

Literary Criticism and Textual Criticism in Judg 6:1–14 in Light of 4QJudg^a

HANS AUSLOOS (F.R.S.–FNRS – UNIVERSITÉ CATHOLIQUE DE LOUVAIN / UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE)

ABSTRACT

Until recently, textual criticism and historical–critical scholarship have been considered as two separate disciplines. However, due to important developments within the field of textual criticism itself – not least thanks to the discovery of new manuscript findings – it has become evident that both fields of research are intrinsically interwoven. The present contribution – written in honour of Prof. Dr. Herrie van Rooy – explores this relationship on the basis of the passage of the call narrative of Gideon in Judg 6. It will demonstrate how the pericope of the unknown prophet (Judg 6:7–10), and more particularly its absence in 4QJudg^a, can serve as a good example to clarify the close intertwinement between historically oriented literary criticism and textual criticism.¹

A INTRODUCTION

From the moment an author gives his permission to the publisher to print the “final text” of his work – mostly after a long process of writing, reworking, correcting, and editing – an identical copy of the work will be available all over the world. If the book promises to be successful, the editor can decide to translate it, and, once the author approves the translation, the authorized version will be printed and distributed as well. When, despite the careful preparation of the manuscript and the correction of the subsequent proofs, some mistakes still seem to be present, the author or the editor can decide to reprint the text in a corrected and updated edition, which will be mentioned explicitly on the front page or in the colophon of the publication.

Contrary to current publication practices, it is not so easy to distinguish the boundaries between the end of the process of “creating” a biblical text (when the text reaches its so-called final form and thus becomes the “final text”) on the one hand and the beginning of the process of its transmission on the other. Nevertheless, for centuries researchers within biblical studies have maintained an almost strict distinction between the process of a text’s “produc-

¹ After the submission of this manuscript, I noticed that, recently, Robert Rezetko has published an extensive article on this topic, coming to similar results (pp. 30–31). See Robert Rezetko, “The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges: Literary Formation, Textual Criticism, and Historical Linguistics,” *JHScr* 13 (2013); Art. #2, 68 pp.; DOI: 10.5508/jhs.2013.v13.a2.

tion" until it reached its "final" form, and the "distribution" of this presumed "final text." Even when, thanks to the development of historical-critical methodology, the biblical books were no longer considered as being written by a single author, but rather as the result of a long and winding process of writing and re-writing, the idea of the "final" text of the Bible remained *de rigueur*. Moreover, the reconstruction of the origin and the growth of the text until it reached its "final" form was considered to be precisely the task of historically oriented literary criticism. However, due to the fact that this "final text" has actually not been preserved (on the contrary: within a multitude of manuscripts, thousands of variant readings are seen) the task of reconstructing the presumed "final text" or so-called *Urtext* fell to textual criticism. As such, the "final" text was considered to be "the end product of the genetic processes and, at the same time, the starting point of the processes of written transmission."² In doing so, historical-critical scholarship and the discipline of textual criticism became strictly separated fields of research:

More and more scholars came to regard the received text not as the *ipsissima verba* of one particular charismatic figure, but as the final redaction of earlier oral and written sources, the *ipsissima verba* of a final redactor. They distinguished between the oral and written processes that went into making the final text of a biblical book and the processes by which the final text, once established, was handed down or transmitted. Higher critics aimed to recover the genetic processes by which the final version of a text came into existence, and text critics aimed to recover the processes of its written transmission so as to restore it to its final, and in that sense original, pristine purity.³

Besides the fact that within this interpretation of textual criticism as a discipline, scribes are considered as merely "contaminators of an authoritative text through the intentional and unintentional changes they introduced into it,"⁴ this view no longer makes sense today thanks to the important developments within the field of textual criticism itself, a development to which the discovery of many manuscripts has contributed.⁵ Furthermore, in light of these new data,

² Ferdinand E. Deist, *Towards the Text of the Old Testament* (Pretoria: Church Booksellers, 1978), 24.

³ Bruce K. Waltke, "Aims of OT Textual Criticism," *WTJ* 51 (1989): 94.

⁴ Waltke, "Aims," 94. See further the methodological prolegomenon on the challenge of the current textual situation by Bénédicte Lemmelijn, "Influence of a So-called P-Redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exod 7-11? Finding Oneself at the Crossroads of Textual and Literary Criticism," in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera* (ed. Andrés Piquer and Pablo A. Torijano Morales; JSJSup 157; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 203-208.

⁵ See recently Jacques van Ruiten, "Nomadic Angels: Gen 6,1-4 and Reception History," in *A Pillar of Cloud to Guide (Exod 13,21): Text-Critical, Redactional, and Linguistic Perspectives on the Old Testament in Honour of Marc Vervenne* (ed. Hans

it has become impossible to clearly distinguish between literary–historical criticism and textual criticism. Besides the book of Ezekiel – a book professor Herrie van Rooy, to whom I heartily dedicate this contribution as a modest sign of appreciation and friendship, has studied in depth in its variant textual forms⁶ – Judg 6:1–14 is a very good example to demonstrate how both disciplines are, or at least should be, interwoven.⁷

B JUDGES 6:7–10 AND ITS LITERARY CONTEXT

At first sight, Judg 6:1–13 fits perfectly within the narrative scheme of the presentation and activity of Israel's judges Othniel (Judg 3:7–11), Ehud (Judg 3:12–30), Deborah (Judg 4:1–5:31), and Gideon (Judg 6:1–8:32). In each episode, it is told how Israel is doing wrong in the eyes of YHWH, how YHWH delivers Israel to an enemy, how the Israelites call to YHWH, how YHWH sends

Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn, Louvain: Peeters, 2014), 255–256: "It seems to be assumed that at a certain moment in time there was a text that stood at the end of a composition process and, at the same time, at the beginning of the copying process. The final edited form of the biblical text, the *Letztgestalt*, becomes in this way the original text, the authentic copy: the archetype. One should ask, however, if a certain paradoxical, almost magical moment in time, when the final edited text became the original text, ever really existed. The diversity of the textual material of the 'biblical' books among the Dead Sea Scrolls, for example the different versions of the book of Jeremiah which cannot be reconciled to each other, seems in any case to contradict the idea that the text of every biblical book was closed at a fixed moment, after which it was copied as faithfully as possible. The available textual material points to the conclusion that an *Urtext* never existed."

