University of Pennsylvania Libraries

NOTICE WARNING CONCERNING COPYRIGHT RESTRICTIONS

The copyright law of the United States (title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specific conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research." If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that user may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law.

This notice is posted in compliance with Title 37 C.F.R., Chapter II, Part 201.14

Introduction

JEFFREY H. TIGAY

The Quest for Empirical Models

Since the seventeenth century it has become axiomatic that the contents of the Hebrew Bible have not always reached us in their original form. The books of the Bible are products of a long evolution, in the course of which individual traditions underwent modifications in form and content. Many of the books are composite, combining traditions or even documentary sources which were originally independent of each other. Further, many are conflate, welding together two or more variant accounts of the same subject. These conclusions were reached by scholars reading between the lines of the Bible. No other method was available for tracing the evolution of biblical literature. Scholars could not base their views on direct statements in the Bible itself, for it has relatively little to say about its own development (the case of Jeremiah 36 is a notable exception).[1] Even less could they rely on the testimony of extrabiblical sources of the biblical period, since none is known which refers to the Bible. Nor were actual

A draft of this Introduction was prepared at the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University in September 1978 and revised after a critique of Chapter 1 by my colleagues at the Institute during a workshop held there in July 1982. I am deeply indebted to the staff of the Institute and to my colleagues for their contributions to this study. Recent articles by two of those colleagues (M. Tsevat, "Common Sense," and F. M. Cross, "Epic Traditions") and further discussion with them have helped me recognize some of the issues discussed here and to clarify my own views. I have found myself returning to these articles frequently to learn and be challenged by them, and my debt to them is not diminished by the fact that I have taken a different path on some of the issues.

1. Passages in the Bible which cite earlier works give no details about the nature of the relationship and in most cases do not explicitly identify the earlier works as their sources (see Chapter 2, n. 83).

copies of the supposed sources or earlier stages of biblical books available for consultation except in rare and late cases, such as Chronicles' sources in Samuel and Kings.[2] As a result, critics were thrown back on internal critical analysis of biblical books in their final forms. Such phenomena as anachronisms, inconsistencies, doublets, and thematic and stylistic variations within a book were considered incompatible with an early or uniform date or homogeneous authorship. They were more plausibly explained by the supposition that multiple documentary sources of differing dates and authorship had been joined together to make up the present books of the Bible.

Although the results of this approach are impressive and command the field to this day, they remain, because of the nature of the methodology involved, hypothetical (witness the term "documentary *hypothesis*").[3] The degree of subjectivity which such hypothetical procedures permit is notorious, and it is no surprise that the documentary hypothesis was subjected early to criticism which has not completely abated even today. One particular line of criticism is the object of the present inquiry. This is the argument that the results of biblical criticism, especially as represented by the documentary hypothesis, are unrealistic. The claim is that no work of literature was ever (or, at least in ancient times) produced in the way criticism supposes biblical books to have been produced. One early opponent of the documentary hypothesis, C. M. Mead, protested that "no example of such a 'crazy patchwork' can be found in all literature as the one alleged to have

2. Note the suggestion of F. M. Cross (*Ancient Library*, pp. 166–68) that the *Prayer of Nabonidus* from Qumran (4QPrNab) may reflect an early stage of the tradition underlying Daniel 4. G. Levi della Vida ("Shiloah Inscription") suggested that the *Siloam Inscription* was an excerpt from one of the sources of Kings. An exception to the general absence of known sources is the likely dependence of certain biblical texts on foreign prototypes. Such dependence is usually, though perhaps not always, indirect, and would in either case require a separate study. Skepticism about such dependence is expressed by A. R. Millard on the basis of an argument that bears on issues examined in this Introduction. With reference to the flood story Millard argues that factual and ideological differences between the Babylonian and Hebrew traditions are so great that "all who suspect or suggest borrowing by the Hebrews are compelled to admit large-scale revisions, alteration, and reinterpretation in a fashion which cannot be substantiated for any other composition from the Ancient Near East or in any other Hebrew writing" (Millard, "New Babylonian," p. 17; to Millard the true explanation for the similarities between the biblical and Mesopotamian flood stories is that both remembered similar details of the same historical event). However, equally extensive changes are observable in the evolution of the *Gilgamesh Epic*, both from one Mesopotamian version to another and from the Mesopotamian versions to the Hittite version (see below, Chapter 1 and, for further details and their implications for the issue of intercultural literary borrowing, Tigay, "Literary-Critical," pp. 22–30).

3. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 1:13–14.

been discovered in the Pentateuch."[4] A later opponent of the hypothesis, M. H. Segal, asserted:

> Hebrew literature, or any other literature the world over, cannot show another example of the production of a literary work by such a succession of recurring amalgamations and such a succession of compilers and redactors centuries apart, all working by one and the same method, as attributed by the [Documentary] Theory to the formation of the Pentateuch.[5]

More recently, K. A. Kitchen made a similar claim based on ancient Near Eastern literature: "Nowhere in the Ancient Orient is there anything which is definitely known to parallel the elaborate history of fragmentary composition and conflation of Hebrew literature (or marked by just such criteria) as the documentary hypothesis would postulate."[6]

The reluctance of these writers to contemplate the possibility of something unique in Israelite literary history does not commend itself. Nevertheless they correctly imply, if only negatively, that other, unimpeachable examples of the assumed methods of composition, especially from the milieu in which biblical literature developed, would enhance our confidence in the results of biblical criticism. 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 to his observations a refinement they could never have so long as they were based entirely on hypotheses devoid of external controls.[7]

Analogues were not entirely absent from the argumentation of early critics. Richard Simon (1678) held that the Torah was in part composed of historical records kept by official scribes of Moses' time; as evidence of such public record keepers he cited the Persian and Egyptian practices attested in Esther, Ezra, Josephus, and Diodorus Siculus, and the prophetic historical records and royal chronicles cited in Kings and Chronicles.

4. Mead, "Tatian's Diatessaron," p. 44. Mead's was the first of several sweeping and mostly unsupported generalizations made by opponents of the documentary hypothesis about what can or cannot be found elsewhere in literature (see below, quotations accompanying nn. 5, 6, 32; cf. the similar assertion about the flood story, quoted in n. 2, above).

