THE BOOK OF SAMUEL — HEBREW AND GREEK  
HINDSIGHT OF A CENTURY*

M. H. Goshen-Gottstein

I set out to write this paper as a newcomer to the textual study of the text of the book of Samuel. Actually the extensive bibliography should have frightened me off from the start. Whatever experience I have gained for the past decades in areas of text-critical study has been in another field which is unlike that of the text of Samuel, namely, the Pentateuch and the Latter Prophets. With the specialization we are going in for in our generation one ought to be a specialist for the particular book one wishes to discuss in order to try one's hand. Someone who prefers to remain a generalist will find himself soon out of place. Even more so, if he does not have some strong feelings about such issues like the configuration of the Greek manuscripts known by their notation as the group boc² and one does not even have some scrap of new evidence from Qumran to offer. What use is there in the world of the nineteen-eighties to rehash long-dead issues?

* This paper is a re-worked version of my lecture, which I gave at the Vienna meeting of the Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies in 1980. As usual, I was late in submitting the paper for the volume of preprints which Emanuel Tov had prepared for that meeting, and I try belatedly to formulate afresh what I wanted to say on that occasion. To be sure, I did not know at the time what other scholars who participated in that meeting had to say, and due to later events I have no recollection of what someone may have said on that occasion. But the aim of my talk was to describe the history of the research in this field, and my notes of this material seem to be still useful for this final reworking. We still depend on the preliminary publications by Frank Cross in BASOR 132 (1953) 15ff.; JBL 74 (1955) 147ff.; BASOR 141 (1956) 9ff. and in Tadmor and Weinfeld (eds.), Studies in Biblical and Cuneiform Literatures (Jerusalem 1983) 148ff., and in the volume of the Vienna proceedings published in 1980, pp. 105f. Some material is included in the dissertation by E. Ulrich, The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus (HSM 19; Missoula 1978). Some use of the published material has been made in the recent Anchor Bible volume published by Kyle McCarter in 1980. Note also R. Kraft, ed., Proceedings IOSCS 1972, pp. 108-126.
The only thing a historian of the text has to offer is his specific general knowledge in the area of exegesis and textual criticism and some knowledge of the general issues that might cast a special light on the text of Samuel.

The problem is then why of all the books of the Bible it is Samuel that raises special questions. Why is what is true for most books of the Bible not fitting for the books of Samuel? Is its tradition different from that of other books?

The unusual character was already diagnosed a hundred years ago, once it transpired that the rules of narrative historical writing need not by necessity be the same as those of poetic writing. All the books of the Former Prophets have a subject of historical contents in common that sets them apart from books of prophecy and poetry. But the Books of Kingdoms — as they are called in the Septuagint — seem to have undergone a special historical development that left its traces in the text as it has reached us. To be sure, any generalization must be misleading. But since we are dependent on the text as it has reached us, we can hardly refrain from trying to infer the facts from one book to the other. As regards each book we have to reckon with textual traditions in different sources: Hebrew, Old Greek, Lucian — or whatever is called by that name — and finally non-masoretic Hebrew. The latter may be Qumran evidence or some other. The problem is always there, but its appearance may differ. At present I am ignoring on purpose the possible evidence from other versions and leave aside what might emerge from evidence from sources such as the Peshitta, the Targum, the Vulgate and the Arabic "Tafsir". All these sources may need the attention of the textual critic, as occasion arises. But as regards the Book of Samuel our problem turns out to be concentrated in the area of the Hebrew and Greek evidence. Whereas a hundred years ago this seemed to be specifically an issue of MT versus LXX, and all the studies concentrated on these questions, the problem in our time has changed considerably. In this generation the main issue is how the facts noted down a century ago should be viewed in light of what we have learned in the past few years from the Qumran evidence and to what degree is what we had thought to be secure knowledge still valid.

