

Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny, *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, Resources for Biblical Study 75, Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014. Pp. ix + 255. ISBN 978-1-58983-747-8. Paperback, \$32.95.

- [1] *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible* contains fifteen essays written by Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas ter Haar Romeny. In the introduction, these authors state that “[t]his book seeks to demonstrate that substantial editing took place in the history of the Hebrew Bible” (1). It is clearly stated by these authors that this volume is not necessarily an exhaustive study of textual, literary, and redaction criticism. Instead, the volume serves as a tool to aid students and other scholars as they introduce themselves to the subject at hand. As a teaching aid, these scholars set out to observe different cases of empirical evidence, cases where the same passage or text is preserved and documented in parallel passages or ancient witnesses. This is done in order to demonstrate that throughout the course of the Hebrew Bible’s history, texts were substantially edited by scribes and editors. While they do acknowledge that not everyone argues for substantial editing in the Hebrew Bible — consider the arguments of John Van Seters in *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the “Editor” in Biblical Criticism*, a primary opponent — they present their argument none-the-less. Furthermore, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny combat the innate impulse of relying on the Masoretic Text (MT) as the primary witness for textual, literary, and redaction criticism. They state, “[T]he MT is a witness of high quality, and in many cases there are good reasons to assume that it represents a relatively old textual tradition. Yet, the Hebrew Bible also contains many passages where the primacy of the MT has been challenged for good reasons” (3). They seek to argue that one must observe other textual witness such as the Samaritan Pentateuch (SP), Septuagint (LXX), and Dead Sea Scrolls (Q), for example, when determining editorial changes in the Hebrew Bible.
- [2] The first chapter (“Added Detail in the Samaritan Version of Leviticus 17:4 Concerning the Sacrifices,” 19–26) addresses the variant readings of Lev 17:1–4 in the SP, 4QLev^d, LXX, 11QpaleoLev^a, and the MT. The SP, 4QLev^d contain a plus that is not present in the MT and 11QpaleoLev^a, which specifies types of sacrificial animals. They state that “Lev 17:1–4 is a prime example of additions that took place in the transmission of the Hebrew Bible” (24). It is concluded that the plus is the result of an editor who had a specific view regarding sacrificial animals. The awkward repetition that appears in the SP, LXX, and 4QLev^d suggests that Lev 17:1–4 had multiple authors. This article makes a strong case for the use of literary criticism to reconstruct the older text of Lev 17:4.
- [3] The second chapter (“An Expansion to the Passover Law: Leviticus 23:5–8 and Numbers 28:16–25,” 27–33) addresses the expanded laws of the Passover festival originally found in Lev 23:5–8, the source text of Num 28:16–25. One of the most significant arguments found in this article has to do with the name of the Passover festival. Exodus 23:15 refers to the festival as “the feast of unleavened bread,” while Exod 34:25 provides the title “the feast of the Passover.” Moreover, Deut 16:1–8 changes the name to “the Passover of YHWH.” These scholars conclude that an editor of Num 28:17 omitted its name and referred to it simply as “the festival” due to confusion. This article also

addresses the difficulties faced by a scholar using varying methodologies. For example, a source critic cannot move past suspicion regarding the phrase ימים שבעה (“[for] seven days”), and a literary critic would have difficulty finding a supporting argument for assuming that Num 28:19–24 is an expansion on the source text.