5. Segal, *The Pentateuch*, p. 4.

6. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient*, p. 115 (the full statement is quoted below, p. 10; similarly Young, *Introduction*, p. 153; Harrison, *Introduction*, p. 517.

7. On the role of analogy in historical study, note the comment of Troeltsch: "The means by which criticism is at all possible is the application of analogy" (cited by von Rad, *Theology*, 1:107 n. 3); cf. Hirsch, *Validity*, pp. 174–77, and Albright, *Archaeology, Historical Analogy*, pp. 3–11.

Simon believed it probable that Moses himself, having witnessed the practice in his native Egypt, established it among the Hebrews early.[8] Some fifty years later Simon was cited by Astruc as one of his authorities for the view that Moses had employed written records in composing Genesis–Exodus 2. Astruc himself suggested, as is well known, that Moses had arranged about a dozen separate sources for the ancestral period in separate columns, our present Genesis being a later erroneous amalgamation of the columns. The only analogues he could cite for this procedure were Gospel harmonies and Origen's *Hexapla*, but these played no major role in his argument.[9] The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries witnessed the well-known parallel development of biblical and Homeric criticism. Although I am not aware whether specific phenomena in the growth of Homeric literature were explicitly invoked in support of theories about the Pentateuch, it has been shown that the methods and theories employed in each field were soon reflected in the other, undoubtedly indicating mutual methodological influence.[10]

Analogy began to play a more prominent, though still limited, role at the end of the nineteenth century. Chronicles was mentioned by J. E. Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby as "a conspicuous instance of the free treatment of earlier sources."[11] W. Robertson Smith made extensive use of the Septuagint as a model of the redactional processes underlying parts of the Bible.[12] He explained the value of the analogy as follows:

> Higher criticism is often supposed to have no other basis than the subjective fancies and arbitrary hypotheses of scholars. When critics maintain that some Old Testament writings, traditionally ascribed to a single hand, are really of composite origin, and that many of the Hebrew books have gone through successive redactions . . . it is often supposed that these are mere idle theories unsupported by evidence. Here it is that the Septuagint comes to justify the critics. The variations of the Greek and

8. Simon, *Histoire*, book 1, chaps. 2–3, 5, 7. For Simon's guess as to Moses' sources for Genesis, see book 1, chap. 7.

9. Astruc, *Conjectures*, pp. 6–9.

10. Cassuto, *Documentary Hypothesis*, chap. 1. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 1:3, in their survey of analogues to the composition of the Hexateuch, mention the analysis of the Iliad only as an example of critical methodology but do not include it among compositions compared in detail. (For recent, explicit use of the Homeric analogue, see below, n. 47.) On the classicists' side G. Murray found "the most instructive example of the growth and change of a traditional book under ancient conditions" to be "in the Hebrew scriptures," and he wondered "that the comparison has not been more widely used by Greek scholars" (Murray, *Rise*, p. 107). For a recent description of the approaches of the "analysts" and "unitarians" in Homeric studies, see Whitman, *Homer*, chap. 1.

11. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 1:11–13.

12. *OTJC*, 3d ed., pp. 90–126, the quotation is from pp. 90–91 (the same statements were made in the first edition [1881]).

Hebrew text reveal to us a time when the functions of copyist and editor shaded into one another by imperceptible degrees. They prove that Old Testament books were subjected to such processes of successive editing as the critics maintain. . . .

Prominent among Smith's examples are the differences between the Septuagint and Masoretic texts of Jeremiah which illustrate the process of revision, and the two conflicting accounts of the story of David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 17, where the absence of the intrusive verses from manuscripts of the Septuagint shows that these represent an alternate version of the story and that the Hebrew text has combined two separate accounts of the episode.[13]

The analogies adduced on the basis of Chronicles and the Septuagint had the advantage of coming from within the literary and textual tradition of the Hebrew Bible and of being products of the same literary environment. But the paucity of examples from close at hand soon led scholars further afield. In 1890, G. F. Moore adduced the analogue of Tatian's *Diatessaron,* a harmony of the four Gospels produced around the year 170 in Syriac or Greek.[14] Unlike the harmonies cited by Astruc, which presented the complete texts of the Gospels in separate columns, the *Diatessaron* wove the four into a single running narrative, thus leading to its Syriac designation as the "Gospel of the Mixed (Gospels"; the Greek title means "[the Gospel] by means of the four").[15] By comparing the *Diatessaron* with its sources, the Gospels, Moore was able to show in it most of the redactional techniques which critics found in the Torah, a demonstration that led one observer to characterize the Torah as "the *Diatessaron* of the Old Testament."[16] It has since been cited frequently as an apt model for Pentateuchal criticism.[17]

Arabic literature (already mentioned by Moore and Robertson Smith)[18] and ancient Near Eastern literature began to figure prominently in the discussion, partly as a result of the debate about oral tradition beginning in the 1930s. The debate centered on the nature of the cultural milieu in which biblical literature was produced. H. S. Nyberg and H. Birkeland and their followers held that in the "ancient Oriental" or "Near Eastern" milieu, tradition was primarily oral, as they argued on the basis of Arabian (mostly

13. Ibid., pp. 103–6, 122–24. For a new treatment of these analogues, see below, Chapters 3 and 8.

14. Moore, "Tatian's Diatessaron," reprinted below in the Appendix.

15. Stenning, "Diatessaron," p. 452.

16. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch,* 1:11.