Possibly the most tantalizing issue is that by the end of the nineteen-eighties we are still dependent on the evidence mentioned in a few advance publications and can never be sure to what extent the information we have at present will ultimately emerge as sound. This is not meant to cast any doubt on the work which those scholars have put at our disposal but to express the frustration which every
scholar must feel at the limitations of his knowledge. All present-day scholars are in the debt of Frank Cross who was the first who realized the importance of the Qumran fragments that had been entrusted to him and made others aware of their importance. But the feeling of frustration is common to all scholars.

As I sit down to rephrase this paper it becomes clear to me that the state of affairs has not changed since 1980, and the historic survey made then is still meaningful after a few years. But why speak of the time of one century? After all, a century is not a given fixed period. Why look back at the time around 1880?

This is not just a matter of finding a date. The time around 1880 was indeed a watershed as regards the study of the text of Samuel. The text of Samuel symbolizes more than any other the precarious relationship between textual criticism and exegesis. This issue had started to develop when Otto Thenius had written his main contribution to the study of the text of Samuel and tried to base his exegesis on what seemed to be the best text and which was blown out of proportion when Paul de Lagarde made his statement on the text of Proverbs. In his approach Lagarde turned the whole issue of the text topsy-turvy and claimed that any textual work has to be carried out before the biblical text can be dealt with in an exegetical context. Lagarde had claimed that no exegetical work should be undertaken before the text-critical "cleansing" of the biblical text has been finalized.

Lagarde had made his claim in the context of dealing with the text of the Book of Proverbs, and the idea of the necessity of "cleansing" remained in his view a necessary condition in order to carry out proper textual and exegetical work. This attitude became finally a major point for years to come.

The major figures of those days were Julius Wellhausen who had made his first major contribution to text-critical study with his "Jugendarbeit" on the text of Samuel over and beyond his work on the history and religion of Israel. When the dispute broke out in its full form, already ten years had passed since Wellhausen had published his work on the text of Samuel, but Driver had not yet entered the fray. Klostermann had not yet started expressing his position nor had Budde or Cornill. But nobody could be aware that the facts of each book of the Bible were different and what had been established regarding the text of the Pentateuch was still regarded as applying to most other books of the Bible. Most work had been done all the time on the text of the Pentateuch, because that was the only canonical text that was of practical importance, and it was taken for granted that
its text had survived in the best-guarded fashion. It was only by chance that the discussion erupted in the end precisely around the text of Samuel which was not an important text from the point of view of religion and theology. Looking at the book of Samuel we realize that the major figures that took part in the discussion were two senior scholars from Germany and England: Julius Wellhausen and Samuel Rolles Driver. But most scholars were from Germany where the main action was played out. The only other book of the Bible that could boast special work in the textual-exegetical field was the book of Ezekiel that was studied intensively by C. H. Cornill, who was apparently the only one who wrote in those days a comprehensive exegetical work based on an exhaustive textual basis. Hence by the end of the nineteenth century three foci of textual-exegetical work had developed: the Pentateuch, Samuel and Ezekiel — leaving aside the general run of commentaries.

By that time another issue had come to the fore: the nature of what was taken to be the Lucianic text of the Greek and its predecessor: proto-Lucian. To be sure, these are only labels that can hide a variety of facts. The Lucianic text was taken to represent the text as developed in the church of Antioch and represented in a special type of manuscript configuration. Those manuscripts had been collated in the eighteenth century by Holmes and Parsons and were available in that collation to every student of the Septuagint text. Since some of these manuscripts predate the date of the assumed Lucianic Version, scholars invented as a solution a type of text they called in the end proto-Lucian. To be sure, what emerged as a standard picture was rather complicated, and each component of this picture remains open to questions and dispute. But in the end, there was only one common opinion: the text of Samuel had a history all of its own. Whereas there is one constant picture for all the rest of the biblical books the book of Samuel stands by itself in splendid isolation: its Hebrew text is regarded as inferior throughout to the Greek text. Since it is the scholars who work on the text of Samuel as of all other texts we need not wonder that there is a steady carry-over from one attitude to another. The question remains open whether that attitude is really justified by the facts. Looking back after a century is the judgment of the character of the Hebrew text of Samuel justified according to our latest and newest findings?