- [4] The third chapter (“From Glosses to Larger Expansion: The Masoretic Text of Numbers 13—14 Compared with the Septuagint and the Samaritan Pentateuch,” 35–44) addresses two changes that are the result of a late editorial process. Particular attention is given to Num 13:33 as the “MT probably represents a textual stage later than that of the LXX, but earlier than the form represented by the SP” (35). This text contains editorial changes that are the result of, first, interpretive decisions, and second, a harmonization with its parallel Deut 1. These changes are primarily found in the LXX and SP and thus leave the MT to attest to the earliest stage of the text’s development.
- [5] The fourth chapter (“Late Additions or Editorial Shortening? Joshua 20 in the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint,” 45–58) addresses the substantial difference that appears in Josh 20 between the MT and LXX, which results in a conflicting conception of the slayer and the cities of refuge. The contrast in this article discusses the possibility of secondary lengthening in the MT or substantial editorial shortening in the LXX. Through an observation of additional sources, these scholars conclude that the editing of this section took place “after the divergence of the *Vorlage* of the LXX from the proto-Masoretic tradition, probably in the last two or three centuries BCE” (57). As a result, it is difficult to confidently argue for editorial lengthening or shortening. Simply, during the late stages of the text’s transmission, two versions existed.
- [6] The fifth chapter (“A Qumran Manuscript as Evidence of an Addition in the Masoretic Text: Judges 6:7–10,” 59–68) highlights the significance of the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls to text-critical scholarship through an observation of Judg 6:7–10. In the nineteenth century, scholars argued that the narrative of the anonymous prophet in the story of Gideon was a late addition. This theory was reinforced by empirical evidence with the discovery of 4QJudg^a as it does not contain any mention of this anonymous prophet who Gideon is seen to ignore in Judg 6:11–24. While some scholars consider the Qumran witness to be irrelevant and the textual omission to be the result of a scribal error, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny propose that this is an improbable theory. They conclude through the application of literary and redaction criticism that 4QJudg^a represents the oldest textual tradition and all other witness represent editorial lengthening.
- [7] The sixth chapter (“A Secondary Omission in the Masoretic Text of 1 Sam 10:1,” 69–77) discusses the conflicting reading of 1 Sam 10:1 between the proto-MT and LXX. Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny address the shorter reading found in the proto-MT and attempt to determine if it is the result of editorial shortening or is a scribal mistake. This article specifically highlights possible exceptions to the text critical rule of *lectio brevior*, “the shorter reading.” As they refute the possibility of haplography, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny suggest that “the omission is best explained as an intentional editorial change caused by content-related considerations regarding the kingship of Saul” (76). By way of supporting evidence, they illustrate that the proto-MT provides an example where *lectio brevior* is problematic and the shorter reading is the result of intentional scribal shortening.

- [8] The seventh chapter (“An Addition in a Qumran Manuscript as Evidence for the Continuous Growth of the Text: 1 Sam 10:27—11:1,” 79–99) addresses the three additional lines that appear in 4QSam^a and create a smoother reading of 1 Sam 10:27—11:1. Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny suggest that these lines are a later addition in Deuteronomistic style, which differs from the rest of the narrative. While this observation is not new to scholarship — consider the argument of Emanuel Tov in *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* 2nd edition (312–3) — Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny argue that this case illustrates that sometimes textual and literary criticism cannot be separate.
- [9] The eighth chapter (“The Septuagint Provides Evidence of a Late Addition in the Masoretic Text: 1 Kings 6:11–14,” 101–08) appears to make a slight transition in methodology as Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny further apply certain elements of source criticism to their analysis of 1 Kgs 6:11–14. They illustrate that “a comparison between the MT and the LXX shows that Deuteronomistic and priestly phraseology were added at a very late stage in the development of the text” (101). It is suggested that the “plus in 1 Kgs 6:11–14 was inserted into the proto-MT after the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX diverged from this textual tradition” (107).
- [10] The ninth chapter (“From Small Additions to Rewriting in the Story about the Burning of Jerusalem,” 109–125) addresses the narrative of the burning of Jerusalem, a passage that has five different biblical accounts: 2 Kgs 25:8–12, Jer 52:12–16, Jer 39:8–10, 2 Chr 36:19–20, 1 Esd 1:52–54. As the article aptly implies, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny argue that there are small editorial variations which took place in 2 Kgs 25:8–12 and Jer 52:12–16, the two oldest accounts of this narrative. They suggest that the Chronicles passage is most likely a rewrite of 2 Kings which allows for corrections to the historical and theological teachings of the narrative. The primary differences which are noted in 2 Kgs 25:8–12 and Jer 52:12–16, the passages of particular focus, are between the LXX and MT. Through the application of literary criticism, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny notice that the additional cases in the MT are the result of a gradual growth of the texts, notice 2 Kgs 25:10. It is then evident that the literary pre-history of Jer 39:8–9 relies on 2 Kgs 25:8–12 and Jer 52:12–16 as its source although the author clearly omitted, rearranged, rewrote, and expanded on the original texts. First Esdras 1:52–54, according to Josephus, follows 2 Chr 36:19–20 almost slavishly, a text that in turn relies on 2 Kgs 25.
- [11] The tenth chapter (“Evidence for the Literary Growth of Gedaliah’s Murder in 2 Kings 25:25, Jeremiah 41:1–3 MT, and Jeremiah 48:1–3 LXX,” 127–141) discusses the narrative of Gedaliah’s murder in 2 Kgs 25:25 and Jer 41:1–3 MT (≈ Jer 48:1–3 LXX). Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny state, “[T]he Hebrew and Greek texts of 2 Kings 25:25 contain only minor differences; the Greek and Hebrew of Jeremiah 41:1–3 (≈ Jeremiah 48:1–3 LXX) differ considerably from each other as well as from 2 Kings 25:25” (127). These three parallel versions represent three different literary stages. This article contains one element of confusion pertaining to these three different literary stages. On pages 127–8, they state that 2 Kgs 25:25 represents the oldest literary stage. Yet, the section “A Possible Original Reading in Jer 48:22 LXX” (137–139) presents a completely different argument regarding the original reading of this narrative. This is based on the possible argument that the shorter reading of 2 Kgs 25:25 is the result of editorial shortening, and thus declares the rule of *lectio brevior* void. Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny primarily observe the differences between 2