17. Ibid., pp. 8–11; Mowinckel, *Prophecy,* p. 20; Bentzen, *Introduction,* 2:61; de Vaux, *Bible,* p. 35.

18. Moore, "Tatian's Diatessaron," pp. 205, 211–12; *OTJC,* pp. 328–29.

Islamic) examples, so that it was wrong to treat biblical literature as essentially the product of written composition and transmission.[19] In response, S. Mowinckel, J. van der Ploeg, and G. Widengren objected to the oral traditionists' reliance on models from Islamic times to the neglect of ancient Mesopotamian, Egyptian, and Canaanite analogues which, they argued, are more relevant to conditions in ancient Israel and are all examples of written literature.[20] Furthermore, argued Widengren, written tradition did play an important role in Arabia alongside oral tradition, and it predominated in cities. Responding for the oral traditionists, I. Engnell in essence withdrew the argument from analogy (which now turned out to support the advocates of written tradition) and held that inner-biblical evidence, rather than foreign analogues, was primary and decisive in the debate and that this evidence pointed toward oral transmission. The procedure of the Chronicler and a few other writers, whose work was admittedly written, could not be extended to most other parts of biblical literature: the *Diatessaron* stems from "a different literary situation" or background than the Bible, the thrust of the Islamic evidence is moot, and it is too late for application to the Bible. The literary-critical method "reflects a modern, anachronistic *book view*, and attempts to interpret ancient biblical literature in modern categories, an *interpretatio europaeica moderna*."[21]

The extreme position of the oral traditionists was not only incompatible with the early evidence for written alongside oral transmission of literary texts in Israel[22] but was in a sense irrelevant to the issue at hand. Since the

19. Cited by Nielsen, *Oral Tradition*, p. 13; Widengren, "Oral Tradition," pp. 203–8.

20. Mowinckel, *Prophecy*, p. 20; van der Ploeg, *RB* 54:5–41; Widengren, "Oral Tradition," p. 203; idem, *Literary*, pp. 57–61.

21. Engnell, *Rigid Scrutiny*, pp. 6–8, 11, 53–54, 163–69; idem, *Call of Isaiah*, pp. 55–60; idem, "Methodological Aspects," p. 24.

22. E.g., Exod. 17:14; 24:7; Num. 21:14; Josh. 10:13; 2 Sam. 1:18. See Widengren, *Literary*, pp. 57–68; de Vaux, *Bible*, pp. 34–36; Koch, *Growth*, pp. 82–84. The Canaanite alphabet was in use in Syria-Palestine from about the seventeenth century on (Albright, *Proto-Sinaitic*, p. 10; Cross, "Origin," pp. 10*–12*; Naveh, *Early History*, pp. 21–42). This includes the period when the Hebrews may have been living on the outskirts of Canaanite cities as seminomads (one of the proto-Canaanite inscriptions is from Shechem, a city that figures prominently in the patriarchal narratives). It is theoretically possible that some Hebrews learned to read or write in this period (literacy is not unknown among pastoral nomads living in contact with literate civilizations; see Lewis, "Literacy"), though the patriarchal narratives do not mention writing (cf. Gandz, "Oral Tradition," p. 250), and there is no reason to suppose that the Hebrew tribesmen would have found it useful to write down their traditions. References to writing among the Israelites (including the writing of historical records) appear regularly from the time of Moses and afterward (see the passages cited at the beginning of this note, as well as Josh. 18:6–9; Judg. 5:14; 8:14; 1 Sam. 10:25; see Gandz, "Oral Tradition," pp. 251–53; Koch, *Growth*, pp. 82–83; cf. Demsky, "Proto-Canaanite," pp. 23–24). The medium of literary texts and many records would have been papyrus and skin (see most recently Haran, "Scribal Workmanship," pp. 68–72; Wenamun [ca. 1090–1080 B.C.E.] refers to records written on scrolls by the ancestors of Zakarbaal of Byblos, which takes us back into the twelfth

oral traditionists stressed that their oral tradition complexes were as fixed as written texts, their critics pointed out that the process of redaction of those complexes must not have differed from processes applied to written texts and was therefore amenable to literary-critical analysis.[23] In searching for analogues to help control the analysis, the question is where appropriate analogues may be found. It goes without saying that evidence from the Bible itself about the transmission and development of Israelite literature would be of the highest value. What evidence exists will be discussed below, but there is not much. It is the very paucity of inner-biblical evidence which prompted the search for external analogues.

Quite apart from the oral tradition debate, since the 1940s scholars have begun to stress the pertinence of analogues from the ancient Near East, especially from the cuneiform literature of Mesopotamia. By the accident of discovery, the first large cache of cuneiform literature found in the nineteenth century was the library of Ashurbanipal (668–627 B.C.E.), which contained mostly the latest versions of cuneiform literary compositions. But since cuneiform literature was written on durable materials (unlike the perishable materials on which Israelite texts were written), earlier versions of these compositions also survived and were subsequently unearthed by archaeologists. It soon became possible to trace the history of some cuneiform compositions through several documented stages over a span of nearly two millennia.

The kinds of insights that ancient Near Eastern literature might offer into the development of biblical literature were illustrated by W. F. Albright in a chapter entitled "The Transmission of Written Documents,"[24] in connection with the problem of estimating the historical reliability of biblical

---

century; see *ANET*, p. 27b, and Goedicke, *Report*, pp. 76–78). The perishability of these materials in the Israelite climate explains why no literary texts from the preexilic period have been found by archaeologists (as Kitchen, *Ancient Orient*, p. 137, notes, none has been found at Byblos either). The current evidence does not imply that literacy was widespread among the early Israelites (see Warner, "Alphabet"), but this does not mean that literary texts would not have been written, only that writing them down would have had some purpose other than dissemination (such as aiding memorization or verification of the text; cf. Beck, *Greek Education*, pp. 44–45 for similar reasoning about early Greece). That most Israelites learned their historical traditions aurally is indicated by Exod. 12:26–27; 13:8, 14–15; Deut. 4:9–10; 6:6–7, 20–25; 11:19; 32:7; Josh. 4:5–7, 20–24; Judg. 6:13; Ps. 44:2; 78:1–6; cf. Gandz, "Oral Tradition," pp. 253–61. But this does not show that these traditions were written down late (thus Koch, *Growth*, p. 85), for some texts make it clear that oral teaching was sometimes accompanied by writing of the same material; see Exod. 17:14; Deut. 6:6–8; 11:19–20; and 31:19–30; compare also 17:18–19 and 27:2–3, 8, with 31:10–13; and Exod. 34:28 with 20:1 (cf. Deut. 5:19). The same is true in other cultures; see *EGE*, p. 102 n. 72; Widengren, *Literary*, p. 47; Finley, *World*, p. 36.

23. North, "Pentateuchal Criticism," p. 78; Bentzen, *Introduction*, pp. 102–3; Eissfe' *OTI*, pp. 5–6; de Vaux, *Bible*, p. 36.