⁶ At the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta (1993), prof. Van Rooy read a paper entitled "Literary Criticism and Textual Criticism in the Book of Ezekiel." Several ideas of this paper have been published in Herrie F. van Rooy, "A New Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible," *JNSL* 30 (2004): 139–150 and Herrie F. van Rooy, "The Peshitta of Ezekiel and the Septuagint: A Study of the Two Traditions in Ezekiel 1," *OTE* 18 (2005): 394–405.

⁷ The book of Jeremiah also plays a main role in this discussion. In this respect Arie van der Kooij, "Preservation and Promulgation: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible," in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Nóra Dávid et al.; FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 30, evokes the different approaches from the perspective of "conservative" and "revisionist" scribal tradition. The short text (4QJer^{b,d}; LXX) is not seen "as an edition standing at the beginning of the transmission history, but rather as part of the literary (redactional) history of the book, representing a stage preceding the transmission history of the book." Interesting insights on the relationship between textual criticism and literary criticism can be found equally in Julio Trebolle Barrera, *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible* (trans. W. G. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 370 and John van Seters, *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 298–350.

a liberator/judge, and how, finally, the land enjoys several restful years.⁸ Gideon's story also follows this stereotypical framework. Because the Israelites "did what was evil in the sight of YHWH" (Judg 6:1), "YHWH gave them into the hand of Midian" (Judg 6:1). As a result, the Israelites became seriously impoverished, so "they cried out to YHWH for help" (Judg 6:6). Next, in Judg 6:11–18, it is told how YHWH calls Gideon to liberate the Israelites. Finally, after his elimination of Midian's leaders, "the land had rest forty years in the days of Gideon" (Judg 8:28).

Although all elements of a "vocation narrative" of the judge Gideon are present in this narrative, the stereotypical scheme seems, nevertheless, to be interrupted in Judg 6:7–10. Suddenly, an unnamed prophet enters the scene, apparently without any clear link to the preceding verses:

When the Israelites cried to YHWH because of the Midianites, YHWH sent a prophet to the Israelites, and he said to them: "Thus says YHWH, the God of Israel: I brought you up from Egypt, and brought you out of the house of slavery. And I delivered you from the hand of the Egyptians, and from the hand of all that oppressed you, and drove them out before you, and gave you their land. And I said to you, I am YHWH, your God; do not fear the gods of the Amorites, in whose land you live. But you have not obeyed my voice."

Ever since the origins of historical–critical research, it has been noted that these verses apparently interrupt the flow of the pattern of the Judges narratives in general and, moreover, of Gideon's vocation narrative in particular. The *Wiederaufnahme* of v. 6b in v. 7 seems to confirm this presumption. It does not surprise, therefore, that Judg 6:7–10 often have been considered as secondary within historical scholarship. J. Wellhausen has noted:

When the anonymous prophet who, in the insertion in the last redaction (chap vi. 7–10), makes his appearance as suddenly as his withdrawal is abrupt, improves the visitation of the Midianites as the text for a penitential discourse, the matter is nevertheless looked at immediately thereafter with quite different eyes.⁹

⁸ See André Wénin, *Échec au Roi: L'art de raconter la violence dans le livre des Juges* (Le livre et le rouleau 43; Brussels: Lessius, 2013), 64–65.

⁹ Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel with a Reprint of the Article Israel from the Encyclopaedia Britannica* (trans. J. S. Black and A. Menzies; Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973), 234, the English translation of Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (6th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927), 230: "Wenn der anonyme Prophet, der in dem Einsatze der letzten Bearbeitung 6,7–10 ebenso plötzlich auftritt wie er abrupt verschwindet, die Midianitenplage zu einer Strafpredigt für Israel benutzt, so wird unmittelbar darauf die Sache mit ganz anderen Augen angesehen."

In Wellhausen's footsteps, and up until recently, several historical-critical analyses of the Gideon narrative continue to point to the secondary character of Judg 6:7–10.¹⁰ Moreover, although originally connected to the Elohist,¹¹ these verses often have been linked to a Deuteronomistic reworking of an older Gideon narrative. M. Noth attributed the passage to Dtr.¹² According to H.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Wolfgang Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch* (BBB 18; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1963) 112–246 even ignores Judg 6,7–10 within his analysis of the Gideon narrative in Judg 6–8. This can be understood from his evaluation of the passage in Wolfgang Richter, *Die Bearbeitungen des „Richterbuches“ in der deuteronomischen Epoche* (BBB 21; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1964), 98: "Der Abschnitt steht vollständig isoliert im Kontext. Stände er nicht hier, würde man nichts vermissen. Ein ungenannter Prophet tritt auf, singular im AT; man erfährt nicht, wo, vor wem, auch nicht, warum, da seine Rede abbricht, bevor sie das Thema angeschnitten hat; und der Prophet tritt nicht wieder ab, obwohl V. 11 ein Gottesbote auftritt. Gleichwohl ist er für immer verschwunden." See also e.g. Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 47: "Judg. 6:7–10 is isolated from its context"; Mark A. O'Brien, *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO 92; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989), 88: "later redaction"; Gregory Mobley, *The Empty Men: The Heroic Tradition of Ancient Israel* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 2005), 125: "Right after the note that the Israelites cried out to YHWH for help (Judg 6:6), Gideon's introduction is delayed by the appearance and speech of a prophet. The content of this speech by an unnamed prophet is unremarkable in itself and is a variant of one given many other times in the Deuteronomistic History (. . .) The speech interrupts the expected sequence of introductory elements in the stories in Judges." Further Daniel I. Block, "Will the Real Gideon Please Stand Up? Narrative Style and Intention in Judges 6–9," *JETS* 40 (1997): 354: "Judges 6 7–10 in particular appears to be secondary."

