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In the history of research on the historical books a change of orientation took place halfway through the last century. From the interest in the history of the sources and the history of the composition (*Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau*, K. Budde)¹ scholars moved to an interest in the history of the redaction. From the search for sources, connected or not to Pentateuch sources, and from the search for the units which make up the books like “the ark narrative,” “the history of David’s rise” or “the succession narrative,”² they moved to the identification of one, two or more successive deuteronomistic redactions, according to theories identified with M. Noth, F. Cross and the Göttingen school.³

This *Colloquium on the Text History* is a sign of how, for some time, we have entered into a new period of history of research which recovers the interest for the history of the text and the history of the literary composition. After the publication of the Qumran biblical manuscripts more attention is paid to the latest period of biblical tradition, the one which follows the composition and redaction of the biblical books. In reference to this period, the question is posed whether through the different “text types,” “recensions” or “editions” attested along the textual history we may recognize “distinct stages in the literary development of the books of Samuel,” as proposed in the topic proposal for this symposium.

---

¹ K. Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel. Ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau* (Giessen, 1890).
The most remarkable variants from the Qumran manuscripts – speaking here of the historical books only – refer not so much to interventions of an exegetical quality, as those found sometimes in the Greek version, but to phenomena which belong to textual composition, concretely affecting the order of literary units and the interconnections between them. Post-Qumran textual criticism sends us back to composition criticism and to a joint exercise of textual and literary criticism. A good example of this is to be found in 4QJosh\(^a\) which presents the pericope from MT Joshua 8:30–35 before 5:2–7, whereas the Septuagint has this passage after 9:2.\(^4\) A repetition in the *Old Latin* (OL) frames this pericope. The OL presents two textual forms of 9:1–2. The first one (OL\(^1\)) follows the order of LXX; it appears between 8:1–29 and 8:30–35. The second form (OL\(^2\)) is located, according to the MT, between 8:30–35 and 9:3–27.\(^5\) In this way it underscores the “mobile” character of this literary piece, which is out of place in its present context in the MT and can appear in three different locations, either after the report of the conquest of Ai (MT), or after 9:2, before the story of the Gibeonites (LXX), or before 5:2–7, the account of the circumcision at Gilgal (4QJosh\(^a\)). Also, 4QJudg\(^a\) presents the omission of a whole literary unit (6:7–10), signaled by petuhot, which could have a different placement in the book.

In Kings the different order of pericopes between MT and the Hebrew text attested by LXX takes substantial dimensions, especially throughout chapters 2 to 14 of 1 Kings. The fact that these two texts, as also the texts of both Esther and Daniel, were considered equally biblical has recently moved E. Tov to compare the rewriting techniques in the Greek 3 *Kings* with Qumran compositions and consequently modify in consequence his opinion regarding the character of 4QRe-worked Pentateuch: “This composition, published as a non-biblical composition, now has to be reclassified as a Bible text similar in character to


\(^5\) U. Robert (ed.), *Heptateuchi partis posterioris Versio latina antiquissima e Codice Lugdunensi* (Lyon, 1900).