Kgs 25:25, Jer 41:2 MT, and Jer 48:2 LXX. In the end, they conclude that these three texts developed separately and the additions are then to be considered unrelated to each other. It would appear that they hold to the argument that 2 Kgs 25:25 represents the oldest literary stage as the plusses cause “thematic tensions and grammatical problems in the expanded text” (139). Jeremiah 41:1–3 MT is the youngest and Jer 48:1–3 LXX represents an intermediate literary stage.

[12] The eleventh chapter (“Techniques of Rewriting Prophecy: Jeremiah 48 Compared with Isa 15—16,” 143–157) addresses the assumption that Isa 15—16 is the literary source of Jer 48. This article provides an example where knowledge of the source text is vital in order to determine editorial variations in the secondary text, that being Jer 48. These two versions are closely related to each other. Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny provide three possibilities: “1) [t]he author of Jer 48:29–30 has used Isa 16:6. (2) The author of Isa 16:6 has used Jer 48:29–30. 3) Both texts are dependent on a third source that is now lost” (145). With little attention given to the theoretical possibility of the third option, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny address the character of the plusses in Jeremiah in order to settle the debate between thesis one and two. This article takes the position that the plusses of Jer 48:29–30 are the result of interpretive editorial decisions and is created on the basis of the Isaiah text. The expanded text of Jer 48:29–30 is primarily comprised of grammatical alterations.

[13] The twelfth chapter (“Evidence of Psalm Composition: Psalm 108 as a Secondary Compilation of Other Psalm Texts,” 159–177) discusses the typical behavior of Psalmist exegetes to ignore the problems of a text’s literary history. Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny state, “Psalms are interpreted as given literary units, irrespective of whether they were in fact initially created as such units or bear marks of editorial work” (159). They argue that there is evidence of substantial editorial work that took place in the historical development of the Psalter. Consider the great Psalms scrolls 11QPs^a or manuscript 4Q236, which exhibit variations from the MT and LXX. Psalm 108 has a close parallel to two other Psalms: 1) Ps 108:2–6 ≈ Ps 57:8–12, and 2) Ps 108:7–14 ≈ Ps 60:7–14. These parallels generate some obvious questions: first, is Ps 108 composed of quotations from Ps 57 and Ps 60? or second, is Ps 57 and Ps 60 composed of quotations from Ps 108? It would appear that Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny attempt to apply certain elements of source criticism once again in order to determine the textual group each of these Psalms belong to: either the *Yahwistic* (J) or *Elohistic* (E) source. This leads them to state that “Ps 108 could be dependent on the elohistic psalms 57 and 60” (166). Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny then address multiple grammatical differences that appear in these three psalms and conclude that Ps 108 is a secondary composition that is a descendant of the elohistic Psalter.