It should be noted, however, that, more recently, several scholars note a link between the passage about the unnamed prophet in Judg 6:7–10 and the Deborah narrative: see e.g. Tammi J. Schneider, *Judges* (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 102: "The reference to a prophet ties this unit to the previous episode through his introduction and use of the term 'man' 'iš reading, 'a man, a prophet' (Judg 6:8) just as Deborah was 'iššâ, 'a woman, a prophet' (Judg 4:4). In contrast, however, the prophet here is unnamed, has no business address, no regularly stated position, nor tribal affiliation. The absence of name, place, and tribal affiliation may lend this prophet a pan-Israelite perspective which emphasizes Deborah's earlier complaints that all the tribes did not participate (Judg 5:16–18)."

¹¹ See e.g. George F. Moore, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (ICC; 8th ed.; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1966), 181: "The speech breaks off abruptly with this introduction (. . .) The incompleteness of the speech, as well as the evidence of language and style, which in this case is unusually decisive, shows that v. 7–10 are not to be ascribed to the compiler, but to an Elohist hand," thus linking the passage to other so-called E/R^{JE}/D-texts.

¹² Martin Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament* (3th ed.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967), 51: "Dtr [hat] (. . .) einen namenlosen

W. Herzberg, the idea of YHWH's punishment of apostate Israel is typically Deuteronomistic.¹³ For J. Gray, Judg 6:7–10 is "a late insertion in the Gideon tradition."¹⁴ R. G. Boling considers these verses "as part of a larger and highly unified Deuteronomic vignette."¹⁵ In A. Soggin's view, vv. 7–10, which do "not have any connection with the context," contain "a typically Dtr message."¹⁶ R. Smend and T. Veijola attribute Judg 6:7–10 to DtrN, the nomistically-oriented Deuteronomistic edition of Judges.¹⁷ On the basis of its secondary nature and the "abrupt transition between 7–10 and 11–24 [which] does not seem to be the work of the Deuteronomic historian, whose transitions are smooth and whose overarching editorial purpose is clear," R. Nelson sees Judg 6:7–10 as a secondary Deuteronomistic passage,¹⁸ whereas A. Mayes considers the passage as the work of DtrG.¹⁹ Being "a later addition to an already formed narrative," G. Auld takes "the Deuteronomistic materials in ch. ii, in vi 7–10, and in x 6–16 as linked, and in fact as one of the structural pillars of the Deuteronomistic composition of Judges."²⁰ For U. Becker, Judg 6:7–10 is a post-exilic post-Deuteronomistic or at least a late-Deuteronomistic "Fortschreibung" of the nomistically oriented Deuteronomistic theology.²¹

Propheten eingeführt, der auf das im Laufe der Geschichte immer größer gewordene Mißverständnis zwischen den hilfreichen Taten Gottes und dem Ungehorsam des Volkes hinweist (6,6b–10)"

¹³ Hans W. Hertzberg, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth übersetzt und erklärt* (ATD 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953), 190.

¹⁴ John Gray, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (London: Nelson, 1967), 295.

¹⁵ Robert G. Boling, *Judges: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (AB 6A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1975), 125. On p. 36, Boling considers Judg 6:7–10 to be "characteristically Deuteronomic."

¹⁶ Soggin, Alberto J., *Judges: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1981), 112–113: "It is (. . .) possible that the notice originally belonged in another context, but that it has been put here to give the Dtr interpretation greater authority (. . .) The incomplete character of the episode of the prophet could (...) be an element in favour of its antiquity, even if the text is now hopelessly mutilated and detached from its original context."

¹⁷ Rudolph Smend, *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments: Zweite, durchgesehene und ergänzte Auflage* (TW 1; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1981), 116; Timo Veijola, *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der Deuteronomistischen Historiographie: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen tiedeakatemia, 1977), 43–45.

¹⁸ Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 47–48.

¹⁹ Andrew D. H. Mayes, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History* (London: SMC, 1983), 163–164.

²⁰ A. Graeme Auld, "Gideon: Hacking at the Heart of the Old Testament," *VT* 39 (1989): 263.

²¹ Uwe Becker, *Richterzeit und Königtum: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Richterbuch* (BZAW 192; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990): 144–145.

To be complete, it has to be mentioned that, despite this overall characterisation of Judg 6:7–10 as a late Deuteronomistic insertion, other voices can be heard as well. So, while accepting the loose connection between these verses and their context, several scholars explicitly deny the Deuteronomistic character of the passage. For instance, there is W. Beyerlin, who argued that Judg 6:7–10 is a fragment of an older pre-Deuteronomistic parenetic tradition that, in a rather late stadium, has been inserted into its context.²² Moreover, it should be noted that, within more recent synchronic analyses of the book of Judges, Judg 6:7–10 is quite often considered as an original part of the (final) text.²³

In sum, although there is little consensus regarding the precise nature of Judg 6:7–10, it can be concluded that for decades of historical-critical scholarship, the pericope has been considered as a "strange" element within its context.

Nevertheless, against the background of the axiom that textual criticism starts where literary criticism ends, there has hardly been any discussion with regard to the MT, which was accepted as the "final" text.²⁴ Notwithstanding the

²² Walter Beyerlin, "Geschichte und heilsgeschichtliche Traditionsbildung im Alten Testament: Ein Beitrag zur Traditionsgeschichte von Richter VI–VIII," *VT* 13 (1963): 10: "An seiner verhältnismässig späten Einschaltung in den Überlieferungszusammenhang [ist] nicht zu zweifeln (. . .) Spezifisch deuteronomische Sprachelemente lassen sich in diesem Traditionsbruchstück nicht nachweisen."

