Criticism, and the Book of Jonah*, JSOTSup 220 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996).

44. Person, *Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles*, 171–72.

45. Robert Rezetko, *Source and Revision in the Narratives of David's Transfer of the Ark: Text, Language, and Story in 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16*, LHBOTS 470 (New York: T&T Clark, 2007). Rezetko referred to Tigay's *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 55 n. 52) and Tov's "Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18" (Rezetko, *Source and Revision*, 32 n. 106, 36 n. 131). See also Rezetko, "David over Saul in MT 2 Samuel 6,1–5: An Exercise in Textual and Literary Criticism," in *For and Against David: Story and History in the Books of Samuel*, ed. A. Graeme Auld and Erik Eynikel, BETL 232 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 255–71, which applies a similar sort of textual-exegetical argumentation.

46. The following contributions stress the relevance of *empirical* manuscript evidence when addressing linguistic developments in ancient Hebrew: Robert Rezetko, "Dating Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Samuel–Kings and Chronicles," in *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, JSOTSup 369 (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 242–45; Rezetko, "'Late' Common Nouns in the Book of Chronicles," in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme*

cal linguistics has found its most comprehensive expression in his publications coauthored with Ian Young and Martin Ehrensvärd. In *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd utilized as empirical controls data from different textual recensions and parallel biblical texts (especially Samuel–Kings and Chronicles) as well as various nonbiblical writings, such as Hebrew inscriptions and Qumran and rabbinic writings.[47] In *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, Rezetko and Young argued for the integration of linguistic, textual, and literary data when analyzing linguistic developments in Classical Hebrew, including also empirical ancient manuscript evidence and contemporary historical linguistic methodologies utilized in studies of premodern varieties of other languages such as English, French, and Spanish.[48] Based on their analysis of such empirical models for linguistic analysis, Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd concluded that

> scholars of the language of the Hebrew Bible must take seriously the text-critical dimension in their research on chronological layers in BH [Biblical Hebrew] and in their efforts to date biblical texts on a linguistic basis. Linguistic analysis cannot afford to ignore scholarly consensuses about the Hebrew Bible's literary complexity and textual fluidity. Assigning dates to biblical *texts* on the basis of linguistic analysis stands at odds with text-critical perspectives on those *texts*. Textual stability is a fundamental premise of the linguistic dating of biblical texts, yet the extant evidence shows that ancient texts of the Bible were characterised by textual *instability*.[49]

Auld, ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim, and W. Brian Aucker, VTSup 113 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 398; Rezetko, "What Happened to the Book of Samuel in the Persian Period and Beyond?," in *A Palimpsest: Rhetoric, Ideology, Stylistics and Language Relating to Persian Israel*, ed. Ehud Ben Zvi, Diana V. Edelman, and Frank H. Polak, PHSC 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2009), 239–41; Rezetko, "The Spelling of 'Damascus' and the Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts," *SJOT* 24 (2010), 124–26; Rezetko, "Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew: Review of an Approach from the Perspective of Paraleipomenon," *HS* 52 (2011): 402–5; Rezetko, "The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges: Literary Formation, Textual Criticism, and Historical Linguistics," *JHS* 13 (2013): 1–68 (passim).

47. Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 2 vols., BibleWorld (London: Equinox, 2008).

48. Robert Rezetko and Ian Young, *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew: Steps Toward an Integrated Approach*, ANEM 9 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

49. Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 1:359 (emphasis original).

This conclusion betrays the influence of the type of text-critical empirical models found in Tigay's volume and applies it to their criticism of the generally accepted approach to historical linguistic analysis of Biblical Hebrew for the purpose of dating biblical writings.[50]

Our own intellectual journey as influenced by Tigay's empirical models mirrors Tigay's own journey to some extent. That is, Tigay's own intellectual journey led him from providing in his earlier work "an empirical basis of the Documentary Hypothesis"—that is, providing external support for the Documentary Hypothesis by undercutting its critics' arguments—to reflecting more on the broader methodological implications of his empirical models. However, whereas Tigay continued to support the Documentary Hypothesis based on source criticism on the basis of his empirical models, we have been led to critique the efficacy of source and redaction criticism further, thereby directly challenging the methodological approaches used by biblical scholars. In other words, the rhetorical force of Tigay's volume, which seems to be confirmed in Tigay's later work and Friedman's foreword to the reprinted edition, understands the ambiguous title as *Empirical Models for* [*the Validity of*] *Biblical Criticism* [*as Commonly Practiced by Source and Redaction Critics*]. In contrast, we have emphasized Tigay's cautionary comments even further than Tigay himself, which can be represented as *Empirical Models for* [*Placing Limits on*] *Biblical Criticism.*

However, we are not alone in exploring further how empirical models suggest real limits on source and redaction criticism. Here we summarize what we understand as the two most significant publications that explicitly explore empirical models in an effort to refine source and redaction criticism within plausible limits, specifically David Carr's *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible* and Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny's *Evidence of Editing.*[51]

Part 1 of Carr's *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible* is an extensive review of documented transmission of ancient texts that have survived

---

50. Although Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd refer to Tigay's volume only once (see ibid., 1:343 n. 7), elsewhere in their book they refer many times to the text-critical work of Cogan, Rofé, and Tov, who contributed to Tigay's volume.

51. David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, RBS 75 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014).

in multiple copies. Carr often cites Tigay's *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* and also his related volume *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic*[52] on the general method of empirical study as well as on particular points of the texts that he studied. Analogues, duplicates, and indicators of textual growth (e.g., doublets) are the foundation of Carr's reconstruction of the Bible's formation. But he also recognizes some limitations to his method. For example, "documented cases of transmission history … show that texts that are the result of textual growth do not consistently preserve enough traces of that growth in their final form for scholars to reconstruct each and every stage of that growth," because "their authors often worked from memory in incorporating earlier texts"[53] and "documented cases of transmission history also suggest that such indicators are easily lost in the process of gradual growth of texts, both in the initial processing of separate documents and in subsequent scribal smoothing of the marks that once indicated their separate existence."[54] That is, Carr argued that his empirical models strongly suggest that the efficacy of source and redaction criticism must be called into question.[55] However, he nevertheless identifies what he called a "trend toward expansion"—that is, in the long-duration literary texts he analyzed, he saw a tendency towards recording in the written tradition more and more of what earlier had been preserved primarily in the collective mind of the community.[56]

Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny's *Evidence of Editing* cited Tigay's book as the origin of "empirical" in connection with textual evidence.[57] They argued by way of fifteen sets of passages that are preserved

---

52. Jeffrey H. Tigay, *The Evolution of the Gilgamesh Epic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1982; repr., Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2002).

53. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 4.

54. Ibid., 106.

55. Despite his own conclusions, part 2 of Carr's work is his discussion of the formation of the Bible in the genre of a standard (German-style) introduction that describes in detail the historical origins of the biblical books or their constituent parts and how they changed over time. That is, although his stated method in part 1 undercuts conventional methods of source and redaction criticism, his conclusions concerning the literary history of the Bible continue to look very much like the results of source and redaction criticism, often without explicit empirical models as controls.

56. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 65–72.

57. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 1 n. 1. Other works of interest by these authors are Juha Pakkala, *God's Word Omitted: Omissions in the Transmission of the Hebrew Bible*, FRLANT 251 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck &

in more than one version that empirical evidence demonstrates substantial editing in the Bible's literary formation. When they focused on the methodological implications of their empirical models, they explicitly noted contradictory tendencies:

> In other words, the evidence points in two opposing directions. Some example texts show that it is possible to gain reliable results by using the literary-critical method. Other example texts, however, indicate that some editorial alterations would be very difficult or impossible to detect, especially many minor changes that nevertheless may affect the meaning substantially. These limitations should be acknowledged in all reconstructions of the literary prehistory.[58]

For example, they provide empirical examples that create "disturbing repetitions" but also those that reduce such repetitions from older versions by omission[59] as well as some examples that create inconsistencies but others that remove such inconsistencies.[60] They also provide examples in which the "rule" *lectio brevior potior* ("the shorter reading is stronger") applies or does not.[61] Despite such contradictory conclusions, their discussions remain chock-full of what they call "discernible traces"[62] of scribal techniques and editorial processes that provide "empirical evidence" for "reliable results." These discernible traces can be summarized in three main points, two specific and one general: (1) "disturbing repetitions" of words and phrases and especially *Wiederaufnahme*, or "resumptive repetition";[63] (2) "grammatical problems" and other linguistic phenomena that involve "unusual wording" or are "syntactically

---

Ruprecht, 2013); and Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala, eds., *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?*, CBET 84 (Leuven: Peeters, forthcoming).

58. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 222–23 (see further 221–25).

59. Ibid., e.g., 36 versus 68.

60. Ibid., e.g., 47–52 versus 184–87.

61. Ibid., 90, 98, 144 n. 4 versus 71, 76–77.

62. Ibid., "discernible traces" on 12, 177, 224–25; "trace(s)" on 15, 43–44, 85 n. 18, 144, 207, 221, 225.

63. Ibid., 21–25, 36–37, 66–68, 84, 103–5, 108, 112, 124, 131–32, 135–37, 139–40, 184–86, 216.

disturbing" or "stylistically awkward";[64] and, finally, (3) the two preceding "traces" and a large array of less well-defined phenomena upset the "literary unity" of the text under consideration.[65] Thus, even though they document empirical examples that provide contradictory conclusions concerning the efficacy of source and redaction criticism based on these discernible traces, the end result continues to be some faith in the very types of discernible traces in Tigay's empirical models, which have been used to support the efficacy of source and redaction criticism. Our estimation of this work by Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny is that, on the one hand, when they are explicitly discussing limitations of the efficacy of source and redaction criticism, they reach some extremely important insights concerning the contradictory evidence produced by their empirical models; however, on the other hand, they continue to apply the same criteria used in source and redaction criticism for many years as somehow supported by the contradictory evidence.

4. The Need for a Reassessment of the Efficacy of Source and Redaction Criticism

Often under the influence of Tigay's empirical models, a variety of scholars have recognized the need for a reassessment of the efficacy of source and redaction criticism and some (especially Carr and Müller, Pakkala, and

---

64. Ibid., 22, 33, 36–37, 43, 48, 56, 64–65, 72–74, 76–77, 79, 83–87, 107, 111–12, 115, 139–40, 146–47, 151, 157, 172, 174, 177, 182–83, 203, 221.

65. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny do not use the phrase "literary unity"; however, they do mention "the unity of the text" (ibid., 65), "[t]he compositional unity" (ibid.), and "an integral unity" (166). They also speak once about the "uniformity ... of texts" (93). Nevertheless, the issue of "literary unity" is continuously under consideration on nearly every page of the volume. It is replete with nouns (and/or related adjectival or verbal forms) such as "confusion," "contradiction(s)," "digression(s)," "disturbance," "incoherence," "inconsistency(ies)," "interruption," "irregularity," "roughness," "tension(s)," and more general words such as "difference(s)" and "problem(s)," that are applied not only to the "disturbing repetitions" and "grammatical problems" of the texts under consideration, but also to other aspects of the texts such as their concepts (themes, topics), tendencies, perspectives, contexts, logic, theology, and so on. All of these phenomena which upset the "literary unity" of the text are described with adjectives and other words such as "abrupt," "awkward," "confusing," "different," "disturbing," "interrupted," "redundant," "sudden," "superfluous," "unnecessary," "unusual," and so on.

Ter Haar Romeny) have begun that reassessment. However, the results of these reassessments often seem to confirm the current practice of source and redaction criticism, if not in theory certainly in practice. This is especially the case with Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, who continue to support the use of "discernible traces" as criteria for source and redaction criticism. Thus, the title of this volume eliminates the ambiguity in the title of Tigay's volume and explicitly focuses on *Empirical Models Challenging Biblical Criticism* [*as Commonly Practiced by Source and Redaction Critics*]. That is, the empirical models of the current volume, when taken together, caution against the kind of excessive conclusions often reached by source and redaction critics in the absence of such empirical controls and rather advocate for a much more modest expectation of the historical critical methods.

