

Textual Supplementation in Poetry: The Song of Hannah as a Test Case

REINHARD G. KRATZ
Universität Göttingen

1. Textual and Literary History in the Psalms

Since the discoveries of the Dead Sea Scrolls, we have external evidence for the phenomenon of textual supplementation in biblical and parabiblical texts of ancient Judaism. The two most important pieces of evidence are (a) the numerous manuscripts of biblical, parabiblical, and nonbiblical books; and (b) the manuscripts of what is known as “rewritten scripture.” Both have confirmed and extended our knowledge of the textual-historical and compositional-historical processes to which ancient versions (esp. the LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch) had already borne witness before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

In scholarship this evidence is usually assigned to the field of textual criticism. Although the textbooks always emphasize the smooth transitions between textual history and literary history, in principle and in practice they maintain a firm distinction.¹ Other scholars see external evidence as proof of the virtual impossibility of literary-critical analysis of the biblical and parabiblical books.² In order to say anything at all about the origin of the Bible, however, a practice of reckoning with only two or three literary strata per book has become common. Scholars who have worked seriously with manuscripts can only shake their heads or laugh at this practice, the more so as a rejection of literary-critical analysis often goes hand in hand with a vivid imagination when reconstructing preliterary, oral traditions or historical scenarios of textual growth.

Translated by Ruth Ludewig-Welch (Göttingen).

1. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 3rd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).

2. David M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

In contrast, I would like to take an approach that acquires criteria for literary-historical analysis from external evidence.³ I believe that, while it is clear that there are limitations to an analysis based on internal criteria, and that we will miss many stages of the process of textual growth (which, by the way, is also the case with external evidence),⁴ we have no reason to capitulate before the task. Rather, the complexity of the external evidence should be an incentive for us to look more closely and to identify as precisely as possible those phenomena in the text that are also attested by the external evidence and thus indicate possible textual growth.⁵

This is true, as we shall see, for poetic texts, and in particular for Psalms, as well as for all other—legal, narrative, and prophetic—texts of the Hebrew Bible. Here are just a few examples from the so-called Small Hallel, taken from the Psalms Scroll 11Q5 and the LXX.

In Ps 145, we find that a refrain has been added after each line of the acrostic (similar to Ps 136), which is not attested in the LXX. Furthermore, the missing *nun*-line in Hebrew was added, which is also witnessed in the LXX, as well as a signature, which unfortunately has not been completely preserved and is therefore somewhat unintelligible.⁶

3. See *Evidence of Editing: Growth and Change of Texts in the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Reinhard Müller, Juha Pakkala, and Bas Ter Haar Romeny, RBS 75 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2014). See also the following works by Reinhard G. Kratz: "Innerbiblische Exegese und Redaktionsgeschichte im Lichte empirischer Evidenz," in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels: Kleine Schriften I*, 2nd ed., FAT 42 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013), 126–56; "Das Alte Testament und die Texte vom Toten Meer," *ZAW* 125 (2013): 198–213; "Rewriting Torah in the Hebrew Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Bernd U. Schipper and D. Andrew Teeter, JSJSup 163 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 273–92; "Law and Narrative in Deuteronomy and the Temple Scroll," in *The Reception of Biblical War Legislation in Narrative Contexts: Proceedings of the EABS Research Group "Law and Narrative"*, ed. Christoph Berner and Harald Samuel, BZAW 460 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 109–22; "Bibelhandschrift oder Midrasch? Zum Verhältnis von Text- und Literaturgeschichte in den Samuelbüchern im Licht der Handschrift 4Q51 (4QSam^a)," in *The Books of Samuel: Stories – History – Reception History*, ed. Walter Dietrich in cooperation with Cynthia Edenburg and Philippe Hugo, BETL 274 (Leuven: Peeters, 2016), 153–80; "Reworked Pentateuch and Pentateuchal Theory," in *The Formation of the Pentateuch: Bridging the Academic Cultures of Europe, Israel, and North America*, ed. Jan C. Gertz et al., FAT 111 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016); "Nahash, King of the Ammonites, in the Deuteronomistic History," in *Insights into Editing in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East: What Does Documented Evidence Tell Us about the Transmission of Authoritative Texts?*, ed. Reinhard Müller and Juha Pakkala, CBET 84 (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 163–88; "Sources, Fragments, and Additions: Biblical Criticism and the Dead Sea Scrolls" (forthcoming).