²³ See e.g. Robert H. O'Connell, *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges* (VTSup 63; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 147 n. 178: "Judg. 6:7–10 is justified as intrinsic to the original (deuteronomistic) design of its context." Also according to Yairah Amit, *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing* (trans. from the Hebrew by J. Chapman; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 251, Judg 6:7–10 "should not be seen as a late insertion, nor as an arbitrary combination of sources, but as part of the systematic and tendentious shaping of the editing of the cycle and its incorporation within the book." See, moreover, Gregory T. K. Wong, *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study* (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 183: "Judg. 6:7–10, which, after all, does seem to have direct literary connection and relevance to its immediate context [referring to Schneider, *Judges*, 102 – H.A.] will be treated as an integral part of the text." Further Gregory T. K. Wong, "Gideon: a New Moses?" in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld* (ed. Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim and W. Brian Aucker; VTSup 113; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 535: "Even if these verses are a late addition, they may still have been incorporated by the final redactor to serve a very specific rhetorical purpose, namely, to strengthen the book's overall progressively deteriorating scheme."

²⁴ For the most recent critical edition of the MT, see Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Judges* (BHQ 7; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011). A critical review of this volume is given by Emanuel Tov, "Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Judges," *Sef* 72 (2012): 483–489. As to the textual history of Judges, see Hans Ausloos, "The Textual History

numerous variants between the MT and the Greek textual witnesses of the book,²⁵ the MT was generally accepted as the most reliable textual witness of the Hebrew text of Judges.

C THE TEXT OF JUDGES 6:6–12

J. Treballe Barrera's publication of 4QJudg^a in 1989²⁶ revitalized the discussion concerning the text of Judges. This manuscript, consisting of two minor fragments and dating back to ca. 50–25 B.C.E., contains the text of Judg 6:2–13*. The most remarkable feature of this fragment is the major *minus* of vv. 7–10, precisely those verses that have been considered for decades by numerous scholars as a Deuteronomistic insertion:

²[The power of Midian was strong over Israel. Because of Midian, the Israelites made themselves the hiding places that are] in the

of the Book of Judges," in *The Hebrew Bible* (vol. 1 of *The Textual History of the Bible*; ed. E. Tov, Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

²⁵ The Greek text of the Book of Judges holds a rather particular position, and has given rise to a lot of speculation. Contrary to the concurrences that link the few witnesses of the MT (Codex Leningradensis, Aleppo Codes and Cairo Codex), there is a great diversity between the many Greek manuscripts. In Rahlfs' edition – a critical edition within the Göttingen series has not yet been published – two Greek texts are printed: in the upper part of the page stands the A-text, which is an eclectic text taking the Codex Alexandrinus as its basis; in the lower half of the page stands the B-text, representing the Codex Vaticanus. Rahlfs' presentation could give the impression – and undoubtedly this was Rahlfs' conviction – that both Greek texts should be considered as two completely independent translations of one single Hebrew *Vorlage*. However, from the second half of the 20th century on, this hypothesis has been criticized, with scholars arguing that the Greek Judges as presented in Rahlfs' A and B texts more probably goes back to one single translation, the so-called Old Greek (OG). Tov, "Biblia," 484, however, continues to consider "the evidence for the existence of two different translations very strong," as does Barthélemy, according to whom the traditions underlying the B-text reflect the *kaige*-recension. For an overview of the debate, see in particular Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 280–283; Barnabas Lindars, "A Commentary on the Greek Judges?" in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987), 196–200; Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Boston: Brill, 2001), 94–95; Philip E. Satterthwaite, "To the Reader of Judges," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 195–200.

²⁶ Julio Treballe Barrera, "Textual Variants in 4QJudg^a and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges," *RevQ* 14 (1989): 229–245. See also Julio Treballe Barrera, "4QJudg^a," in *Qumran Cave 4: IX, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (ed. Eugene Ulrich et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), 161–164; plate xxxvi.

[moun]tains, [the] caves and [the strongholds. ³Whenever Israel had sown its crops, the Midianites would come up, or the Amalekites] or other people from the east. ⁴They encamped again[st] them and destroyed [the land's produce as far as Gaza. They left no]thing living in Israel: sheep, ox, or do[nke]y. ⁵Indeed, they [and their livestock would come up, with their tents and camels. They entered,] numbering [like lo]custs – they [were innumerable. They en]tered the la[nd to destroy it. ⁶So Israel was brought very low because of Midian, and] the Is[rael]ites cried [to] the LORD. ¹¹Then the messenger of the LORD came and sat under the oak in Ophrah] which belonged to Joash the Abiezrite, while Gi[deon his son was beating out wheat in the winepress, to hide it from the Midianites].²⁷

In line with E. Tov's classification of the Dead Sea manuscripts,²⁸ Trebolle Barrera characterises 4QJudg^a as representing "an independent text form."²⁹ Precisely due to the fact that these verses, lacking in 4QJudg^a, have been considered as bearing traces of Deuteronomistic phraseology, Trebolle Barrera concludes that 4QJudg^a represents a textual form that "ignores a literary development that entered into the masoretic textual tradition and is reflected also in the Greek version (as witnessed by *i.a.* Rahlfs' A and B texts – H.A.)"³⁰:

This fragment represents a form of the text independent from any other known text-type, although it shares readings with the proto-Lucianic text. It is the only extant witness which does not include the literary insertion found in vv. 7–10 of $\mathfrak{M} \mathfrak{G}$, although $\mathfrak{M}^{\text{mss}}$ and the \mathfrak{G}^{B} text also omit v. 7a. Verses 8–10 have been generally recognized by modern critics as a literary insertion, attributed in the past to an Elohist source (G.F. Moore, *ICC*, 1895) and now generally considered (e.g. Wellhausen, Gray, Bodine, Soggin) a piece of late

²⁷ Martin Abegg, Peter Flint and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English* (San Francisco, Calif.: Harper, 1999), 208–209. For a transcription and reconstruction of the text, see Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 231.