But we must not ignore one side-issue. How does our judgment relate to the fact that manuscripts b0c2e2 seem to offer a different and separate textual tradition? And if so, are they really transmitting the text current in the church of Antioch?
The facts that Lagarde saw a century ago were there for all to see, and they constitute a tradition of their own. Later scholars raised the issue whether the identification of those manuscripts as Lucianic was correct. But the configuration of mss boc3e2 remained a kind of trademark and cannot be ignored. Even though we may feel that Lagarde had come to his identification on the prejudice that the ancient church-divisions had come to light through the facts of manuscript evidence, the special status of those manuscripts is nowadays a given fact.

To be sure, Lagarde had never dealt with the special facts of the book of Samuel, and his entire approach was based on the facts that had emerged from his study of the Pentateuch and Proverbs. But he had come to one major conclusion: scholars should only engage in exegesis once they have accomplished the text-critical part of their work. Hence the fight was finally fought out in the area which the then still young Wellhausen had chosen: the book of Samuel. Thus two different types of scholars confronted each other: Lagarde was mainly a philologist who dealt as a side-line in exegesis. Wellhausen was an exegete who dealt also with the facts of the text. It was an odd twist of circumstances that the final confrontation did not break out over the major issue of the text of the Pentateuch nor in an area which Lagarde had specifically worked on, i.e. Proverbs, but as regards the book of Samuel on which Lagarde held no especially strong views. The ground was chosen by the work of Wellhausen and, in light of the recent finds regarding the Hebrew text of Samuel, this fact is decisive for our discussion.

To be sure, for the modern student of the biblical text the opponent of Lagarde best known is Paul Kahle and not Wellhausen, who remains for the average Bible student the prototype of the proponent of views pertaining to "higher criticism". As we do know now, the period between the third century B.C.E. and the second century was decisive in the development of the biblical text, as evidenced by the recent finds from Qumran. This is true in the main for the text of the Pentateuch but also for the text of Samuel. But what had been seen a century ago as the difference between the text of the Hebrew MT and the Greek text of the Septuagint did now turn out to be the difference of two textual types inside the tradition of Hebrew. Hence the old question whether the differences between Hebrew and Greek were differences of texts or translation techniques had finally to be viewed in a different light. This question was not the one which had been raised by Lagarde but by the first Jewish scholars who entered the field of
textual studies. In hindsight, it was the position of those Jewish scholars that put the problem before the non-Jewish theologians who were utterly unprepared for this type of question. While we may phrase this issue as relating only to the textual facts, it may be viewed as the first frontal collision between Jewish and non-Jewish scholars. This may be a rather partisan way of viewing the history, since there was no overt expression to the denominational differences between the positions taken. But the fact is that what finally emerged was the difference between the different backgrounds of the scholars involved in these positions. To be sure, any such view from hindsight will be dependent on each reviewer's personal equation, and what seems to me an obvious fact may not seem so self-evident for other scholars.

By now we may start to review the question of the text of Samuel in its entirety. To start: The first period is that of undifferentiated philological-exegetical discussion that was partly beclouded by theological bias. This was the first study by humanist theologians timewise from Andreas Masius via Hugo Grotius till the seventeenth-century figures like Ludovico Capellus and Richard Simon. Some of these already saw the problem of differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts as especially important, while others concentrated on the question of the Hebrew text. This prehistory was finally summed up in the 18th-century introductions of David Heinrich Michaelis and J. G. Eichhorn, who was the first one to formulate a modern critical picture of the development of the biblical history and texts. But at that stage the question of the exactness and authority had not yet become the central issue. As a side-remark: we should not be content to look at what Eichhorn did write in his "Introduction". Much is contained in his volumes of the "exegetische Bibliothek", which served his needs for continued discussion. I speak of that time as the "prehistory" of our subject, because nobody did pay any specific attention to the text of Samuel and all texts of the Bible were taken as posing the same kind of problems. It was only by chance that the first discussion of an issue relating to the text of Samuel appeared in those days in the "Bibliotheck" of Michaelis in 1777 and later on in the "Introduction" of Eichhorn. This was the problem of the text in I Samuel 17. For the better part of the following century most textual discussions proceeded as before, without any specific dealing with the text of Samuel. It was assumed that what had been found fitting for the text of the Pentateuch would fit also for all other books of the Bible. The procedure applied was that of simple retroversion, assuming that
one can establish the correct Hebrew text by retroverting from the Greek translation.

