

17.1-12  
93.17-11

Albright, W. F., Archaeology, Historical Analogy and early Biblical Tradition  
(Louisiana State University Press; Baton Rouge) 1966

p. 44 Modern scholars, beginning especially with Julius Wellhausen, have tried to distribute the narratives of Samuel among different documentary sources. In Genesis this can be done to a certain extent, thanks to the two divine names, Yahweh and Elohim. However, in the Book of Samuel there are no such concrete criteria of form, so that scholars who try to use the divergent traditions about Samuel's role as a means of differentiating documentary sources are soon reduced to speculation. In the absence of clear-cut differences in wording and / <sup>p. 45</sup> structured formulas, it is impossible to classify literary sources on the basis of content alone

p. 45 The analysis of the Hebrew recensions of I and II Samuel by Frank M. Cross, Jr., as they appear among the sheepskin fragments of Cave IV at Qumran, is at last providing us with a textual basis for the study of Samuel's career.<sup>2</sup> . . . In other words, the original text of Samuel was longer than any derived recensions, and naturally longer than all modern translations. Where the Greek and Hebrew differ, most apparent recensional variants were already found in the earlier text. Since we find similar indications of a fuller original text in Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges, we may be sure that all these books share in the tendency to reduce the original text through copyists' errors, instead of expanding it by editorial glosses. Therefore, it is impossible to carry out any of those close analyses / <sup>p.46</sup> of the Hebrew text which became so popular in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The text of the Hebrew Bible was not fixed at such an early date as supposed by most critical scholars, a fact which means that the Massoretic text cannot be used as a basis for the kind of analysis which sometimes divided a single verse among three different sources.

2 See F. M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Study (New York, 1958), especially pages 31 ff. and 133 ff.