The empirical models found in Tigay's *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* and similar studies have clearly demonstrated that many ancient texts are composite texts with a complex literary history. That is, the vast majority of literary texts—that is, those writings that were written and transmitted as cultural objects rather than personal documents (such as contracts)—were the result of various authors and/or editors. Yet these same studies have also illustrated that the composition and transmission processes that produced such composite texts sometimes, even often, erased the types of visible signs that are necessary for the accurate application of the methods of source and redaction criticism. In some cases, short of conflicting textual data, we would not recognize that texts are actually composite. Furthermore, other empirical models have demonstrated that the types of visible signs that underlie literary-critical study can also be found in texts that are clearly produced by one writer, containing one source.

The chapters in this book explore various aspects of empirical models and their methods and conclusions. In some cases, well-known models are applied and vindicated, but at other times their efficacy is questioned. In a few cases new models are made use of or at least receive more attention than in previous studies. The studies as a whole are intended to complement and challenge previous studies, the latter in the sense that they contest a model's assumptions, methods, or conclusions or bring several different models into conversation and conflict with one another.

The ten chapters that follow relate to the literature of Mesopotamia, the Hebrew Bible, the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls, and the New Testament, representing a similar breadth of studies as found in Tigay's earlier vol-

ume.[66] Regarding the Hebrew Bible, the major versions figure prominently (MT, SP, LXX, and the biblical DSS), and each major section of the canon is represented: Pentateuch (Schorch, Lemmelijn), Prophets (Trebolle Barrera, Person, Rezetko), and Writings (Person, Young). Some of the specific texts and topics addressed are described in the following abstracts. The chapters are organized generally in chronological and/or canonical order.

Sara Milstein, in "Outsourcing Gilgamesh," considers manuscript evidence for two originally independent Sumerian stories, Gilgamesh and Huwawa and Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld, which were incorporated at distinct points in the Standard Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic. She describes two different methods for the reuse of sources in an extended work, one where a source is transferred faithfully, only lightly revised, so that its content and wording may remain readily identifiable, and another where the source is radically transformed, very heavily revised, so that its independent origin and earlier wording may have vanished. She concludes by discussing several potential implications of her findings for understanding scribal methods in the production of biblical literature and the book of Judges in particular.

Alan Lenzi, in "Scribal Revision and Textual Variation in Akkadian *Šuila*-Prayers: Two Case Studies in Ritual Adaptation," examines manuscripts of two well-attested Akkadian religious texts, the "hand-lifting' prayers" Gula 1a = Belet-ili 1 and Sîn 1. Though the surviving texts of these prayers are situated in time and place and though they furnish tangible evidence for scribal revision, an analysis of the textual variants and of other stylistic and theological phenomena proves inconclusive for determining exactly when, how, and why the texts were changed. He contrasts how much we know about the origins of these texts versus how little we know about the origins of the texts of the Bible, and he suggests that the results of the present study are a sobering caution to those who would engage in detailed reconstruction of the historical development of biblical writings.

Stefan Schorch, in "Dissimilatory Reading and the Making of Biblical Texts: The Jewish Pentateuch and the Samaritan Pentateuch," accentuates the complex interaction of textual and oral factors in the late stages of development of biblical texts. Not only were different written texts spoken

---

66. We deeply regret the absence of a chapter on postbiblical Jewish literature. That chapter was commissioned but, unfortunately, had to be dropped in order not to delay the publication of this book any longer.

differently, but different oral reading traditions of a single consonantal framework could bring about two different written texts. He illustrates this phenomenon in a selection of passages from the books of Genesis (and Exodus), especially Jacob's blessing in Gen 49:5–7. He argues that, in the examples under consideration, the readers who wrote the SP (and LXX), compared to the MT, read the consonantal framework differently, and this in turn led to a different written account arising from the same earlier written source.

Bénédicte Lemmelijn, in "Text-Critically Studying the Biblical Manuscript Evidence: An 'Empirical' Entry to the Literary Composition of the Text," elaborates a model for researching the history of biblical texts, one which rests first and foremost on textual criticism and which involves the collection, registration, description, and evaluation of the Hebrew and Greek witnesses to biblical texts. She argues that textual criticism should take priority over source and redaction criticism and that in fact a text-critical approach challenges the traditional view of distinctive phases in the literary production (composition and transmission) of texts. She illustrates the method in a discussion of a section of the Plague Narrative in Exodus (Exod 11:2–3). She concludes that in this text the MT contains the majority of preferable readings compared to the DSS, SP, and LXX. Furthermore, her text-critical analysis highlights some of the literary and theological concerns that led these other texts to diverge from the MT.

Julio Trebolle Barrera, in "Division Markers as Empirical Evidence for the Editorial Growth of Biblical Books," shows that the placements of these late markers in many places in these books frequently converge with the results of experienced literary-critical analysis, which concluded independently that a passage had been inserted in or after another one or moved to a different location. Consequently such concrete data for editorial activity in the formation of biblical writings should not be ignored in literary-critical research or by modern commentators and editors. More often than not, he underlines a late insertion or later arrangement in the MT compared to other textual witnesses.

Raymond Person, in "The Problem of 'Literary Unity' from the Perspective of the Study of Oral Traditions," contextualizes the formation of biblical literature in the comparative study of oral traditions and literary texts with roots in oral traditions, in particular Homeric and Serbo-Croatian epics. He argues that modern notions of literary unity that assume "linguistic unity" and "consistency of story" may be anachronistic when applied to ancient literary texts. He illustrates this in a discussion of sev-

eral differences between the parallel passages 2 Sam 7 and 1 Chr 17, both of which can be regarded as incomplete instantiations of a selection of the broader tradition that was preserved in the collective memory of the ancient community that wrote those texts.

Robert Rezetko, in "The (Dis)Connection between Textual and Linguistic Developments in the Book of Jeremiah: Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism Challenges Biblical Hebrew Historical Linguistics," brings into conversation two research models, the first textual and the second linguistic, which seldom interact with one another and which have resulted in conflicting conclusions about the production of the book of Jeremiah, especially the time when that occurred. He argues that the surviving manuscript evidence favors the conventional literary-critical conclusion that the book gradually formed throughout the centuries of the Second Temple period. On the other hand, the efficacy of linguistic evidence for dating the production of this and other biblical writings is thrown into doubt, since observation of language usage in biblical and other literature suggests that late authors and editors could, and often did, use "early" language.