24. Albright, *FSAC*, pp. 76–81.

literature. On the subject of literary style, Albright observed that the anonymity and stereotypicality observable in biblical literature are even more pervasive in Egyptian and cuneiform literature, where traditional, stereotypical style so predominates over personal style as to warn against "using canons of style and vocabulary too rigidly in trying to determine authorship of" biblical passages.[25] With reference to literary evolution, Albright remarked on "the tendency of ancient Oriental scribes and compilers to add rather than to subtract," in other words, the fact that literature tends in the course of time to become expanded by additions, including variants, commentaries, and glosses, rather than to become abridged. Albright argued that this tendency has implications for the method followed in the compilation of the Pentateuch and for scholars' attempts to reconstruct the original sources. It implies, he said, that whatever divergences we find between different versions of a tradition represent nearly all the variants that existed; had there been other variants they would not have been subtracted. The process of growth by addition also implies "that much of the expansion evident in legal and liturgic passages is not due to literary doublets but to the normal swelling of the text by the accretion of commentaries or of subsequent court decisions, etc."[26]

Touching on the same subject some years later, G. E. Mendenhall noted that the evaluation of the historical worth of the Pentateuchal documents has been largely hypothetical, and he suggested the study of cuneiform literary history as one possible source of criteria for evaluating the historical accuracy of written traditions:

> Since some religious traditions of the ancient world can be traced over periods of many centuries, we can see how the ancient scribe conceived of his task; we can at least have preliminary insights into the circumstances under which changes in religious (or legal) traditions took place. Even here we cannot mechanically transfer into Israel all the characteristics of the Babylonian scribe, but we shall at least have some comparable material which would be far more adequate than that on which 19th-century assumptions were based.[27]

The advantage of cuneiform analogues as a corrective to the hypothetical nature of biblical literary criticism was emphasized in a programmatic study by W. W. Hallo in 1962, in which he offered the comparative method as the

> one approach which seems to offer some prospect of objective, verifiable data against which to test biblical [critics'] hypotheses. . . . In the area of literary tech-

25. Ibid., p. 77.
26. Ibid., p. 80.
27. Mendenhall, "Biblical History," pp. 30–31.

niques, the evidence from the literate neighbors of ancient Israel is not only relevant to the biblical problems, but also enjoys a scholarly consensus based on a maximum of facts and a minimum of theories.

> The possibility . . . presents itself of tracing the growth of a Mesopotamian literary composition through two millennia, from its first written fixation, through its creative adaptation to new forms and even new languages, to its final, orderly incorporation into an official canon. Without this basic knowledge, all higher literary criticism remains hopelessly hypothetical. With it, the foundations are laid for a comparative approach to biblical criticism.[28]

Implicit in these calls for comparative models is the recognition that their analysis might yield results at variance with certain critical hypotheses about biblical literature. Albright illustrated this point in discussing the growth in length of the various literary genres:

> Following the analogies of [Mesopotamia and Egypt], as well as of Asia Minor and Greece, we should expect to have long compositions as well as short at any given period. We should, accordingly, reject the evolutionary strait jacket imposed on early literatures by H. Gunkel and some of his successors, according to which short compositions are generally earlier than long compositions in the same category.[29]

In discussing the historical reliability of the Pentateuch, M. Greenberg raised a fundamental question about some of the suppositions underlying source analysis. Two of these suppositions are: (1) "that an interruption of chronological order or a mixture of styles indicates composition—resting on the assumption that original creations in biblical times were chronologically ordered and stylistically homogeneous," and (2) "that composition implies lateness." In order to test these suppositions, Greenberg called for tapping

> the materials of ancient Near Eastern literature . . . by tradition and form criticism. . . . [A] study of their literary styles and habits, especially with an eye to the differences between our expectations and their performance, would put solid ground under the feet of the man who would speak confidently about what may and may

28. Hallo, "New Viewpoints," pp. 12–13, 26. Hallo's study is the first known to me to have cited specific examples of phenomena in cuneiform literature that bear on questions asked by biblical literary critics. Among the phenomena discussed are authorship, creative adaptation, the use of topoi and formulas, unofficial/popular literature, and the collecting, selecting, and preserving of compositions. In several later studies, Hallo discussed Mesopotamian cultic poetry in the light of biblical-critical questions; see Hallo, "Letters," pp. 17–18. For further illustrations, see Tigay, "Literary-Critical," pp. 5–30, and idem, "On Some Aspects," pp. 372–78.

29. Albright, "Oriental Glosses," p. 163; idem, "Canaanite-Phoenician Sources," p. 4.

not be expected in a piece of ancient Near Eastern literature. . . . Until we have solid studies of the styles of ancient Near Eastern writing, how can we speak with confidence about what is in and out of order, an editorial excrescence or an original "awkwardness"—from our viewpoint—in biblical writing? Not, mind you, that one has any right automatically to equate biblical style with extrabiblical. But if the evidence goes the way I suspect it will, the same sort of verisimilitude that Mari, Nuzi, and Hammurabi have given the customs of patriarchal times is likely to be lent to the present styles of biblical writing, changing our conception of the editor's hand in creating them.[30]

One of the first to adduce specific cases allegedly discordant with current theories of biblical critics was C. H. Gordon, who argued that stylistic differences within unitary Ugaritic and Akkadian texts weakened the use of stylistic differences as a criterion for differences of authorship in the Bible.[31] The same line of reasoning was pursued vigorously by K. A. Kitchen in his broadside against the documentary hypothesis, which was partly quoted above, p. 3. He stated:

The stylistic criteria and assumed mode of composition by conflation are illusory. For the documentary theory in its many variations has throughout been elaborated *in a vacuum*, without any proper reference to other ancient Oriental literatures to find out whether they had been created in this singular manner. . . . [Failure to compare these literatures] is a most serious omission, because—in the forms actually preserved to us in the extant Old Testament—Hebrew literature shows very close external stylistic similarities to the other Ancient Oriental literatures among which (and as part of which) it grew up. Now, nowhere in the Ancient Orient is there anything which is definitely known to parallel the elaborate history of fragmentary composition and conflation of Hebrew literature (or marked by just such criteria) as the documentary hypothesis would postulate. And conversely, any attempt to apply the criteria of the documentary theorists to Ancient Oriental compositions that have known histories but exhibit the same literary phenomena results in manifest absurdities.[32]

Like Gordon, Kitchen cited specific cases to buttress his argument. In using such evidence as the basis for evaluating a specific theory about biblical literature, Gordon and Kitchen have advanced the discussion from the plane of programmatic suggestions to the practical application of the program. Below (chapter 5) we take issue with their interpretation of the evidence and their conclusions, but their studies are a salutary reminder that

30. Greenberg, "Response," pp. 41–43.

31. C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Literature*, pp. 6–7, 132. In *HUCA* 26 (1955): 97, Gordon added Greek evidence to the argument.