²⁸ Emanuel Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *HUCA* 53 (1982): 20–21, where he speaks about "independent" or "individualistic" texts. See also Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (3rd, rev. and exp. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 109–110 where the term "non-aligned" is used. On non-aligned biblical manuscripts from Qumran, see recently Sidnie White Crawford, "Understanding the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible: A New Proposal," in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Nóra Dávid et al.; FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 60–69.

²⁹ Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 237.

³⁰ Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 238.

Dtr. redaction. 4QJudg^a can confidently be seen as an earlier literary form of the book than our traditional texts.³¹

As indicated by Trebolle Barrera, the "short" text of 4QJudg^a does not stand alone. In his view, the Old Greek (OG) version of Judg 6:2–13*, which, as it is generally accepted, can be found in the Lucianic or Antiochene text and is reflected by the Old Latin (OL),³² does show similarities to 4QJudg^a in several instances, and as such equally diverges from MT.³³ Therefore, Trebolle Barrera concludes that both the OG as attested by the Lucianic or Antiochene text and the OL have "preserved traces of a shorter form of the text."³⁴ Textual witnesses of several other passages may support this hypothesis concerning the textual history of Judges. Trebolle Barrera refers to Judg 9:16–19; 12:4–5; 20:19–31, where the (reconstructed) OG as it is attested by the Lucianic or Antiochene text and the OL seem to have preserved similar traces of a shorter text form, which was expanded (as in Judg 6:7–10, in a so-called Deuteronomistic style), mostly making use of the editorial technique of resumptive repetition.³⁵ It has to be noted, however, that for these pericopes, and contrary to Judg 6:7–10, no Hebrew witnesses of a shorter text are extant.³⁶

Although Trebolle Barrera's assumption that 4QJudg^a bears witness to an earlier stage in the development of the Hebrew text of Judges,³⁷ and thus exemplifies the close relationship – or even interweave – between the disciplines of textual criticism and literary criticism,³⁸ his hypothesis has been the

³¹ Trebolle Barrera, "4QJudg^a," 162.

³² On the reconstruction of the OG, see in particular Fernández Marcos, *Judges*, 6*–9*.

³³ Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 236–237.

³⁴ Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 239.

³⁵ See also Julio Trebolle Barrera, "A Combined Textual and Literary Criticism Analysis: Editorial Traces in Joshua and Judges," in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne; BETL 224; Louvain, Peeters, 2008), 437–463.

³⁶ Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 239.

³⁷ This is the case for the two "editions" of the prose sermons book of Jeremiah: contrary to the *Vorlage* of the OG, within the prose sermons in Jeremiah MT, some "Deuteronomistic" interpolations have been made by means of the literary technique of the resumptive repetition. See Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 238–239.

³⁸ Cf. e.g. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 313–314; Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans / Leiden: Brill, 1999), 105–106. Trebolle Barrera himself considers the problem caused by this major minus as belonging "more in the realm of literary criticism than in the field of text history" (Trebolle Barrera, "Textual Variants," 236). On the importance of 4QJudg^a for literary criticism, see in particular Alexander Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text in the Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudg^a," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of*

impetus to a vivid discussion. In particular R.S. Hess and N. Fernández Marcos have strongly criticized Treballe's hypothesis. Their arguments are as follows.³⁹

Firstly, both Hess and Fernández Marcos emphasize that 4QJudg^a, which contains only Judg 6:2–13*, is too small to draw such a far-reaching conclusion as to the issue of the textual history of the book of Judges.⁴⁰

Secondly, it is argued that the other Qumran fragments of the book of Judges, namely 4QJudg^b, 4QJudg^c and the fragments from 1Q,⁴¹ do not differ on important matters from MT, but, on the contrary, are almost identical to it. Although this statement is factually correct, in my view, it does not say anything about the specificity of 4QJudg^a. So despite its isolated position within the corpus of Qumran texts of Judges, it remains possible that 4QJudg^a would reflect an "independent" text, whereas the other Judges manuscripts belong to the "proto-Masoretic" or "MT-like" group of texts.⁴²

Thirdly, on the basis of the similarities between the Qumran manuscripts of Joshua and Judges, Hess argues that "the omission (*sic*) of 4QJudg^a follows a tendency to insert, omit and change sections or paragraphs of biblical text at what would become the Masoretic *parashoth* divisions of text."⁴³ So, according

Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures (ed. Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov and Matthias Weigold; VTSup 140/1; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 111–123.

³⁹ Hess, Richard S., "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of 4QJudg^a," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997): 122–128; Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 1–16.

⁴⁰ Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 124–125: "The strongest argument in favour of reserving judgment (. . .) is the size of the fragment. It is difficult to say whether or not such a phenomenon can explain this omission (*sic*), because it is not possible to see the larger context from which 4QJudg^a is derived. It is difficult categorically to deny the possibility of an original omission (*sic*) of vv. 7–10, but it is not easy to convince on the basis of a fragment of nine lines from which over half of each line of 59 to 65 letters is missing."

⁴¹ Cf. Émile Puech, "Les manuscrits 4QJuges^c (= 4Q50A) et 1QJuges (= 1Q6)," in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich* (ed. Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James C. VanderKam; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 201: "l'unique fragment de 4QJuges^c se contente d'une simple variante orthographique"; Julio Treballe Barrera, "Édition préliminaire de 4QJuges^b: Contribution des manuscrits Qumrâniens des Juges à l'étude textuelle et littéraire du livre," *RevQ* 57–58 (1991): 79–99.

⁴² Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 108.