4. Kratz, "Innerbiblische Exegese," 156.

5. Phenomena within a given text that indicate—with or without any external evidence in manuscripts or versions—a possible example of textual growth, I call in this essay "internal evidence." Both internal evidence and external evidence are not objective proofs but indications, which, of course, require a (subjective) interpretation in every single case.

6. See Reinhard G. Kratz, "Das Sch^rma' des Psalters: Die Botschaft vom Reich Gottes nach Psalm 145," in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter*, 190–205; Kratz, "'Blessed Be the Lord and

Psalm 145 (11Q5 XVI–XVII)

- 1 תהלה לדוד ארוממך אלוהי המלך ואברכה שמך לעולם ועד
ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד
- 2 בכל יום אברכך ואהללה שמך לעולם ועד
ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד
- etc.
- 13 מלכותך מלכות כל עלמים וממשלתך בכל דור ודור
ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד
- (ג) נאמן אלוהים בדבריו וחסיד בכול מעשיו
ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד
- 14 סומך יהוה לכל הנפלים וזוקף לכל הכפופים
ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד
- etc.
- 21 תהלת יהוה ידבר פי ויברך כל בשר שם קדשו לעולם ועד
ברוך יהוה וברוך שמו לעולם ועד
- זואת לזכרון [--]ל[--]ל[--]ל[--]ל[--]

In Ps 146, a line is inserted between vv. 9 and 10 that is in part quoted verbatim from Ps 33:8, and to some extent recalls Ps 145:12.

Psalm 146 (11Q5 II, 1–5); cf. Ps 33:8 and 145:12

- 8 יהוה פקח עורים יהוה זקף כפופים יהוה אהב צדיקים
9 יהוה שמר את־גרים יתום ואלמנה יעודד ודרך רשעים יעות
מיהוה כול הארץ ממנו [--] בהודעו לכול מעשיו ברא [--] גבורותיו
- 10 ימלך יהוה לעולם אלהיך ציון לדר ודר הללויה

In Ps 148 in the LXX, we find a supplement to v. 5, taken, again, from Ps 33:9.

Psalm 148 (11Q5 II, 6–16; LXX)

- 5 יהללו את־שם יהוה כי הוא צוה ונבראו
αἰνεσάτωσαν τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν καὶ ἐγενήθησαν αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο
καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν (cf. Ps 33:9, ועמד ויעמד, ויהי הוא־צוה ויעמד, ויהי הוא־צוה ויעמד)
- 6 ויעמידם לעד לעולם חק־נתן ולא יעבור

In Ps 149, an additional line is inserted after v. 9, making a connection to Ps 148:14.

Blessed Be His Name Forever': Psalm 145 in the Hebrew Bible and in the Psalms Scroll 11Q5," in *Prayer and Poetry in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature: Essays in Honor of Eileen Schuller on the Occasion of Her 65th Birthday*, ed. Jeremy Penner, Ken M. Penner, and Cecilia Wassen, STDJ 98 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 229–43 (German version in Kratz, *Das Judentum im Zeitalter*, 206–17). See further the contribution of Marc Z. Brettler in this volume.

Psalm 148:14 (11Q5 II, 6–16)

13 יהללו את־שם יהוה כי־נשגב שמו לבדו הודו על־ארץ ושמים
14 וירם קרן לעמו תהלה לכל־חסידיו לבני ישראל עם־קרבו הללו־יה

Psalm 149 (11Q5 XXVI, 1–3)

1 הללו יה שירו ליהוה שיר חדש תהלתו בקהל חסידים

...

9 לעשות בהם משפט כתוב הדר הוא לכל־חסידיו הללו־יה

(... הדר הוא לכול חסידיו) לבני ישראל עם קודשו הללו יה

This is interesting because Ps 149 in 11Q5 is disconnected from Ps 148 in the Small Hallel and relocated to a different place. The addition was most likely made before this rearrangement, when the two Psalms (148 and 149) followed each other, as in the MT. In this context, it is likely that Ps 148:14 is itself an addition, producing a connection to Ps 149:1. Thus, a transition is created from Ps 148, which clearly comes to an end in v. 13, to Ps 149, which addresses the righteous ones of Israel. The external evidence thus leads to the following genealogy: Ps 148:1–13 → 149:1–9 → 148:14 → 149:9⁺ (addition in 11Q5) → rearrangement in 11Q5.