32. Kitchen, *Ancient Orient*, pp. 112–29; the quotation is from pp. 114–15 (italics in the original).

comparative models could suggest conclusions at variance with current theories of biblical criticism. Challenges such as these must be met by any scholar who wishes, as Greenberg put it, to have solid ground under his feet when he theorizes about the development of biblical literature.

Parallel to the increasing interest in ancient Near Eastern models has been a renewed interest in the evidence provided by the Septuagint and ancient biblical manuscripts, as well as a second source of extrabiblical analogues, postbiblical Jewish literature. M. Smith has observed that biblical criticism began with

> methods . . . based largely, though not entirely, on subjective criteria—especially on the critic's notion of the consistency and historical reliability which might be expected of an ancient author. . . .
>
> Ideally, the critical study of the Old Testament should have begun with the relationships between [Kings and Chronicles and the differences between the Hebrew and Septuagint texts of Jeremiah, Psalms, Proverbs, Esther, Daniel, and 1 Esdras, and between Genesis and its revision in Jubilees].[33]
>
> What form a book had before its present form we can only guess. The most reliable guide for such guesswork is a careful study of the actual procedures of the copyists, editors, or authors—whichever one call them—of the Old Testament tradition. In the differences between [the texts listed] we have objective evidence to show the extent and nature of possible changes.[34]

A few recent studies have made reference to some of these texts for various literary-critical purposes. E. Tov described the redaction of the Masoretic edition of Jeremiah by comparing it to the shorter, earlier edition reflected in the Septuagint; unlike Robertson Smith's earlier discussion, Tov's had the advantage of being able to refer to a Hebrew manuscript from Qumran which reflects the shorter edition on which the Septuagint was based.[35] In the Greek version of Esther, E. J. Bickerman found an analogue to the way that biblical authors preserve parallel accounts of the same incidents by presenting them as different incidents.[36] P. W. Skehan described the way the text of certain passages was expanded in the Septuagint, the Samaritan

33. As we have seen, some of these texts were mentioned by early critics, but only to support positions already reached on other grounds. They did not serve as models for the analysis.

34. M. Smith, *Palestinian Parties*, pp. 3–5.

35. Tov, "L'incidence"; for Tov's latest treatment of the subject, see below, Chapter 8. For other parts of the LXX which have a bearing on biblical literary criticism, see Tov, *Text-Critical*, pp. 293–306.

36. Bickerman, *Studies*, pp. 264–65; idem, *Four Strange Books*, pp. 224–25, cf. 187. See below, Chapter 2, pp. 57–61.

Pentateuch, and biblical manuscripts from Qumran by the addition of matter drawn from parallel passages. He suggested that the same phenomenon underlies Exodus 36–39, which describes the building and equipping of the Tabernacle in terms that echo the divine instructions of Exodus 25–31 virtually verbatim.[37]

Among studies drawing on postbiblical literature is one by I. L. Seeligmann entitled "Aetiological Elements in Biblical Historiography." Seeligmann observed that a number of nonetiological stories from Genesis are retold in Jubilees, with supplements making etiological points. From this he inferred that the etiological element in a story can be secondary, so that the same could be true of etiological elements found in stories appearing in the Bible itself.[38] M. Weippert, in discussing the historicity of Genesis 14, responded to the view that certain archaic traits of the chapter, such as second-millennium personal names like Arioch, suggest that the chapter rests on authentic historical tradition. He pointed to the book of Judith, where there appear characters named Arpachshad and Arioch, names the author of Judith found in the Bible and regarded as exotic and archaic-sounding. This illustration of how a late author digs up ancient names to give his story an archaic flavor indicates to Weippert that "in the case of Gen. 14 . . . we cannot deduce from the ancient personal names an equal antiquity for the tradition as a whole."[39] Most recently the Qumran *Temple Scroll* has been studied by S. A. Kaufman "as a model against which to test the validity of Pentateuchal source criticism."[40]

Some recent studies have also sought analogues in Talmudic literature (roughly contemporary with the *Diatessaron*).[41] M. Greenberg invoked the

37. Skehan, "Scrolls," pp. 102–3.

38. Seeligmann, "Aetiological," pp. 151–53.

39. Weippert, *Settlement*, pp. 98–100. On the other hand, Mendenhall cited Hellenistic literature in support of a warning against hyperskepticism about biblical historical traditions. The fact that Hellenistic writings utilized very ancient traditions implies that the lateness of a text does not imply the lateness of all its contents (Mendenhall, "Biblical History," p. 31 with n. 21). This would counter Wellhausen's much-quoted dictum that from the patriarchal narratives "we attain to no historical knowledge of the patriarchs, but *only* of the time when the stories about them arose in the Israelite people" (Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, pp. 318–19; emphasis added).

40. See below, Chapter 2, p. 83 and n. 71.

41. However, not much use has been made of Talmudic source criticism. E. Z. Melamed described some features of the Mishna which make it amenable to empirical source criticism: "Critics of the Mishna have an advantage over biblical critics. While the latter . . . analyze sources according to imaginary internal indicators and conjectures which float in the air, the former have something to rely on: firm internal indicators, the testimony of texts contemporary to the Mishna, and the testimony of sages who were close, geographically and chronologically, to the redactor and his school" (Melamed, *Introduction*, p. 24 n. 63). Some suggestions about the applicability of Mishnaic source criticism were made by D. Weiss Halivni, "Epistemological Bondage." An example of the source and redaction criticism of the Babylonian Talmud, which the biblical critic will find suggestive, is S. Friedman, *Critical Study*.