⁴³ Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 127.

to Hess, the *minus* in 4QJudg^a is part of a tendency of scribes who were exercising "a liberty in moving these paragraphs of their Former Prophets around, inserting and omitting sections for their own purposes, be they liturgical or otherwise."⁴⁴ Further, Hess concludes that it

seems less likely that this lone fragment should preserve a pre-deuteronomistic text than that the fragment is part of a larger manuscript that never was intended to present the whole book of Judges but rather may have been a collection of biblical texts serving a particular liturgical purpose for the community who read it.⁴⁵

At this point, however, in my view, Hess' main objection against Trebolle Barrera's hypothesis – namely the small size of the fragment – is equally problematic for his own argument: because no other fragments of this presumed "larger manuscript" that could give evidence to this hypothesis have been preserved, one ignores whether or not this re-arrangement of the text is an overall tendency within this particular Judges manuscript.⁴⁶

Fourthly, the date of 4QJudg^a (50–25 B.C.E.) would be problematic. According to Fernández Marcos,

the supposed Deuteronomistic insertion was already present when the Septuagint of Judges was translated at the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.E..⁴⁷

Although this argument actually cannot deny the possibility that 4QJudg^a represents an older stadium of the text, this remark leads us to the fifth objection against Trebolle Barrera's thesis, namely concerning his distinction between the reading of Judg 6 in the OG and the one in LXX. Contrary to Trebolle Barrera, Fernández Marcos argues that the OG of Judges as handed down in the Antiochene text and the *Vetus Latina*,

ne peut être caractérisé en tant que texte plus court que celui du TM.
Il faut plutôt le considérer comme un texte augmenté, prenant en

⁴⁴ Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 126.

⁴⁵ Hess, "Dead Sea Scrolls," 127.

⁴⁶ In Natalio Fernández Marcos, "L'histoire textuelle: les livres historiques (Juges)," in *L'enfance de la Bible hébraïque: Histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (ed. Adrian Schenker and Philippe Hugo; MdB 52; Genève: Labor et fides, 2005), 164, the author is skeptical with regard to Hess' hypothesis: "Il est loin d'être certain que ce fragment préserve une forme textuelle ancienne, pré-deutéronomiste, ou même représente une édition postérieure réarrangée par des scribes pour des raisons spécifiques." Compare, however, with his 2003 opinion in Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts," 16: The *minus* of vv. 6–10 in 4QJudg^a may "represent a late secondary abbreviation for liturgical or other purposes."

⁴⁷ Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts," 6. See also Fernández Marcos, "L'histoire textuelle," 164–165.

compte les nombreuses petites additions ajoutées tout au long du livre, servant à clarifier ou rendre explicite le texte hébreu, de même que les doublets fréquents, une certaine liberté dans l'ordre des mots et un réarrangement dans la séquence de la narration.⁴⁸

As a result, in Fernández Marcos' view, 4QJudg^a cannot be considered "simply as typologically connected with the *Vorlage* of Antiochene text."⁴⁹ Therefore, "the hypothesis of a shorter text for Judges based on 4QJudg^a is not shared by any other extant witness of the book."⁵⁰

Finally, Fernández Marcos refers to more recent literary–critical analyses of the book of Judges, which, contrary to traditional historical–critical exegesis, argue that vv. 7–10 form an integral part of Judg 6.⁵¹ Even if this were the case – all studies referred to are synchronic oriented analyses, reading the Hebrew text in its "final form" – it does not necessarily imply that 4QJudg^a cannot reflect an earlier stage within the textual history of Judges. Moreover, it would mean that by deliberately omitting vv. 7–10, the scribe would not have perceived the importance of these verses, and thus would have destroyed the "original" meaning and plot of the text.

D CONCLUSION

Fernández Marcos' and Hess' criticisms do make sense; indeed, in their footsteps, it is often argued that the *minus* of Judg 6:7–10 should be characterised as a deliberate omission.⁵² Yet Treballe's initial hypothesis of a multiple textual tradition, thus interpreting 4QJudg^a as indicative of the textual history of the book of Judges, remains very attractive.⁵³ There do not seem to be sound

⁴⁸ Fernández Marcos, "L'histoire textuelle," 165.

⁴⁹ Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts," 8. See also Fernández Marcos, "L'histoire textuelle," 165.

⁵⁰ Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts," 16; Fernández Marcos, "L'histoire textuelle," 165.

⁵¹ Fernández Marcos, "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges," 16 refers to Amit, *Book of Judges*, 251. For other contributions going into that direction, see *supra* note 22.

⁵² See *e.g.* O'Connell, *Rhetoric*, 147; Serge Frolov, *Judges* (FOTL; Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2013), 155: "(. . .) it would appear that 4QJudg^a or its *Vorlage* systematically eliminated apparent redundancies, perhaps classifying 6:7–10 as such because of similarities to 2:1–3"; Trent C. Butler, *Judges* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2009), 185: "It remains possible that the DSS preserved this independent unit elsewhere, in parts of the DSS text that are no longer preserved, to avoid splitting the crisis description of vv. 1–6 from the divine response in v 11. But splitting the two sections is precisely the artistic purpose of the writer as shown."

⁵³ According to Marc Zvi Brettler, *The Book of Judges* (London: Routledge, 2002), 42, 4QJudg^a gives "incontrovertible evidence that the Book of Judges went through a number of recensions, and that in its current form, it incorporates significant editorial

reasons enough to consider the *minus* in 4QJudg^a as the result of deliberate or accidental omission, even if, theoretically, an omission due to *parablepsis* (*homoioarcton*) is possible – in that case, the copyist's eye would have jumped from –ו in v. 7 to –ו in v. 11.⁵⁴ Therefore, despite the argumentation against the originality of the *minus* in 4QJudg^a, and despite the controversy over the LXX of Judges, I deem it legitimate to consider 4QJudg^a as improving "our understanding of the development of MT and to postulate a stage before the earliest available manuscript evidence."⁵⁵ As such, the comparison of the MT and this particular Qumran manuscript can serve as a textbook example of the close intertwinement between diachronically oriented literary criticism and textual criticism.⁵⁶ Moreover, the valorization of 4QJudg^a as a doorway to the his-

activity." For Eugene Ulrich, "Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology Thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls," *CBQ* 66 (2004): 6, the verses are a late addition. Tov, Emanuel, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources," in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SBLSCS 52; Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 135–136 mentions both possibilities: "If this *minus* did not stem from a textual accident, such as the omission of a complete paragraph ending with open sections, it could reflect an earlier edition of the book, in which part of the deuteronomistic framework, contained in these verses, was lacking." See also Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 344–345, where he argues that Judg 6:7–10, "in deuteronomistic diction, runs parallel with vv. 11–24, in which the angel of the LORD appeared to Gideon, similarly telling him that the Israelites will be saved. On the basis of these parallel accounts various scholars have asserted in the past that Judg 6:7–10 reflects a later addition within the deuteronomistic layer, an assumption which may now be supported by the Qumran fragment, in which it is lacking." On the basis of 4QJudg^a, Auld, "Gideon," 263 even suggests that "DtrN may be too tidy a label for vv. 7–10, and may also suggest much too early a date for their incorporation."

