historical understanding might benefit from more attention to mutual differences and the tracing of the trajectories of traditions.

In spite of this criticism Barker's *The Older Testament* should be read by every scholar interested in either the Book of Enoch or the Old Testament, whereas every public library should acquire *The Lost Prophet*.

Eibert Tigchelaar


In the aftermath of the 1980 IOSCS Vienna Congress D. Barthélemy invited three other leading scholars to work together on one of the most vexing problems in the textual and literary criticism of the Bible. Barthélemy himself describes the working method followed in this "joint research venture" (pp. 1-3, 107-113). The book contains the original contributions written by each author (pp. 5-86), followed by the responses and reactions to each other's papers (pp. 87-106). After a comment by D. W. Gooding and some methodological remarks by J. Lust, the book ends with the conclusions drawn by each author (pp. 129-156).

This joint research focuses on the omission of some sections of the Masoretic text in the Old Greek version of 1 Sam 17-18: either the Greek translator or his Hebrew Vorlage abbreviated a longer text, or the MT added text portions to a shorter Hebrew text as reflected by the LXX. A tendency to harmonize tensions among the various episodes could have induced the Greek translator or more probably a Hebrew editor to omit some disturbing or inconvenient passages. This was the view of K. Budde. However, the LXX of Samuel does not delete text portions elsewhere, whereas the MT of this book sometimes must be considered as an expanded and later text; the Greek translator must have known therefore a Hebrew text which was much shorter than MT. This was the view of Wellhausen and, more recently, of Stoebbe and McCarter.

J. Lust tends to accept the expanded character of the MT, since intentional shortening is unlikely. His contention that the Old Greek included vv. 18:1b. (3).4, omitted later on through parablepsis, is highly hypothetical, but his main conclusion rests on firm grounds: vv. 18:1b. (3).4 are part of a well-balanced composition found in 17:1-11.32-54; 18:1b. (3).4, interrupted by another version of the story in 17:12-31.55-58; 18:2. E. Tov considers an investigation based only on the analysis of the minuses of the OG as highly subjective and attempts therefore a new way of research by taking into consideration all aspects of the relationship
between MT and the OG. A study of the translation techniques (exegetical renderings, word-order, quantitative representation, consistency in translation equivalents, hebraisms) leads to the conclusion that the translator knew a text which was much shorter than MT. LXX reflects an early stage of ch. 17-18 and MT a later, expanded one. D. Barthélemy remarks that the shorter Hebrew textual form reflected by the OG cannot represent an independent story, since many of its elements cannot be understood independently of the longer text of the MT. The OG Vorlage originated therefore from the longer textual form by elimination of some passages. D. Gooding finds that the MT account is an extremely sophisticated narrative-sequence, truncated and simplified in a pedantic manner by the LXX-version.

The responses and final conclusions conduce to a better understanding of each author’s position, but do not advance the discussion significantly beyond the starting points expressed in the original contributions. Gooding moves slightly towards the recognition that the Greek faithfully reflects a short Hebrew text. Barthélemy and Gooding continue considering the long version of the MT as the original form of the story. Lust and Tov show a preference for shorter texts and tend to assign a composite character to the biblical stories, assuming that biblical texts developed generally by way of expansion and not by way of shortening.

The reader gets the impression that the authors have in some respects interchanged their roles. Barthélemy and Gooding, who are particularly trained in textual criticism and do not seem to think much of literary critical analyses, argue against the original character of the shorter Greek text by handling first arguments characteristic of rhetorical and literary criticism; only later on they consider the textual questions involved in both accounts. Lust and Tov start with the more factual evidence provided by textual criticism but their conclusions reach the process of literary composition. They suggest a complex history of growth of the text that resulted in two diverging editorial compositions. However, at this level the literary analyses often do not allow more than hypothetical judgements. Lust is right in taking advantage of the difference in the literary genre between the two accounts of 1 Sam 17,2-11.32ff. and 1 Sam 17:12-31. Perhaps a more common ground for discussion should be found. This could be provided by the analysis of the composition techniques employed by the editors of both compositions. Resumptive repetitions, transpositions and double readings introduced in the text by the editors are likely to have left their traces in the textual tradition. These phenomena are therefore the confluence places where practitioners of textual criticism and literary criticism can meet each other and work together.

At the textual level Lust rightly pays attention to the pre-hexaplaric text. Its Hebrew Vorlage was not necessarily identical with the MT. Fur-