Talmudic practice of preserving variant versions of a story to help explain the similar procedure of the redactor in Exodus.[42] S. M. Paul explained the disruptive position of Exod. 22:1–2a on the basis of the Talmudic method of "footnoting."[43] J. Weingreen has argued that Deuteronomy is a "proto-Mishna," relating to Exodus through Numbers much as the Mishna relates to the written Torah.[44]

Preferences Among Models

As we can see from the above survey, interest has focused especially on three sources of analogues: inner-biblical evidence from Chronicles and from biblical manuscripts and versions; postbiblical Jewish (and some Christian) literature; and the cuneiform literature of ancient Mesopotamia. A certain amount of attention has also been directed to Arabic literature, and not only by protagonists in the oral tradition debate;[45] however, interest in Arabic analogues has been limited, perhaps as a consequence of (and for the same reasons as) the diminishing of the role of Arabic-Islamic learning in biblical studies in favor of ancient Near Eastern lore. From time to time the literary histories of more distant cultures, ranging from the classical world to Iceland, Britain, and India, have also been invoked.[46] Recently the Homeric epics, viewed as products of oral literature, have attracted renewed attention as a possible model.[47] Finally, M. Tsevat has argued that the best

42. Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, p. 195.
43. Paul, *Studies*, p. 110 n. 1.
44. Weingreen, *Bible*, pp. 132–54.
45. See Widengren, "Oral Tradition"; Porter, "Pre-Islamic"; Greenberg, "Response," pp. 37–38.
46. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby, *Hexateuch*, 1:2–8; Nielsen, *Oral Tradition*, pp. 47–48.
47. See Cross's suggestive "Epic Traditions" and earlier studies cited by Alster, *Dumuzi's Dream*, p. 19 n. 8, and p. 21 n. 18. As the present volume is restricted to analogues whose development can be documented, Homeric analogues have been omitted, since Homeric criticism is hypothetical in the same way that biblical criticism is (see Tsevat, "Common Sense," p. 220) and is equally in need of help from analogues (see Murray, *Rise*, pp. 93–119; Nilsson, *Homer*, pp. 184–211). (This is not to say that biblical scholarship can afford to ignore hypothetical analogues; the number of empirical analogues is not large enough to permit such a luxury.)

One aspect of the Homeric analogy, which reopens the issue of oral tradition, should be mentioned here. There has never been any doubt that there was oral tradition in Israel (see Gandz, "Oral Tradition") and that it supplied much of the information found in our texts. The oral traditionists in biblical studies have sought to go beyond this truism and demonstrate that particular texts rely on oral tradition not only for their information but also their very wording. In recent years this has been done by applying the theory of M. Parry and A. B. Lord, first developed in connection with the composition of the Homeric epics (see Lord, *Singer*). According to this theory, certain features of epic style, such as traditional themes,

models for testing critics' assumptions are modern works of literature.[48] On the relevance of such models we shall have more to say shortly, but first we

---

formulaic language, and repetitions, indicate that texts containing them in considerable density were created and transmitted orally, always with a greater or lesser degree of improvisation and variation in performance. Yet there are problems that hamper the biblicist in applying this theory to biblical literature. Even in the home field of this theory, Homeric studies, the theory is not accepted by all scholars (see Lesky, *History*, pp. 37–39). Some scholars of comparative literature question whether the use of formulas necessarily implies oral composition (cf. Stolz and Shannon, *Oral Literature*, p. x; Russo, "Composition"; Davison, "Transmission," pp. 216–17). Even if one should assume that such features could have no possible origin other than the practice of oral composition, their presence in a text is not a certain indication that *that* text was composed orally. They may indicate nothing more than that the *stylistic canons* of the literary tradition to which that text belongs were shaped (or partly shaped) in a period when literature was still created orally. They cannot prove that literature was still being composed orally when a particular text was composed. It stands to reason that a narrative style created for oral composition and delivery could survive as a norm for centuries after the transition to writing (cf. below, Chapter 1 n. 65, and see, further, Komoróczy, "Akkadian Epic Poetry," p. 63 n. 88; Zakovitch, "*For Three*," p. 9; Zwettler, *Oral Tradition*, pp. 15–19; Porter, "Pre-Islamic," p. 22; Redford, *Study*, pp. 111 [on stock expressions used by writers of Egyptian stelae]; *EGE*, pp. 102–3). Another difficulty in applying this theory to biblical literature is the fact that it depends heavily on the existence of highly trained professional or semi-professional bards who sang epic poems and who are mentioned several times in Homer, while writing is virtually absent (Kirk, *Homer*, pp. 1, 53, 83, 152; Finley, *World*, pp. 36–37; Nilsson, *Homer*, pp. 206–8). In the biblical narratives about early Hebrew and Israelite history there are no bards. Historical tradition is related by parents to children, and written records are also kept (see above, n. 22). Professional singers first appear under David and Solomon, not as traveling bards but in groups, as palace personnel (2 Sam. 19:35; 1 Kings 10:12). They were perhaps preceded by the *mōšĕlim* poets mentioned in Num. 21:27, but the style of the poetry attributed to the singers and the *mōšĕlim* is lyric, not epic (2 Chron. 35:25; Num. 21:27–30; cf. Ps. 68:26–27). Indeed, whether there ever was epic poetry about Israelite history is uncertain; see Chapter 1 n. 3.

48. In a provocative article, Tsevat argues that the fundamental assumptions of critics about what authors are likely or unlikely to do (e.g., authors do not contradict themselves or use different names for the same character) are based on modern Western standards, since such assumptions could not have been derived from the Bible itself; therefore it is valid to test these assumptions by seeing whether they really apply to modern Western literature (Tsevat, "Common Sense," pp. 218–19, 229). There is also an advantage in using modern examples because we are relatively well informed about their authorship and composition, which is not the case with ancient Near Eastern works (ibid., pp. 220, 225). Tsevat concludes that certain critical assumptions are proved wrong by modern works that display inconsistencies but are known to be the products of individual authors. One may grant the value of modern analogues for testing universal statements about what authors do or do not do, as well as the fact that individual authors may be inconsistent in certain situations (cf. also W. Kaufmann, *Critique*, pp. 373–78). However, the assumption that contradiction may reflect different authors is not solely a modern Western one but is found as early as the Talmud, where clauses in a mishna which are inconsistent and cannot be harmonized are attributed by some rabbis to different *tannaim* (see Samuel in *b. B. Qam.* 14a and 36b and R. Yohanan in *b. B. Meṣ.* 41a [see note of Steinsaltz, *Masseket*, ad loc.] and *Sanh.* 62b), and contradictory statements of a *tanna* are explained as reflecting different traditionists' accounts of what he said (*b. Ber.* 3a). In any