In addition to such examples of textual supplementation, which can easily be multiplied, we must also consider other phenomena of editing in the psalms that are attested by the external evidence. This includes the rearrangement of the psalms in 11Q5 and also the addition of entire psalms, such as Ps 151 in the LXX (Syrian Psalm I), which is also witnessed in a different format and alongside other additional psalms in 11Q5. Finally, we encounter the patchwork composed of pieces from different psalms that have undergone textual supplementation during this process. Examples are Ps 136 in 11Q5, which was supplemented with verses from Ps 118 (the so-called *catena*), and Ps 100 and Ps 135 in the MT, which were composed of elements from other psalms and, at the same time, were supplemented by new material.⁷ For all these phenomena, the external evidence provides us with criteria that we can use in a literary-critical analysis.

And so I will begin this essay with the external evidence and feel my way cautiously from there back to the literary history of the Psalms. At the same time, we should not be under any illusion that the external evidence is any less problematic than the results of an internal analysis. As a rule, external evidence is ambiguous and needs critical interpretation. Its explanation is no less hypothetical than literary-critical analysis. Scholars who want to give up literary-critical analysis because it produces too many

7. For the latter, see Reinhard G. Kratz, "Die Tora Davids: Psalm 1 und die doxologische Fünfteilung des Psalters," in *Das Judentum im Zeitalter*, 280–311, here 297 with n. 43, 308 with n. 79; and Kratz "Reste hebräischen Heidentums am Beispiel der Psalmen," in *Mythos und Geschichte: Kleine Schriften III*, FAT 102 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 156–89, esp. 178–79.

ἐστερεώθη ἡ καρδία μου ἐν κυρίῳ ὑψώθη κέρασ μου ἐν θεῷ μου ἐπλατύνθη ἐπὶ
ἐχθροὺς τὸ στόμα μου εὐφράνθη ἐν σωτηρίᾳ σου
ἐπι εχθρ. το στ. μου] το στ. μου ἐπι εχθρ. μου G^o
My heart was made firm in the Lord; my horn was exalted in my Lord; my mouth was
made wide against enemies; I was glad in your deliverance,

2 אִין־קדוש כיהוה כי אין בלתך ואין צור כאלהינו

There is no Holy One like the LORD, because there is no one besides you; and there is no
Rock like our God.

[כ] יא אין קדוש כיה[וה] [ואין צדיק כאלוהינו ואין בלתך] ואין צור כאלוהינו

Because there is no one holy like the LORD; and there is no one righteous like our God; and
there is no one besides you; and there is no Rock like our God.

ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος ὡς κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος
πλήν σοῦ
δίκαιος- fin.] πλην σου και ουκ εστιν δικαιος ως ο θεος ημων G^o | ουκ εστιν] και ουκ εστιν G^L
(ואין)

Because there is none holy like the Lord, and there is none righteous like our God; there is
none holy besides you.

3 אֶל־תִּרְבוּ תִּדְבְּרוּ גְבָהָה גְבָהָה יִצְא עֵתֶק מִפִּיכֶם כִּי אֶל דְּעוֹת יְהוָה וְלֹא [וְלוֹ] נִתְכַּנּוּ עַלְלוֹת

Talk no more so very proudly, let not arrogance come from your mouth; for the LORD is a
God of knowledge [pl.], and by him actions are weighed.

[אל תרבו תדברו גבהה אל יצא עתק מפיכם כי אל דעת] יהוה ואל תוכן עללותיו

... because the LORD is a God of knowledge, and a God who balances his own actions.