But issues of hermeneutically conditioned changes in the Greek text did not arise in those discussions, apparently, since hardly anyone paid attention to what those few Jewish scholars had to remark on textual questions. Thus the issue of the difference between the Greek and the Hebrew texts became the first case of discussion between the founders of the nascent science of Judaism and the recently established critical movement in theological faculties of the time.

It is rather unfortunate that it looks to the outsider that the lines of combat seemed to be drawn between the two major Jewish scholars and the rabid anti-Semitic Lagarde. Much as we would like to change that picture, these are facts as they emerge from our sources. Questions of the possible midrashic basis of the changes in the Greek text were not even considered by the theologians who might even have been somehow suspicious of the nature of the argument which, by the way, was never raised in the context of the book of Samuel. To be sure, this was not the way in which the actual fight developed. By the 1880s the old considerations of polemical nature were long out of sight, but as a modern Jewish scholar I cannot get rid of some misgivings when I read what Thenius did write on the position of Frankel and what Geiger wrote against Wellhausen. Since this was at the time the sole position that Jewish scholars could offer as new to the discussion, one need not be astonished that the non-Jewish theologians must have regarded this as some kind of oddity.

Time has come now to have a closer look at the discussion as it developed in the special area of the text of the book of Samuel. It started with the remarks made by Otto Thenius in 1864. Thenius was hardly a pioneering spirit, but he was the one who first remarked on the issue of the text of Samuel. From his looking at the text of the Hebrew and the Greek of Samuel Thenius came to the conclusion that we have in front of us two different versions of the same material, that is to say, two different tales of the same story. The position became the subject of discussion, in the following years until finally more prominent scholars were credited to be those who made the initial statement. Since by that time more prominent scholars had entered the field, it was they who received credit as well as blame. We can gauge the developments of this discussion from looking at the various editions of the book by Thenius, that was finally re-edited by Max Loehr in the third edition which appeared half a century after the first edition.
As it happened, Loehr did oppose the position originally taken by Thenius and may thus have contributed to the later re-telling of the development of this field. But Loehr did sum up the position as it looked at the turn of the last century correctly: "MT und LXX der Bücher Samuelis stellen zwei vielfach voneinander abweichende Text-rezensionen dar, was erkannt zu haben als Thenius' unumstrittenes Verdienst bezeichnet werden muss". MT and LXX represent two often differing recensions of the text — a merit of Thenius that cannot be denied.

To be sure, it was the accepted attitude in those days that the Hebrew text was described as MT, while the Greek was termed LXX. Nobody dreamt of differentiating between different Greek versions or talking of the Hebrew as different from what was known as MT. Text evaluations in those days were still judging all the facts of these texts as identical for all books of the Bible, and only those scholars who dealt with the exegesis of Samuel realized how the text of that book put a different problem. For all general textbooks of the day the old attitude still persisted that one judged all textual issues according to the facts that had emerged in the text of the Pentateuch. As far as I can make out it was only Abraham Kuenen who singled out the text of Samuel as a unique problem, as by 1887 it was already established. But nobody did for Samuel what Cornill did in those days for the book of Ezekiel.

For us it is rather interesting that the special position that Thenius had initially occupied was later on almost forgotten. More prominent scholars like Wellhausen and Driver occupied the center of the stage. Although all were theological exegetes, some figured more prominently than others.

While men like Lagarde and Wellhausen were the main actors, both of them hardly ever dealt with the specific problem of Samuel. It was initially Thenius who led the fight on the issue of over-simplification regarding the judgment of easier readings that were taken by all philologists to represent the preferable text. These rules were initially conceived in dealing with classical poetic texts but were by now recognized as not applicable to texts of historic narrative.