need to look more closely at scholars' reasons for preferring the nearer analogues, and at the proper role of analogues. As we have noted, inner-biblical analogues have the most direct bearing on the way literary works developed in ancient Israel. The analogues in question are the texts transmitted in two versions: Chronicles' revision of Samuel–Kings, certain psalms preserved in duplicate, and non-Masoretic forms of certain biblical books.[49] By comparing the different versions, we can observe the process of continuity and identify the kind of changes introduced in texts and the methods by which they were introduced. Such evidence is directly relevant to the literary growth of the compositions it comes from, but it is also valuable indirectly as an analogue that may apply to the growth of other compositions. K. Koch, in his *Growth of the Biblical Tradition*, begins a section entitled "The First Steps in an Investigation into the Background of a Text" with the observation that "a study of material with a double transmission will provide the experience necessary to deal with" other texts transmitted only singly.[50] The relationships between such doubly transmitted texts may be typical of the kind of transmission many biblical books went through.

It is this feature of double or multiple transmission which makes certain postbiblical and ancient Near Eastern compositions attractive as additional models of literary development. Given the relative paucity of evidence from within the Bible (in all its textual traditions), they are welcome additions to the body of relevant evidence. But the relevance of models from these two spheres must be carefully defined, for each has disadvantages as well as advantages.

The great advantage of models from postbiblical Jewish literature is the fact that they are part of the same Israelite literary tradition in which the Bible itself grew. Indeed, several of them are revisions of parts of the Bible (e.g., Jubilees, the *Temple Scroll*). Though many of them survived only in translations, which makes comparison with their Hebrew originals more difficult, scholars who have advocated the use of these models have implicitly presumed that the techniques of the revisers are a continuation of techniques in use when the books of the Bible reached their present literary form. But this is not necessarily the case. Precisely when the books of the Bible reached their present literary form is a matter of conjecture, but it is fair to conclude that this occurred in most cases prior to the Hellenistic period, in some cases considerably earlier. But the postbiblical compositions in question (from the Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Qumran texts)

---

case, the present volume will show that we are adequately informed about the development of some ancient texts and that, in some, contradictory matter is the result of multiple authorship, that is, the combination of sources.

49. See the texts surveyed by Tov, *Text-Critical*, pp. 293–306.

50. Koch, *Growth*, p. 51; cf. Gunkel, *Legends*, pp. 99–100.

are products of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. By this time the Israelites had undergone a considerable cultural upheaval, having come under the dominion and cultural influence of the Assyrians and Babylonians, the Persians, and the Hellenistic empires. One cannot rule out the possibility that some of the techniques reflected in postbiblical literature are different from those used earlier, due either to foreign influence or late internal development.

Lateness is precisely the impediment from which ancient Near Eastern analogues do not suffer. An important part of their appeal for comparative literary criticism lies in the presumption that they stem from a milieu which is culturally and chronologically close to that in which biblical literature was produced. In its most extreme form this assumption was expressed by S. Mowinckel: analogues from these quarters are "for the mentality and literary activity of the ancient Orient . . . even primary sources compared to" the Islamic sources.[51] However, other advocates of ancient Near Eastern analogues (Mendenhall, Greenberg) cautioned against automatically transferring the evidence of Mesopotamian literature to Israel, and with good reason. No less than postbiblical literature, Mesopotamian literature may sometimes have been produced under different conditions. Although some Mesopotamian texts were perhaps composed contemporaneously with biblical literature, some of the most important ones (such as the *Gilgamesh Epic*) were first composed in the Old Babylonian period (2000–1600) and reached their classic literary form in approximately the thirteenth century. The chronological gap separating such analogues from the final redaction of the Torah (± 500 B.C.E.) is hardly less significant than those separating that redaction from the *Diatessaron* (ca. 170 C.E.) or early Islamic historical literature (eighth to ninth centuries C.E.). Nor was ancient Mesopotamia in any period culturally identical with ancient Israel, notwithstanding the many parallels between the two civilizations that have been identified.[52] The kinds of contact Israelites had with Mesopotamia in patriarchal, monarchic, exilic, and postexilic times do not seem to have been of the sort that would familiarize Israelite writers with the techniques that their Mesopotamian counterparts used in redacting older sources. That such techniques may somehow have passed from Mesopotamia to Israel is conceivable, but hardly to be taken for granted.[53]

Therefore, neither Mesopotamian nor postbiblical analogues are perfect; neither is really a "primary source" for the techniques of Israelite writers in

51. Mowinckel, *Prophecy*, p. 20.

52. Differences between the two civilizations have been emphasized by M. Smith, "Present State," pp. 26–35, and idem, "Differences."

53. A. Lemaire summarizes similarities in the institutions responsible for the transmission of "classical" literature in Israel and elsewhere in the ancient world (Lemaire, *Écoles*, chap. 3), but these similarities do not permit us to presume a priori an identity of *techniques*.

the biblical period. Each is a step removed from biblical literature and may have been produced under different conditions. 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.[54] 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. The absence of an analogue for a particular theory is not *ipso facto* an argument against its plausibility (what is unique is not implausible), but 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.

Keeping these considerations in mind, it remains an open question whether postbiblical and Mesopotamian analogues should be given preference above all other extrabiblical analogues. If a degree of discontinuity with biblical texts does not disqualify these analogues, is there an identifiable point at which other analogues can be ruled too distant or foreign? If we assumed that similarities in redactional techniques could only be the result of cultural contact, or if we thought that an analogue could prove a theory of development, there might be grounds for insisting on proximity or close contact. But enough similarities in techniques are known from around the world to suggest that they can arise independently as well as through cultural borrowing. Despite the doubts expressed earlier about particular theories that have been supported with Greek and Islamic analogues, it is undeniable that Greek and Islamic literary history offer some valuable and instructive parallels to the techniques underlying biblical literature.[55] The same is sometimes true of Talmudic literature and early Christian literature (the *Diatessaron*), and even of literature from more distant quarters. The technique of conflating was practiced by medieval English chroniclers, who wrote accounts of Thomas à Becket's return to England by conflating and revising earlier accounts.[56] Shakespeare used Plutarch's lives of Caesar, Brutus, and Antony in a similar way in composing his

54. See Tsevat, "Common Sense"; cf. R. M. Frye's similar use of analogues from English literature, including the "disintegration" of Shakespeare, in evaluating the source criticism of the Gospels (Frye, "Synoptic Problems").