⁵⁴ Within the transmission history of the text of Judg 6:2–13, an intentional theologically motivated omission can be excluded with a high degree of certainty. Although, from a literary-critical perspective, Rofé ("Studying the Biblical Text," 121) accepts Judg 6:7–10 to be an addition, according to him the *minus* in 4QJudg^a is "just an omission due to *parablepsis*, *i.e.* the copyist's eye skipped a whole paragraph." Contrary to Fernández Marcos, "Hebrew and Greek Texts," 4–5: "The omission of four verses cannot be explained by accidental haplography due to *homoio-teleuton*. At most, it could be a slip from blank to blank space (present, as it seems, in the Qumran manuscripts in the place of the later Masoretic *parashiyot*), Though four verses seem too much space to be omitted by this mechanical accident."

⁵⁵ Tov, Emanuel, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible," in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Nóra Dávid et al; FRLANT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012), 49.

⁵⁶ See the evaluation of the *minus* by Thomas Römer, *The So-Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction* (London: T & T Clark, 2007), 138: "Judg. 6.7–10 is missing in a manuscript from Qumran and should therefore be considered as a much later [than the Deuteronomists – H.A.] addition."

tory of the text seems to fit well within the more general tendency to harmonise texts outside Deuteronomy with Deuteronomistic phraseology, even within the process of the transmission of the text.⁵⁷

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abegg, Martin, Peter Flint and Eugene Ulrich. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible: The Oldest Known Bible Translated for the First Time into English*. San Francisco, Calif.: Harper, 1999.
- Amit, Yairah. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Translated from the Hebrew by J. Chapman. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Auld, A. Graeme. "Gideon: Hacking at the Heart of the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 257–267.
- Ausloos, Hans. "The Septuagint Version of Exod 23:20–33: A 'Deuteronomist' at Work?" in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 22/2 (1996): 89–106.
- _____. "LXX Num 14:23: Once More a 'Deuteronomist' at Work?" Pages 415–427 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies – Oslo 1998*. Edited by Bernard A. Taylor. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 51. Atlanta, GA, 2001.
- _____. "Traces of Deuteronomic Influence in the Septuagint: A Text–Critical Analysis of Exodus 33:1–6." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 35 (2009): 27–44.
- _____. "The Textual History of the Book of Judges." In *The Hebrew Bible*. Volume 1 of *The Textual History of the Bible*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- Becker, Uwe. *Richterzeit und Königtum: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Richterbuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 192. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.
- Beyerlin, Walter. "Geschichte und heilsgeschichtliche Traditionsbildung im Alten Testament: Ein Beitrag zur Traditionsgeschichte von Richter vi–viii." *Vetus Testamentum* 13 (1963): 1–25.
- Block, Daniel I. "Will the Real Gideon Please Stand Up? Narrative Style and Intention in Judges 6–9." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (1997): 353–366.
- Boling, Robert G. *Judges: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 6A. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1975.
- Bretler, Marc Zvi. *The Book of Judges*. London: Routledge, 2002.

⁵⁷ In addition to very prominent harmonisations with Deuteronomistic phraseology, there are also more subtle indications of harmonisations with Deuteronom(ist)ic literature. See Rofé, "Studying the Biblical Text," 114–115 on Josh 20 and 1 Kings 6:11–13. See also Hans Ausloos, "The Septuagint Version of Exod 23:20–33: A 'Deuteronomist' at Work?" *JNSL* 22/2 (1996): 89–106; Hans Ausloos, "LXX Num 14:23: Once More a 'Deuteronomist' at Work?," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies – Oslo 1998* (ed. Bernard A. Taylor; SBLSCS 51; Atlanta, Ga., 2001), 415–427; Hans Ausloos, "Traces of Deuteronomic Influence in the Septuagint: A Text–Critical Analysis of Exodus 33:1–6," *JNSL* 35 (2009): 27–44.

- Butler, Trent C. *Judges*. Word Biblical Commentary 8. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2009.
- Deist, Ferdinand E. *Towards the Text of the Old Testament*. Pretoria: Church Booksellers, 1978.
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*. Translated by W. G. E. Watson. Boston: Brill, 2001.
- _____. "The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges." Pages 1–16 in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*. Edited by Adrian Schenker. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- _____. "L'Histoire textuelle: les livres historiques (Juges)." Pages 148–169 in *L'enfance de la Bible hébraïque: Histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament*. Edited by Adrian Schenker and Philippe Hugo. Le monde de la Bible 52. Genève: Labor et fides, 2005.
- _____. *Judges*. Biblia Hebraica Quinta 7. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
- Frolov, Serge. *Judges*. The Forms of the Old Testament Literature. Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 2013.
- Gray, John. *Joshua, Judges and Ruth*. London: Nelson, 1967.
- Hertzberg, Hans W. *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth übersetzt und erklärt*. Das Alte Testament Deutsch 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953.
- Hess, Richard S. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. The Case of 4QJudg^a." Pages 122–128 in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures. Qumran Fifty Years After*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans. Supplements to Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 26. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Lemmelijn, Bénédicte. "Influence of a So-called P-Redaction in the 'Major Expansions' of Exod 7–11? Finding Oneself at the Crossroads of Textual and Literary Criticism." Pages 203–222 in *Textual Criticism and Dead Sea Scrolls Studies in Honour of Julio Trebolle Barrera*. Edited by Andrés Piquer and Pablo A. Torijano Morales. Supplements to Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods 157. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Lindars, Barnabas. "A Commentary on the Greek Judges?" Pages 196–200 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 23. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Mayes, Andrew D. H. *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile: A Redactional Study of the Deuteronomistic History*. London: SMC, 1983.
- Mobley, Gregory. *The Empty Men: The Heroic Tradition of Ancient Israel*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 2005.
- Moore, George F. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*. International Critical Commentary. 8th ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1966.
- Nelson, Richard D. *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 18. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.
- Noth, Martin. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien: Die sammelnden und bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im Alten Testament*. 3th ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1967.