But there was another issue that played a considerable role: the relationship between exegesis and text-criticism. Also in this case the major figures were Lagarde and Wellhausen. Lagarde was a philologist who dealt with problems of exegesis but regarded himself as having to carry out the duties of a theologian whose field is exegesis. But most other scholars were theologians whose area was indeed exegesis who dealt with methods developed in the field of classical
philology. The only scholars whose training was neither that of a philologist nor a theologian were the two Jewish representatives of the young field of Judaic studies — Geiger and Frankel, who had their training in rabbinics and had studied on the side some philological method. As Jews they could not be theologians, since this field was reserved for Christians only.

But there were issues that related to personal questions. Both Lagarde and Wellhausen were outsiders. Lagarde had the feeling that he wasted the taxpayer's money in dealing with issues that should have been the field of theologians. Wellhausen, on the other hand, had managed to maneuver himself outside the theological guild with his higher criticism. Since what he was doing seemed to be wrong for the education of young theologians, he had finally to seek refuge in the oriental faculty. Lagarde remained officially a Semitist. Lagarde was convinced that no meaningful exegesis could be undertaken without a previously "cleansed" biblical text. What all theologians were doing was basically wrong. The tragic side of the picture is that Lagarde spent many years trying to achieve his self-imposed goal, but never managed to carry out this task in practice. Lagarde had made his programmatic statement in his early study on the text of Proverbs, and Wellhausen never managed to get beyond what he had stated in his edition of the "introduction" of Bleek. Hence we have to check in various places for the positions that clashed. Wellhausen's time and energy were taken up by his dealing with the text of the Pentateuch and its history, but neither dealt with the text of Samuel. The only one who took up the cudgels which Thenius had laid down was the British scholar S. R. Driver who published in 1890 his "Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel". Both Driver and Wellhausen felt that their duties as exegites did not suffer the delay that would have resulted from waiting until the claim put forward by Lagarde was fulfilled. Both held that the primary task of the theologian was to approach exegesis even before a "cleansed" text had been established. While Driver did not write a work of commentary on the book of Samuel but only restricted his work to an exhaustive commentary around the Hebrew text, Wellhausen held that anyone who had the necessary feeling for the text could approach the task of exegesis.

It seems somewhat astonishing that the battle was not carried out in some central field but mainly in the area of Proverbs and Samuel. As it turned out, Samuel was central to the later events. The text of Samuel was unique in that it really needed prior establishing in order to gain the text which could be used by
the exegete. For modern students of the Bible each one has first to make a decision whether he prefers axiomatically to base his exegesis on the Hebrew text or the Greek. Such a position may be influenced by the denominational affiliation of each individual scholar. As for Samuel, objective facts made such a decision impossible. Thus the discussion between Lagarde and Wellhausen was decided by the force of facts, and scholars had to make their choice on the evidence that was in front of them.

Writing in light of our knowledge in the nineteen-eighties, that set of conditions looks rather bewildering. In our days the issue is still whether there was any sense to the position of Paul Kahle or whether Neo-Lagardians have won the day. But this is the combined weight of the findings in both the evidence from the Pentateuch and Samuel or some other pieces of evidence. Kahle had argued for the multiple traditions of the Greek text per analogiam from what he took to be the facts of the Aramaic Targum. At present, this kind of argument seems oddly out of place in light of the facts that have now emerged. The dispute between Kahle and Lagarde seems very much irrelevant if this was altogether not a storm in a water-glass.

Returning now to the specific issues of the text of Samuel: Lagarde had made his claims in the context of Proverbs and had stated that establishing the correct text of a book is a sine qua non for all exegetical endeavor.