55. See nn. 45, 47. A biblical critic feels very much at home reading such works as Whitman's *Homer*. On the relevance of Greek parallels to Israelite culture in general, see the articles of M. Smith cited in n. 52.

56. Longstaff, *Evidence*, pp. 42–113. I owe this and the next reference to Frye, "Synoptic Problems," pp. 274–83, where further examples of conflation are cited.

Julius Caesar.[57] Early in the nineteenth century, Thomas Jefferson compiled *The Life and Morals of Jesus of Nazareth* by literally cutting and pasting extracts from the four Gospels to produce a single running (though selective) account.[58] In the early twentieth century the Hebrew writers H. N. Bialik and Y. H. Rawnitzki composed their anthology of aggadic literature by combination and conflation.[59] N. K. Sandars' English edition of the *Gilgamesh Epic* not only added passages from a Sumerian text about Gilgamesh that was never part of the Akkadian epic, but also interpolated passages from other epics (such as the reason for the flood, taken from *Atrahasis*).[60] As recently as 1983, D. Wolkstein and S. N. Kramer published a book of stories about the Sumerian goddess Inanna in which Wolkstein combined different Sumerian compositions (in translations by Kramer) into a single story and, in Kramer's words, "skillfully wove the texts of numerous related poems into a unifying whole."[61] No doubt one could draw up a hypothetical chain of transmission showing how such techniques could have been passed from Mesopotamia to Israel and later Near Eastern cultures, and through Anatolia to Greece and the rest of Europe down to modern times.[62] But it seems just as possible that we are dealing not—or at least not always—with techniques borrowed by one culture from another, but with common-sense techniques which developed independently among the transmitters of literary traditions when they faced similar tasks. One need merely consider the research papers of inexperienced students to realize how natural such techniques are. Until taught otherwise, schoolchildren often string together verbatim excerpts from their sources, arranging them in a somewhat coherent order. In earlier times, prior to the recognition of authors' rights over their works which eventually led to copyright laws, such practices were not limited to the inexperienced.[63]

If we are indeed dealing with widespread common-sense techniques, and if ancient Near Eastern and postbiblical Jewish analogues cannot claim exclusive validity as models for biblical literary criticism, they will nonetheless retain a preeminent position among extrabiblical models used by biblical scholars. These are the bodies of extrabiblical literature best known and most accessible on a scholarly level to students of the Hebrew Bible.

57. Dorsch, *Caesar*, pp. xii–xix.

58. Roche, *Jefferson Bible*; cf. Thomson, "Four Gospels."

59. See below, Chapter 2, pp. 87–88.

60. See Sandars, *Gilgamesh*, pp. 49–54.

61. See Wolkstein and Kramer, *Inanna*, pp. xiii–xiv, 205–7, for an account of Wolkstein's editorial procedure. For a critique of this work, see below, Summary and Conclusions, n. 7.

62. Jefferson explicitly acknowledged Gospel harmonies as analogous to, if not the source of, his idea; see Roche, *Jefferson Bible*, p. 19; cf. Sheridan, "Introduction," pp. 57–58.

63. Cf. Wilcke, "Formale Gesichtspunkte," p. 242 n. 55, 2d par.; Frye, "Synoptic Problems," p. 275.

Furthermore, it would be premature to decide that no literary techniques are shared because of cultural borrowing, and scholars will naturally feel more comfortable with analogues from cultures with known relations to biblical Israel. But so long as the main use of analogues is to show what is realistic, even distant analogues will have heuristic value if they were produced under conditions comparable to those underlying biblical literature, especially if our knowledge of how they developed is empirical rather than hypothetical.

The Present Volume

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. The analogues are drawn primarily, though not exclusively, from the three areas focused on above: the biblical textual tradition (Chapters 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8), Mesopotamian literature (Chapters 1, 5, 7), and postbiblical Jewish literature (Chapters 2, 5, 6; the Appendix is based on postbiblical Christian literature). Some of the chapters are based on single analogues and their implications for biblical criticism (Chapters 1, 3, 8) while others start from specific critical questions and seek relevant analogues (Chapters 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, Appendix). Chapters 3 and 8 do not discuss the analogical implications of the texts they study; the author of these chapters traces the development of these texts in their own right, and the studies are presented here because of my own conviction about their value as analogues (each chapter is introduced by an editor's note pointing out the bearing of that chapter on thesis of the volume as a whole).

One chapter in this volume deals with the development of a prophetic book (Chapter 8), while another studies a type of editorial technique in historical books (Chapter 7). Chapter 6 is presented as an example of a little-used approach to certain biblical narratives that is suggested by a number of analogues. Chapter 1 deals with the growth of the narrative complexes in the Pentateuch. The greatest amount of space is devoted to analogues that have a bearing on the documentary hypothesis (Chapters 2–5 and the Appendix). This is because of the seminal role played by this subject in modern biblical studies and because Pentateuchal criticism has been the focus of most controversy. It will be clear from my own chapters that I find the documentary hypothesis persuasive, but the reader is urged not to read this volume as essentially a defense of that hypothesis. The processes illustrated here do not exhaust the possibilities for explaining the development of biblical literature; they only scratch the surface. Even where a chapter lends support to a particular theory about a biblical composition,

some other comparative model might lend equal plausibility to a competing theory or even suggest a new theory. Indeed, Alexander Rofé suggests in Chapter 4 that the supplementary hypothesis, rather than the documentary hypothesis, best explains the development of Joshua 20, and in Chapter 6 Yair Zakovitch offers a theory of assimilation to replace the documentary analysis of Genesis 34. But in addition to lending plausibility to particular theories, new or old, the volume is designed to give the reader experience with concrete models of literary development and to illustrate the kind of research that must go into interpreting the evidence that is available about these models. It is hoped that readers will be encouraged to seek more such models, especially for genres of biblical literature not covered in this volume. Experience with such models offers the biblical scholar what wide exposure to literature gives any student of that subject: a feeling for what happens in literature, and the sophistication to formulate literary theories and evaluate those of others in an informed and critical way.