Ian Young's "The Original Problem: The Old Greek and the Masoretic Text of Daniel 5" evaluates three explanations for the highly variant Hebrew and Greek texts of Dan 5: the MT and the Old Greek (OG) are expansions of a common core text, the MT and/or the OG is a substantial rewrite of an earlier written version, or the OG and the MT are independent renditions of a common oral tradition. Based on, first, the recognized importance of oral traditions alongside written traditions for (preprinting press) story collections and, second, the small number of actual verbatim parallels between the two texts, the third explanation is preferred for the MT and OG of Dan 5. In other words, there may not be a direct relationship between the two texts of Dan 5; in effect there never was a common base text, each is a text without an original.

Maxine Grossman, in "Community Rule or Community Rules: Examining a Supplementary Approach in Light of the Sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls," considers three distinct types of textual variation in the eleven Qumran copies of the Serek Hayaḥad (1QS, 4QS255–264), and she ponders the significance of the differences between the manuscripts for our understanding of original texts and textual formation in an ancient Jewish setting. In particular, the textual profiles of the surviving copies of the Community Rule problematize any simplistic notion of linear evolutionary development from earlier texts to later ones, since the supplementation that is encountered is one of addition (or expansion) and subtraction

(or contraction). More generally, the manuscripts of the Community Rule are evidence for a situation of simultaneous textual diversity in which it is possible that each distinct edition of the rule was understood as saying "the same thing."

Joseph Weaks, in "Limited Efficacy in Reconstructing the Gospel Sources for Matthew and Luke," evaluates the chance that the hypothetical source Q, which scholars have reconstructed from Matthew and Luke, is a reliable reconstruction. To test that possibility, he reconstructs Mark from Matthew and Luke—it is widely believed that Matthew and Luke used both Q and Mark as sources—and then compares the reconstructed MarQ to the actual Mark. It turns out that MarQ is a very poor representation of Mark. The reconstruction of a source, whether Q, MarQ, or otherwise, is a tenuous undertaking. In particular, the present analogy problematizes the way in which the reconstructed Q is used as a source for studying Christian origins.

5. Conclusions on the Efficacy
of Source and Redaction Criticism

What follows is our assessment of the efficacy of source and redaction criticism based on our reading of previous studies as well as our synthesis of the individual chapters included in this volume. As such, we acknowledge that some of these conclusions may go further than the conclusions reached by some of the individual contributors to the volume. Nevertheless, these conclusions are our interpretation of the rhetorical force of our edited volume as a collective.

Like Tigay and other earlier studies using empirical models, many of the chapters provide empirical evidence for the composite character of texts in the Bible. This observation should not be the least bit surprising, since the composite character of biblical writings is widely accepted in scholarship. In fact, because of the strong influence of textual criticism on the contributors, none of them suggest that any of the extant texts can be understood as the original text and generally reject the very idea of ever constructing an original text, due to the characteristics of textual fluidity and textual plurality. This is especially obvious in the chapters by Milstein, Trebolle Barrera, and Grossman, all three of whom discuss how the textual fluidity of their respective texts allows for the transposition of entire passages into various locations within those texts in a modular fashion. Young goes one step further, suggesting that the most plausible explanation of the relationship of the OG and MT of Dan 5 is not to be found in

a *literary* relationship based on one original text but on the basis of two independent textual traditions, both of which represent the oral tradition behind the texts.

Like Tigay and others, some of the chapters point to possible discernible traces of sources and redactional layers. However, none of the contributors explicitly suggest that any of these traces can be used without other empirical controls in the application of source and/or redaction criticism with any significant degree of certainty. For example, although Trebolle Barrera often refers to *Wiederaufnahme*, it is always in combination with the placement of the late markers dividing manuscripts into sections. Furthermore, nowhere does he conclude that the presence of any of these late markers, *Wiederaufnahme*, or the two combined necessarily indicates an insertion, because he notes the tremendous fluidity of the texts and the sometimes inconsistent use of such late markers in the different textual traditions. With this caveat, as will be discussed further below, we can conclude that even in these cases *Wiederaufnahme* cannot be understood as a discernible trace, if that term implies an objective criterion that necessarily identifies an insertion. In addition, although Lemmelijn points to literary problems similar to discernible traces, her explicit methodology requires not only a combination of textual criticism and redaction criticism but the priority of textual criticism as a control on redactional arguments.

Like Carr's assessment that "such indicators are easily lost in the process of gradual growth of texts,"[67] some of the chapters explicitly note the complexity of the literary history of the text, a complexity that would too easily eliminate many discernible traces. Of course, this problem was already implicit in Tigay's volume, especially in the chapter by Yair Zakovitch on assimilation and harmonization. That is, if a redactor's tendency for harmonization was especially high, then the very process of harmonization would eliminate many (if not all) of the discernible traces assumed to be found in composite texts. In this volume, Lemmelijn also provides empirical evidence of harmonization, but she can only do so on the basis of textual variation—that is, any discernible traces were removed in the very process of harmonization. Milstein discusses the same process in the incorporation of the source Gilgamesh and Huwawa into the Gilgamesh Epic, leading her to conclude as follows: "Source content *could* be com-

---

67. Carr, *Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 106.

pletely rewritten."[68] Thus, some of the empirical models suggest that discernible traces are sometimes lacking in composite texts.