[14] The thirteenth chapter (“Revision of Ezra-Nehemiah in 1 Esdras: Expansions, Omissions, and Rewritings,” 179–191) addresses the possibility that in some cases 1 Esdras represents an older literary stage than the MT. The following parallel texts are observed in this article: 1 Esd 5:51–52 // Ezra 3:5; 1 Esd 8:3–4 // Ezra 7:6; 1 Esd 8:69–70 // Ezra 9:4–5; 1 Esd 8:63 // Ezra 8:35; Neh 8:1 ≈ 2 Esd 18:1 // 1 Esd 9:39; Neh 8:2 ≈ 2 Esd 18:2 // 1 Esd 9:40; Neh 8:9 ≈ 2 Esd 18:9 // 1 Esd 9:49; 1 Esd 8:90 // Ezra 10:3. Following an almost too brief investigation of these texts, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny state that Esdras typically represents a younger textual form compared to Ezra-Nehemiah. A majority of the editorial changes “correspond to the conventional assumption in

- literary and redaction criticism that the texts developed through expansions” (191). It would appear that the editorial changes which took place in 1 Esdras were conducted in order to remove inconsistencies from Ezra-Nehemiah.
- [15] The fourteenth chapter (“Evidence for Large Additions in the Book of Esther,” 193–204) addresses the importance of the book of Esther to the claim that scribal editing took place in the literary history of the canonical Old Testament. There are three versions of Esther addressed in this article: the Hebrew MT; and the two Greek texts, the older B-text, and the younger A-text. The Greek texts contain six large passages that are not included in the MT. Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny discuss the overall validity of using Esther in order to support the claim of substantial scribal editing in the Hebrew Bible. Simply, they argue that there is no doubt that Esther was heavily edited. Yet, “Ironically, we may have too much evidence” (194). Furthermore, an observation of varying readings is made more difficult when observing the B-text, which exhibits a free translation of the Hebrew text. The greatest difference one can observe between these three versions of Esther is the religious component of the book. The MT contains no reference to God, while the A-text and B-text add an explicit religious dimension to the narrative.
- [16] The fifteenth chapter (“Evidence for Expansion, Relocations, Omission and Rewriting: Joash the King and Jehoiada the Priest in 2 Kings 11—12 and 2 Chronicles 22—24,” 205–217) addresses the textual variants that appear in the parallel narratives of king Joash in 2 Kgs 11—12 and 2 Chr 22—24. First, as it is commonly believed that Kings is the source of Chronicles, these scholars state that a majority of the variations that appear in the Chronicles text are inventions of the Chronicler, yet the writer did function within the confines of the original story. The Chronicler and his community clearly had a great respect for the authority and religious source of 1–2 Kings as there are sections where the source text is followed word for word. However, 2 Kgs 12 contradicts some of the theology conveyed in 2 Chr 22—24. Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny explain that this contradiction resulted in omissions and alterations. Some of these alterations have resulted in a significant change in the meaning of the text — consider 2 Kgs 12:1–3 // 2 Chr 24:1–2.
- [17] In the conclusion (“Conclusions: Empirical Evidence of Editorial Processes,” 219–227), Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny, as expected, review the overall purpose of the volume. The important aspect of their conclusion is the evaluation of the appropriateness of literary and redaction criticism to the task of arguing for substantial editing in the Hebrew Bible. They hold to the conviction that literary criticism is appropriate for determining literary expansion. These methodologies, in their opinion, should not be ignored and neither should the traces of editorial processes in the Hebrew Bible when conducting exegesis. In a final defense of their methodology, Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny state, “this methodology may be the only possibility to identify, at least in part, later editorial changes and thus to understand that the final texts are the result of long-standing and intricate editorial processes” (224).
- [18] Müller, Pakkala, and Romeny should be thanked for their contribution to the study of substantial editing in the Hebrew Bible. I consider this volume to be appropriate for individuals who seek to introduce themselves to the subject at hand. This volume provides fifteen case studies, which allow for students and scholars to observe the application of literary and redaction criticism. Furthermore, it illustrates that literary and textual criticism can function to

complement each other. I would not say that this volume belongs in every biblical studies scholars' library, but it would certainly be an appropriate addition.

Andrew W. Dyck
McMaster Divinity College,

© Copyright TC: *A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*, 2014