- O’Brien, Mark A. *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*. *Orbis biblicus et orientalis* 92. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag – Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.
- O’Connell, Robert H. *The Rhetoric of the Book of Judges*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 63. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Puech, Émile. “Les manuscrits 4QJuges^c (= 4Q50A) et 1QJuges (= 1Q6).” Pages 184–202 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov and James VanderKam. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 101. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Rezetko, Robert. “The Qumran Scrolls of the Book of Judges: Literary Formation, Textual Criticism, and Historical Linguistics.” *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 13 (2013). Article #2, 68 pages. DOI: 10.5508/jhs.2013.v13.a2.
- Richter, Wolfgang. *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 18. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1963.
- Richter, Wolfgang. *Die Bearbeitungen des „Retterbuches“ in der deuteronomischen Epoche*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 21. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1964.
- Rofé, Alexander. “Studying the Biblical Text in the Light of Historico–Literary Criticism: The Reproach of the Prophet in Judg 6:7–10 and 4QJudg^a.” Pages 111–123 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Context: Integrating the Dead Sea Scrolls in the Study of Ancient Texts, Languages, and Cultures*. Edited by Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov and Matthias Weigold. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 140/1. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Römer, Thomas. *The So–Called Deuteronomistic History: A Sociological, Historical and Literary Introduction*. London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Satterthwaite, Philip E. “To the Reader of Judges.” Pages 195–200 in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title*. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Schneider, Tammi J. *Judges*. Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Smend, Rudolph. *Die Entstehung des Alten Testaments: Zweite, durchgesehene und ergänzte Auflage*. Theologische Wissenschaft 1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1981.
- Soggin, Alberto. J. *Judges: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. London: SCM, 1981.
- Tov, Emanuel. “A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls,” in *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 11–27.
- _____. “The Nature of the Large–Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources.” Pages 121–144 in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*. Edited by Adrian Schenker. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 52. Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- _____. “Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Judges.” *Sefarad* 72 (2012): 483–489.
- _____. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Masoretic Bible.” Pages 41–53 in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange, Kristin de Troyer and Shani Tzoref. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.

-
- _____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Third Revised and Expanded Edition. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012.
- Trebolle Barrera, Julio. "Textual Variants in 4QJudg^a and the Textual and Editorial History of the Book of Judges." *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989): 229–245.
- _____. "Édition préliminaire de 4QJuges^b: Contribution des manuscrits Qumrâniens des Juges à l'étude textuelle et littéraire du livre." *Revue de Qumran* 57–58 (1991): 79–99.
- _____. "4QJudg^a." Pages 161–164 and plate xxxvi in *Qumran Cave 4: IX, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*. Edited by Eugene Ulrich, Frank M. Cross, Sidnie W. Crawford, Julie A. Duncan, Patrick W. Skehan, Emanuel Tov and Julio T. Barrera. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 14. Oxford: Clarendon, 1995.
- _____. *The Jewish Bible and the Christian Bible: An Introduction to the History of the Bible*. Translated by W. G. Watson. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- _____. "A Combined Textual and Literary Criticism Analysis: Editorial Traces in Joshua and Judges." Pages 437–463 in *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. Edited by Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 224. Louvain: Peeters, 2008.
- Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origin of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans – Brill, 1999.
- _____. "Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology Thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 66 (2004): 1–24.
- Van der Kooij, Arie. "Preservation and Promulgation: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 29–40 in *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange, Kristin de Troyer and Shani Tzoref. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Van Rooy, Herrie F. "A New Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 30 (2004): 139–150.
- _____. "The Peshitta of Ezekiel and the Septuagint: A Study of the Two Traditions in Ezekiel 1." *Old Testament Essays* 18 (2005): 394–405.
- Van Ruiten, Jacques. "Nomadic Angels: Gen 6,1–4 and Reception History." Pages 247–276 in *A Pillar of Cloud to Guide (Exod 13,21): Text-critical, Redactional, and Linguistic Perspectives on the Old Testament in Honour of Marc Vervenne*. Edited by Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 269. Louvain: Peeters, 2014.
- Van Seters, John. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the "Editor" in Biblical Criticism*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- Vejjola, Timo. *Das Königtum in der Beurteilung der Deuteronomistischen Historiographie. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen tiedeakatemia, 1977.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "Aims of OT Textual Criticism." *Westminster Theological Journal* 51 (1989): 93–108.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. 6th ed. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1927.

- _____. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel with a Reprint of the Article Israel from the Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Translated by J. S. Black and A. Menzies. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1973.
- Wénin, André. *Échec au Roi: L'art de raconter la violence dans le livre des Juges*. Le livre et le rouleau 43. Brussels: Lessius, 2013.
- White Crawford, Sidnie. "Understanding the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible: A New Proposal." Pages 60–69 *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange, Kristin de Troyer and Shani Tzoref. Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012.
- Wong, Gregory T. K., "Gideon: A New Moses?" Pages 529–545 in *Reflection and Refraction: Studies in Biblical Historiography in Honour of A. Graeme Auld*. Edited by Robert Rezetko, Timothy H. Lim and W. Brian Aucker. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 113. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- _____. *Compositional Strategy of the Book of Judges: An Inductive, Rhetorical Study*. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Prof. Dr. Hans Ausloos, F.R.S.–FNRS – Université catholique de Louvain – University of the Free State. *E-mail*: hans.ausloos@uclouvain.be.