Like Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, some of the chapters point to "opposing directions."[69] As just noted, Lemmelijn points to harmonizing tendencies in the Plague Narrative in Exodus. In contrast, Schorch demonstrates the opposite tendency in the passage about Jacob's blessing in Genesis—that is, "dissimilatory reading" of even the exact same consonantal framework could lead to different vocalizing/pointing of the consonantal framework and/or changes in the consonantal framework itself. Certainly, Lemmelijn and Schorch allow for these opposing tendencies to occur in different texts and even within the same text within different communities in various historical periods of the texts' development. Nevertheless, the presence of these opposing tendencies creates problems for the efficacy of source and redaction criticism. Even more challenging are the conclusions by Grossman and Milstein, both of whom see opposing tendencies within the *same* textual tradition. Grossman's conclusion contradicts the often dichotomous assumption that redaction occurred according to a block/modular method of combining sources or according to a method of supplementation. Grossman gives evidence of both types of redactional development in her analysis of the Community Rule of Qumran: "Unlike my earlier examples, which reflected a practice of modular addition and subtraction, the form of supplementation that we encounter here is one of expansion and contraction, in which a simpler and a more complex version of the same text appears in parallel manuscript witnesses."[70] Note that even within both of these types of redactional development Grossman sees *opposing directions, addition and subtraction,* and *expansion and contraction*. Within the long literary history of the Gilgamesh Epic, Milstein concludes: "On the one hand, we have evidence of a source that has been transformed completely already in the first identifiable phase of transmission. Subsequently, however, that plotline became comparatively more stable. On the other hand, we have evidence of a source that is represented in near-identical form after a thousand years."[71] Thus, both Grossman and Milstein provide us with empirical evidence of opposing directions within the same literary text and its tradition. This should warn us against making

---

68. Milstein in this volume, 58 (emphasis added).
69. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 222.
70. Grossman in this volume, 314.
71. Milstein in this volume, 59.

too much of any such tendencies as providing us with any type of *objective* means to identify sources and redactional layers based on discernible traces and on our assumptions about scribal tendencies.

As noted above, despite such contradictory evidence in their empirical data, Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny nevertheless conclude that source and redaction criticism, at least for some texts, can be successfully applied when "discernible traces" are found, presumably even without (other) empirical evidence. Repeating what we said above, these discernible traces fall into three categories: (1) "disturbing repetitions" of words and phrases and especially *Wiederaufnahme* or resumptive repetition; (2) "grammatical problems" and other linguistic phenomena that involve "unusual wording" or are "syntactically disturbing" or "stylistically awkward"; and finally, (3) the two preceding "traces" and a large array of less well-defined phenomena upset the "literary unity" of the text under consideration. Therefore, even though in some ways Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny seem to undercut the efficacy of source and redaction criticism, they nevertheless conclude that these three types of discernible traces remain in some texts in the Bible, thereby defending the efficacy of source and redaction criticism as applied to these texts. Consequently, it seems appropriate for us to be explicit about these three types of what they identify as discernible traces in terms of how the collective voice of this volume critiques these discernible traces. Before turning to the evidence that challenges the efficacy of each of these three types, we should repeat that the contributors in this volume assert that most (if not all) of the books in the Bible are composite texts and provide empirical models that sometimes point to the possible efficacy of these discernible traces *when paired with text-critical variants and other empirical data*. However, as we will see, this does not suggest that these types of discernible traces alone—that is, without text-critical variants—can be successfully used to identify, with certainty, sources and redactional layers. Furthermore, even text-critical variants do not provide completely objective evidence, because there is always a certain degree of subjectivity to text-critical conclusions as well.

For over one hundred years, first in classical studies and later in biblical studies, *Wiederaufnahme*, or resumptive repetition, has been recognized as a practice used by ancient scribes to denote that an insertion has occurred.[72] An example confirmed by text-critical variants is found in the

---

72. For further critique of *Wiederaufnahme* as a discernible trace, see Raymond F.

comparison of the MT and LXX of Jer 27:19–22, where the editor of the
(proto–)MT of Jeremiah inserted verses 19b–21 and repeated the phrase
immediately preceding the insertion: "19 For thus said the Lord (of Hosts
… 21 Thus said the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, concerning the ves-
sels…)."[73] Tigay referred to *Wiederaufnahme* as empirical evidence and
Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny make frequent use of *Wiederauf-
nahme* as a discernible trace.[74] Similarly, in this volume Trebolle Barrera
uses *Wiederaufnahme* in combination with later division markers to sug-
gest a possible insertion.[75] Their use of *Wiederaufnahme* has its roots in
the study of the Greek classics but was used in biblical studies first in 1929
by Harold Wiener, who described "resumptive repetition" in his search for
"discernible marks and signs," and was discussed systematically in 1952 by
Curt Kuhl, who sought "somewhat objective aids."[76] Unfortunately, none
of the chapters in this volume contain empirical models explicitly chal-
lenging *Wiederaufnahme*, but earlier publications have clearly addressed
the problem of assuming that *Wiederaufnahme* alone can provide evi-
dence of an insertion on the basis of what in hindsight fits Tigay's notion
of *empirical* data. Therefore, we will review these previous studies briefly
here. As early as 1962, Isac Leo Seeligmann posed the problem of how
one could identify *Wiederaufnahme* from what he called "Pseudo-*Wiede-
raufnahme*," because he noted that such repetition can simply be a literary
device of the original author, thereby complicating what had been seen
as an objective criterion.[77] In his attempt to overcome this complication,

---

Person Jr., "A Reassessment of Wiederaufnahme from the Perspective of Conversation
Analysis," *BZ* 43 (1999): 241–48.

73. This example is from Tov, "Literary History of the Book of Jeremiah," 235 and
is cited by Trebolle Barrera in this volume, 181–82.

74. Tigay, "Evolution of the Pentateuchal Narratives," 48–49; Tigay, "Conflation as
a Redactional Technique," 74 n. 46; Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of
Editing*, 22–25, 67–68, 103–4, 108, 131, 139–40, 186.

75. Trebolle Barrera in this volume, 174, 181–83, 189, 197, 201, 203, 205–6, 208.

76. Harold M. Wiener, *The Composition of Judges II 11 to I Kings II 46* (Leipzig:
Heinrichs, 1929), 2; Curt Kuhl, "Die 'Wiederaufnahme'—ein literarkritisches
Prinzip?," *ZAW* 64 (1952): 11.

77. Isac Leo Seeligmann, "Hebräische Erzählung und biblische Geschichtsschr-
eibung," *TZ* 18 (1962): 305–25. See similarly, Henry Van Dyke Parunak, "Oral Type-
setting: Some Uses of Biblical Structure," *Bib* 62 (1981): 153–68; Michael Fishbane,
Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), 85–86.