Wellhausen had put forward his claims by mounting his attack against what he regarded as the "cavalier" treatment of the Septuagint text by Thenius. Thenius had indeed recognized the importance of the Greek text of Samuel but had not carried out what that lesson should have taught him. Wellhausen uttered his misgivings first in 1871 and afterwards in his re-edition of the "introduction" by Bleek. The question remains whether Wellhausen really intended to pick a fight with what Thenius had done or whether his real aim was the position of Geiger and Frankel. As far as Wellhausen was concerned, Thenius had seen the matter correctly but not carried out what he should have done. But what both Geiger and Frankel had done was indeed, by the standards of a theologian, "cavalier" treatment. One wonders why Wellhausen, who had seen what the position of Thenius was, did choose to attack him for not accomplishing what the task should have been. The person who should have been the target of his criticism should have been Lagarde if anyone. It was Lagarde who had maintained that the exegetical work has to wait until the
textual critic had finished his primary task. It seems somewhat odd that of all scholars who preceded him it was Thenius who was the object of his specific strictures. Even though the tone used in discussion between scholars in those days was very far from being always polite, it seems rather strange that Wellhausen singled out Thenius for his biting criticism: "Je durchgehender und systematischer aber in den Kommentaren von Thenius die LXX zur Vergleichung herangezogen und als kritisches Hilfsmittel verwertet wird, desto schädlicher werden die Folgen kritikloser Benutzung ihres überlieferten Textes".

Wellhausen apparently found himself caught on the horns of a dilemma. The positions of both Lagarde and Thenius seemed to him equally dangerous. But whereas his attitude to Lagarde seems justified, given his position, his treatment of Thenius seems rather exaggerated. Yet his main problem was all the time what the Jewish scholars had claimed, because this flew into the face of all that theologians had achieved. It was in particular Geiger who felt himself attacked by what theologians said responding to his claim, since it was he who had built an entire structure on that position: "Das ist in meiner Urchrift widerholt und nachdrücklich zur Erkenntnis gebracht, und wenn Herr W. in der von ihm behaupteten Naivität eine Entdeckung gemacht zu haben glaubt, die er bei mir vermisst, so zeigt er hierin wieder dass er mein Buch mit ziemlich geringer Aufmerksamkeit durchgelesen hat" (Zeitschrift für jüdische Theologie 1872). To be sure, the fight was carried out in a field of Wellhausen's choice. The main issues were those concerning the text and study of the Pentateuch. This was the ground on which the discussion had developed and where issues of Halakha had to be decided. For the Christian theologian it was only a question of the different hyp-archetypes that could be reached for the Greek through straight retroversion. It would seem that textual criticism remained since the end of the nineteenth century in a cul-de-sac: it became the handmaiden of exegesis, as can be seen from what is taken to be the model critical edition of the text, the Biblia Hebraica.

While Lagarde saw himself as the pathfinder for textual criticism, his heirs to this day have become textual specialists whose interests are practically divorced from the exegetical effort. Wellhausen was the last great exegete who felt that the exegetical task is the paramount duty of the Bible scholar. While Lagarde held that exegesis had to wait until the text-critical task was accomplished, Wellhausen acted as if Lagarde could not have meant what he
said. Just as he saw himself able to feel his way through a heap of variants, so every other scholar should be able to act. Although Thenius had not followed through what his correct intuition should have told him the demands put forward by Lagarde seemed excessive. It was not impractical to demand prior "cleansing" of the text for exegetical purposes, but this demand sounded the death-knell for the work of the exegete. It was in the end Geiger who heaped biting scorn on the demand of Lagarde: "Wenn man die Hauptaufgabe darin sieht unseren Text mit dem alexandrinischen zu vergleichen...und ihre Wiedergabe in das schlechteste (!) Hebräisch zurück zu übersetzen so hat man für die Aufklärung des Ursprünglichen doch sehr wenig getan". We do not know what specific act provoked that irony of Geiger. But this was a general attitude against the exaggerated demand put forward by Lagarde.