Urban C. von Wahlde suggested four criteria that can be used to identify *Wiederaufnahme* as a redactional marker:

> Firstly, there is the presence of awkward repetition. The more extensive and the more awkward the repetition is, the more likely it is that we are dealing with redactional repetition. It is also significant if the repetition cannot be shown to serve some other clear function within the text. Secondly, the presence of phrases which have no other function than to resume or which are awkward in the text.… Thirdly, the intervening material contains "*aporiai*," literary features which are either inconsistent with or contradictory to the surrounding context. These can be "literary" in the general sense, or stylistic or theological. Fourthly, the "primitive" sequences attained by the excision of the supposed addition must make reasonable sense. In some cases, in fact, the resulting original sequence makes much better sense than the text as we now have it. In a given text, these factors will be present in varying degrees and so the text must be judged individually. However the presence of a majority of them would be a strong indication that the material has in fact been edited.[78]

Of course, von Wahlde's solution has effectively eliminated *Wiederaufnahme* as an efficacious discernible trace by itself—that is, as a discernible trace, it has no independence apart from using problems with literary unity as discernible traces. That is, *even without* the presence of *Wiederaufnahme*, many redaction critics would use von Wahlde's four criteria based on problems with literary unity to suggest a redactional insertion. Although Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny refer briefly to Kuhl's work on *Wiederaufnahme*, they appear to be unaware of Seeligmann's and others' critique of the efficacy of *Wiederaufnahme* as a reliable discernible trace.[79] However, in our judgment, *Wiederaufnahme* by itself cannot be understood as a reliable discernible trace. That is, although there is ample empirical evidence that *Wiederaufnahme* is sometimes such a discernible trace, there is also ample empirical evidence of what Seeligmann called "Pseudo-*Wiederaufnahme*" that was a literary device used by a single author.[80]

---

78. Urban C. von Wahlde, "Wiederaufnahme as a Marker of Redaction in Jn 6,51–58," *Bib* 64 (1983): 546.

79. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 22 n. 5, 67 n. 19, 103 n. 3.

80. For an analysis of how *Wiederaufnahme* is one of many similar so-called literary strategies, all of which are adaptations of a conversational practice called "restarts,"

At first glance the criterion of what Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny called "grammatical problems" seems to have a much better chance of control on our source and redactional conclusions, especially since historical linguistics has proven to be such a useful tool in other areas of literary study.[81] However, this criterion is challenged by some of the contributors in this volume. Rezetko, sometimes in collaboration with Young and Ehrensvärd, has published a variety of works criticizing the linguistic dating of biblical writings,[82] and his chapter in this volume continues to challenge the value of linguistic variation in Biblical Hebrew, especially between so-called early and late linguistic variants, as an empirical control for dating literary sources and redactional layers or establishing a relative chronology of biblical writings. Their challenge to linguistic dating has attracted its critics and one of the criticisms is that there is no evidence of literature produced by a single individual that contains such linguistic variety as found in the Bible, what Ziony Zevit labeled "an odd construct."[83] That is, Zevit and others assume that a high degree of linguistic variety within a text is often evidence of a composite text that lends itself well to analysis by source and redaction criticism in that early and late forms can help identify the relative chronology of the various redactional layers and sources. Person's chapter in this volume provides empirical evidence of just such "an odd construct" by drawing from the comparative study of oral traditions in which the traditional register of an oral tradition can actually be characterized by a blending of different linguistic forms (dialectical and historical) as a way of implying its universality within that tradition. Thus, if biblical texts have roots in oral traditions, then biblical texts may contain linguistic diversity that is the result of the same author or redactor using a traditional register. Such cases complicate the ability to discern different sources and redactional layers based on grammatical problems. Although

---

see Raymond F. Person Jr., *From Conversation to Oral Tradition: A Simplest Systematics for Oral Traditions*, RSRS 10 (London: Taylor & Francis, 2016).

81. We have chosen to focus here on the issue of language variation and change and linguistic diachrony, but there are other kinds of grammatical problems which we could address, such as the use of, for example, so-called Deuteronomistic or Priestly language in editorial adjustments and redactional layers. However, many of these such "problems" are also "problems" of literary unity.

82. Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*; Rezetko and Young, *Historical Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*.

83. Ziony Zevit, review of *Biblical Hebrew: Studies in Chronology and Typology*, ed. Ian Young, *RBL* 8 (2004): 13.

it is certainly possible that sources and redactional layers in the composite texts of the Bible may have different linguistic profiles, Rezetko argues that our current insufficient knowledge of the linguistic history of ancient Hebrew[84] complicates this task, and Person argues that, even if we had sufficient knowledge, we must allow the possibility that the same author or redactor may use various linguistic forms for stylistic purposes. Therefore, grammatical problems are ineffective as discernible traces.[85]

As we noted above, von Wahlde's solution to the problem of "Pseudo-*Wiederaufnahme*" was simply to discern problems of literary unity created by an insertion. This tactic is very similar to Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny's, when they identify such *literary* problems as "contradictions," "digressions," "inconsistencies," "tensions," and so on. Of course, this is a common criterion used in source and redaction criticism and some contributors to this volume also note correctly how insertions may compromise the literary unity of a text. However, various contributors directly question the appropriateness of our modern notions of literary unity as a standard for discerning when the literary unity of an ancient text has been compromised. This is most explicit in the chapter by Person entitled "The Problem of 'Literary Unity' from the Perspective of the Study of Oral Traditions," but it is commented on by others as well. Lemmelijn notes as follows: "Our modern understanding of logicality need not square with that of the biblical authors and can often be extremely subjective."[86] Lenzi similarly observes: "[W]hen an argument for revision relies exclusively on some inconsistency, tension, or contradiction within the text and there is no other evidence to corroborate this perception, we run the risk of impos-

---

84. Our knowledge is insufficient, first, because of the absence of both early biblical manuscripts and an adequate control corpus of dated and localized extrabiblical sources, and second, because the actual distribution of linguistic data in the extant (late) texts of the Hebrew Bible (biblical DSS, MT, SP) resists an explanation along the lines of simple linear development from so-called Archaic to Early to Transitional to Late Biblical Hebrew. These issues are discussed at length in the volumes cited in n. 82.

85. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny argue that "late" language betrays late editing (*Evidence of Editing*, 83, 85; see also 86 n. 23); however, elsewhere they argue that late use of "early" language is only "archaizing" rather than truly "archaic" (79 ["imitated older style"], 83-84, 87, 151 ["emulate older poetical texts"]; see also 65). In our opinion, they have not fully grasped the serious difficulty with using historical linguistics as a redactional criterion when late writers and editors could use either "early" or "late" language variants.

86. Lemmelijn in this volume, 132.

ing modern literary expectations on ancient texts and thereby inventing problems to which revision is the solution."[87] If our very notion of literary unity is anachronistic, then what we identify as discernible traces based on that anachronistic understanding not only does not provide some sort of *objective* means for identifying sources and redactional layers but at least in some cases also misleads us in that very effort.

Another of the observations made by Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny finds confirmation in some of the chapters in this volume—that is, their discussion of the important role of omissions in the literary history of the Bible, which undercuts at least to some degree Carr's notion of a "trend toward expansion," which is obviously closely related to the widely accepted principle of *lectio brevior potior* ("the shorter reading is stronger").[88] As Carr himself is aware, a trend is not a hard and fast rule, so the questions of "How strong is this trend?" and "Does this particular text exemplify this trend?" have always been implicit in this notion and the related principle of *lectio brevior potior*. However, drawing substantially from Pakkala's book *God's Word Omitted*, Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny's conclusions nevertheless bring some needed uncertainty to how effective one can be when assuming such a trend while making source-critical and redaction-critical arguments. That is, even if the trend is valid either for the majority of texts or even limited to the later periods of written transmission, the general validity cannot be easily applied to all cases of pluses and minuses in textual traditions. Much like Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, both Milstein and Grossman provide additional empirical evidence of omissions in the literary history of the texts analyzed. Milstein observes "a major elimination of content," when the source Gilgamesh, Enkidu, and the Netherworld is incorporated into the Gilgamesh Epic.[89] Grossman, in her analysis of the various versions of the Community Rule and other rule texts at Qumran, concludes that

> 1QS appears to represent a more developed and more comprehensive witness to the Qumran Serek tradition than we find in our other key Serek manuscripts. From the perspective of textual transmission, it is therefore fascinating—and not a little bit confounding—to acknowledge

---

87. Lenzi in this volume, 68.

88. Müller, Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing*, 71, 76–77, 90, 98, 144 n. 4.

89. Milstein in this volume, 57.

that 1QS has been identified as one of the *earliest* manuscript witnesses
to the Serek tradition.[90]

That is, the earliest extant text in the Qumran Serek tradition is also the
longest and most comprehensive. Thus, both Milstein and Grossman pro-
vide compelling nonbiblical empirical evidence similar to that of Müller,
Pakkala, and Ter Haar Romeny concerning omissions.

Thus far, the above summary and conclusions have been structured
primarily on the basis of conclusions by Carr and especially Müller, Pak-
kala, and Ter Haar Romeny in relationship to the efficacy of source and
redaction criticism, but we think that the collective force of the volume
has further implications, so we will discuss these further conclusions here.

In order for someone to begin to use empirical models, a scholar
must first decide what extant texts to compare. Today the comparison of
the MT and the LXX of Daniel (Young) or of the MT and SP of Genesis
(Schorch), for example, seems rather obvious, but it was not too long ago
when the use of the versions was typically dismissed as the versions were
understood as "vulgar" or "sectarian" texts with little to contribute to the
study of the Bible. That is, before the discovery of the biblical material in
the Dead Sea Scrolls, the versions were often considered so aberrant to be
generally unworthy of study for the source-critical and redaction-critical
study of the Bible. Increasingly the division between *biblical* and *nonbibli-*
cal scrolls at Qumran is being questioned. For example, was the so-called
Reworked Pentateuch (4QRP = 4Q158, 4Q364–367) nonbiblical or bibli-
cal in the eyes of the Qumran community, especially if the types of varia-
tions—additions, omissions, substitutions, and different sequences—are
similar to the variations between Exodus and Deuteronomy or between
the MT and the SP? Some scholars, such as Eugene Ulrich, are now con-
cluding that the Reworked Pentateuch may "constitute simply a variant
literary edition of the Torah, alongside the MT and the SP."[91] This very

---

90. Grossman in this volume, 320 (emphasis original).

91. Eugene Ulrich, "The Text of the Hebrew Scriptures at the Time of Hillel and
Jesus," in *Congress Volume: Basel 2011*, ed. André Lemaire, VTSup 92 (Leiden: Brill,
2002), 102. See also Sidnie White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple
Times*, SDSS (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 56–57; Sarianna Metso, "When the
Evidence Does Not Fit: Method, Theory, and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Rediscover-
ing the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Assessment of Old and New Approaches and Methods*, ed.
Maxine L. Grossman (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 6.

issue is explicitly discussed by some of the contributors to this volume.
Lenzi asks, "How do we know two tablets represent the same text?"[92] He
then adds:

> [A]nd it admonishes us to own up to the fact that we are the ones who
> decide what counts as evidence of revision and what does not by decid-
> ing which texts to compare because they are *similar* enough to each
> other—despite some differences—to catch our eye and which to leave
> aside because they are *dissimilar* enough—despite some similarities—
> that we do not consider them relevant for our purposes.[93]

Similarly, Grossman recognizes our need to rethink "literary text":

> To the extent that a variety of very diverse manuscripts—with different
> wording, content, and character—can be recognized not only as exam-
> ples of the same *textual tradition* but in fact as copies of the same *literary
> text*, it becomes necessary to rethink our larger understanding of origi-
> nal texts and textual formation in an ancient Jewish setting.[94]

For example, are 1QSa and 1QSb independent from or a part of the lit-
erary text the Community Rule (best preserved in 1QS)? These are the
kinds of questions that led Person to question the consensus model's
understanding of the relationship between Samuel–Kings and Chronicles
as representing different literary texts that contain significantly different
theologies.[95] Complicating the discussion of what is the *same* literary text
and, therefore, by implication what constitutes a *different* literary text is
Schorch's chapter in which he highlights how the exact same consonantal
Hebrew text can nevertheless be read as different texts in various reading
communities. Thus, the very notion of what a *literary text* is (complete
with what are its sources and different redactional versions) that underlies

---

92. Lenzi in this volume, 68

93. Ibid., 65–66 (emphasis original)

94. Grossman in this volume, 329–30 (emphasis original).

95. Person in this volume. See also Person, *Deuteronomic History and the Book
of Chronicles*; Raymond F. Person Jr., "Text Criticism as a Lens for Understanding
the Transmission of Ancient Texts in Their Oral Environments," in *Contextualizing
Israel's Sacred Writings: Ancient Literacy, Orality, and Literary Production*, ed. Brian B.
Schmidt, AIL 22 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 193–211.

the current practice of source and redaction criticism requires much more serious thought based on empirical models.

One of the empirical models used in this volume that is not found in Tigay's volume comes from the comparative study of oral traditions. This should not be surprising, since the influence of the comparative study of oral traditions in biblical studies has expanded significantly since Tigay's volume appeared.[96] The challenge of the comparative study of oral traditions to source and redaction criticism has been recognized for some time. For example, in 1996, Susan Niditch acknowledged that understanding ancient Israel as a primarily oral society "forces us to question long-respected theories about the development of the Israelite literary traditions preserved in the Bible"—especially source criticism.[97] These earlier challenges have been too often and too quickly dismissed, especially by those who have made a reputation for themselves by defending the Documentary Hypothesis. For example, in his "Foreword" to the 2005 edition of Tigay's volume, Friedman explicitly proclaims Niditch's challenge as seriously flawed based on, in our opinion, his misunderstanding of Niditch's argument.[98] Nevertheless, some of the contributors to this volume bring additional insights to bear on source and redaction criticism based on the comparative study of oral tradition. Person draws from the study of oral traditions to critique the flawed assumptions concerning literary unity in the current practice of source and redaction criticism. Young concludes that, of the three models he evaluates to explain the relationship between the MT and the LXX of Dan 5, the best model is one that suggests that these two texts are independent literary traditions recording an earlier oral tradition of the character Daniel. Similarly, both Lenzi and Grossman imagine that the continuation of an oral tradition behind the texts they study helps to explain the textual plurality of the Akkadian "hand-lifting" prayers and the Serek texts of Qumran, respectively. In our opinion, like that of Niditch, the comparative study of oral traditions presents some

---

96. For recent reviews, see Raymond F. Person Jr., "Orality Studies, Oral Tradition: Hebrew Bible," in *The Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Steven L. McKenzie, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 2:55–63; Raymond F. Person Jr. and Chris Keith, "Introduction," in *The Dictionary of the Bible and Ancient Media*, ed. Tom Thatcher et al. (London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming).

97. Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*, LAI (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 134.

98. Friedman, "Foreword," [4–6].

serious challenges to biblical criticism, but also provides some empirical models for moving forward with a better understanding of the efficacy of source and redaction criticism, even if the influence is primarily limiting.

Our above summary and conclusions for the collective force of the volume has thus far not included comments on Weaks's insightful chapter. This is because it differs significantly from the other chapters in that it is a thought experiment in which he reconstructs a source based on the standard methods of source criticism of the gospels (although being in a real sense too generous), not because his chapter does not have much to contribute. In fact, in many ways it is a very fitting conclusion to the volume, so let us explicate here how we see Weaks's contribution in relationship to the conclusions we have given above, especially as it relates to the study of the Hebrew Bible. The reconstruction of the sayings source Q from Matthew and Luke is widely regarded as something highly plausible, even by those who might be skeptical about the application of source criticism to other texts based on discernible traces. This high degree of probability and plausibility is due to our ability to triangulate from Matthew and Luke to Q by using the material in the double tradition and by observing how the authors of Matthew and Luke used Mark as a source, since we have this source as a control on their redactional tendencies. Weaks's thought experiment explores how ineffective even this most probable reconstruction can be by reconstructing Mark on the basis of the triple tradition—that is, by triangulating from Matthew and Luke to his reconstructed Mark (what he calls MarQ). He can then compare Mark and MarQ. When he does, he concludes as follows: "A reconstructed text is unreliable in that it is missing the very features and structures characteristic of the actual source text and, further, it contains features and structures that originate not from the actual source text but from the reconstruction process itself."[99] He demonstrates that even with his most generous reconstruction, MarQ is only half the size of Mark and that this has tremendous consequences for the understanding of the literary and linguistic characteristics of the source text. Weaks's conclusions alone have wide implications for the efficacy of source and redaction criticism as valid methodologies. For example, our ability to describe the theology of the Priestly writer or the Succession Narrative or source A of Jeremiah poetry depends significantly on our ability to reconstruct these sources with a high degree of accuracy that

---

99. Weaks in this volume, 350.

preserves a significant majority of these sources. Weaks provides an example of why, at least in some cases, this standard cannot possibly be met. When we combine Weaks's conclusion with the above critique concerning the efficacy of source and redaction criticism on the basis of what have traditionally been understood as discernible traces that ensure some degree of plausibility, we must question even our ability to reconstruct sources and redactional layers with a high enough degree of plausibility *even when we have strong empirical evidence*. In other words, the most that source and redaction criticism may be able to do *even with empirical evidence* is help us understand in general ways the composite nature of the text with only sketchy notions of what sources and redactional layers may have contributed to the literary character of the text. Once we devote much time to analyzing these reconstructed sources and redactional layers themselves as literary objects worthy of close literary and theological study, we probably have crossed a line of plausibility that becomes much too speculative, at least in most cases. We certainly allow that there may be some limited cases in which the empirical controls appear to provide relatively sound judgments concerning sources and redactional layers—for example, the two sources behind 1 Sam 16–18. Nevertheless, we must acknowledge that even in these cases there are dissenting voices by respected scholars. Thus, in our opinion, future studies in source and redaction criticism must accept much more limited goals and objectives, primarily focused on the extant texts in their textual plurality and how that plurality may enlighten us on the prehistory of the chosen literary text, even if only faintly.