It seems to us that the trouble in our field started right there and then in the discussion of the "never never" approach which Lagarde had championed. This was some kind of positivist fancy of the type that was widespread in those days and Lagarde was the proper person to carry it out. It seems to us that these disputes are of little value in the eyes of the present-day scholars who are mainly computer-oriented and feel that the problem is solved once they have reckoned out how large the percentage of agreements and disagreements is regarding the text of MT vis-à-vis LXX or Qumran. In our time hardly anyone ever compares the texts to the evidence that one might be able to gather from quotes in rabbinic literature. Apparently, it is easier to count occurrences in Greek texts than count agreements and disagreements with quotes in rabbinic literature. Once the primacy of exegesis was out of the way, scholars got used to dealing in numbers, often leaving aside the major duties of biblical scholarship. It is not only the history of the study of Samuel that we are dealing with but the entire development from the last decades of the past century onward. All present-day studies should be viewed in this light.

We have already stressed repeatedly that Lagarde had formulated his demand which ultimately resulted in frightening off other scholars. While Lagarde was a very competent scholar, he was not always right. He thought that the constellation of manuscripts boc2e2 yields the alleged Greek version of the church of Antioch. His heirs were to show how he erred. He thought that what he found represented that text, but he did not have the material correctly. On the other hand, Wellhausen did clamor for a better method in dealing with the text
of the Septuagint but could not accept the strict demands put forward by Lagarde. While all those who dealt with the text of the Septuagint could see the configuration of those manuscripts, some later scholars maintained that it was Wellhausen who had fought valiantly for the establishment of the Lucianic recension as it must have existed. To be sure, any collation of manuscripts can be faulty, but to this very day we are still dependent on the collection of variants as collected by Holmes and Parsons. In the two centuries that have passed, no later collection of readings has managed to re-check those details — neither the Cambridge collection, nor the Göttingen edition nor the new Spanish polyglot.

Hitherto we have acted as if the main scholars of that generation were the only "dramatis personae" and have neglected others who played a decisive part. But others were also active in finding the facts. Among these were the main investigator of the hexaplaric text and the main investigator of the Latin text, A. Ceriani and C. Vercellone. Ceriani published his findings in Monumenta Sacra et Profana II (1864). It is, therefore, somewhat surprising to find in the handbook by S. Jellicoe the following appraisal: "Wellhausen in his monograph published in 1871 and described by Driver as 'an unpretending but epoch-making work on the textual criticism of the OT', recognized the importance of some of the readings of this group and their witness to the text antedating that of B". It can hardly be our task to trace in detailed fashion all the discussions and contributions of scholars who contributed to the findings a century ago. But we must single out A. Klostermann who dealt with questions of the text as an integral part of exegesis. In the long run, of nineteenth-century scholars Wellhausen and Klostermann were the only scholars who stressed the need of basing the exegesis of Samuel on a firm text-critical basis. To be sure, all attempts at writing a historical appreciation leads to evaluations and distortions. To us the line of Wellhausen and Driver seems more important than that leading from Thenius to Klostermann. Those were the days of publishing many comprehensive exegetical handbooks, and each scholar tried to trace the text-critical documents. We look here at the evidence and approaches with the eyes of the student of the facts of the book of Samuel, and our vision is thus beclouded. Hence it is only once we have the new commentary on Samuel by Kyle McCarter in our hands, which traces all the evidence of the versions and Qumran fragments that we can form for ourselves a

\[1\text{S. Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (Oxford 1968) 164.}\]
clear picture. Going through the literature of a century one realizes that we still stand at the spot where we were left a century ago. The only ones who still remain to be mentioned are S. Brock and P. de Boer, who published in the beginning of the nineteen-forties his re-worked dissertation on the evidence of all the versions of Samuel. But only now can we evaluate fully the entire evidence in the light of the Qumran fragments.

In this paper we have looked at the history of the textual-exegetical study of the book of Samuel with the eyes of someone who tries to remain a generalist and who loves to study aspects of theology and textual criticism, but himself has never carried out the task of a modern commentator. I repeat: The present writer is not a specialist on the book of Samuel but an occasional amateur. But I trust that what I have written presents a fair view of the development of the issues of textual criticism and its impact on exegesis of the book of Samuel during the past century.
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