μη καυχᾶσθε καὶ μη λαλεῖτε ὑψηλά μη ἐξελθάτω μεγαλορρημοσύνη ἐκ τοῦ στόματος
ὑμῶν ὅτι θεὸς γνώσεων κύριος καὶ θεὸς ἐτοιμάζων ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ
υψηλα] + εις υπεροχην G^{Lo} | γνωσεων] γνωσεως G^{Bl} | αυτου] αυτων A

Boast not, and speak not lofty things; let not big talking come forth from your mouth, because
the Lord is a god of knowledge, and a god who balances his (their) own actions.

4 קֶשֶׁת גְּבוּרִים חֲתִים וְנַכְשָׁלִים אֲזָרוּ חֵיל

The bow(s) of the mighty are broken, but the feeble gird on strength.

[קשת גבורים] חתה ונ[כ]שלים אז[רו] [חיל]

The bow of the mighty is broken...

τόξον δυνατῶν ἡσθένησεν καὶ ἀσθενοῦντες περιεζώσαντο δύναμιν

The bow of the mighty has become weak, and weak ones have girded themselves with might.

5 שבעים בלחם נשכרו ורעבים חדלו עד-עקרה ילדה שבעה ורבת בנים אמללה
[שבעים בלחם נשכרו ורעבים חדל] ל[ו עד ע] קרה ילדה [שבעה ורבת בנים אמללה]

Those who were full have hired themselves out for bread, but those who were hungry are fat
with spoil. The barren has borne seven, but she who has many children is forlorn.

πλήρεις ἄρτων ἠλαττώθησαν καὶ οἱ πεινῶντες παρήκαν γῆν ὅτι στεῖρα ἔτεκεν ἑπτὰ
καὶ ἡ πολλή ἐν τέκνοις ἡσθένησεν

Full of bread they suffered loss, and the hungry have forsaken the land, because a barren one
has borne seven, and she who is rich in children became weak.

6 יהוה ממית ומחיה מוריד שאול ויעל
[יהוה ממית ומחיה מוריד [שאול ויעל]

The LORD kills and brings to life; he brings down to Sheol and raises up.
κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ κατάρχει εἰς ᾗδου καὶ ἀνάγει
The Lord puts to death and brings to life; he brings down to Hades and brings up.

7 יהוה מוריש ומעשיר משפיל אף־מרומם
[יהוה מוריש ומעשיר משפיל] אף [מרומם]

The LORD makes poor and makes rich; he brings low, he also exalts.
κύριος πτωχίζει καὶ πλουτίζει ταπεινοῖ καὶ ἀνυψοῖ
The Lord makes poor and makes rich; he brings low, and he raises on high.

8a מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון להושיב עם־נדיבים וכסא כבוד ינחלם
[מקים מעפר דל ומאשפות ירים אביון להושיב עם] נדיב[ים וכסא כבוד ינחלם]

He raises up the poor from the dust; he lifts the needy from the ash heap, to make them sit with princes and inherit a seat of honor.

ἀνίστα ἄπὸ γῆς πένητα καὶ ἀπὸ κοπρίας ἐγείρει πτωχὸν καθίσαι μετὰ δυναστώων λαῶν
καὶ θρόνον δόξης κατακληρονομήων αὐτοῖς
[εἰς καθίσαι] + αὐτον A | λαων] λαου G^{LO}

He raises up the needy from the ground and lifts the poor from the dunghill, to make them sit with the mighty of the peoples, even making them inherit a throne of glory.

8b כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת עליהם תבל
[כי ליהוה מצוקי ארץ וישת] עליהם תבל[ל]

For the pillars of the earth are the LORD's, and on them he has set the world.
LXX —

9 רגלי חסידו [חסידיו] ישמר ורשעים בחשך ידמו כילא בכח יגבר־איש

He will guard the feet of his faithful ones, but the wicked shall be cut off in darkness; for not by might does one prevail.

[] ודרך ח[סידיו ישמור ורשעים בחשך ידמו] נתן נד[ר] ל[נוד]ר ויברך ש[נות צדיק כי לוא
בכח יגבר איש]

He will guard the way of his faithful ones, but the wicked shall be cut off in darkness; he grants the vow to the one who takes vows, he blesses the years of the righteous, for not by might does one prevail.

διδοὺς εὐχὴν τῷ εὐχομένῳ καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἔτη δικαίου ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἰσχύι δυνατὸς ἀνὴρ
δικαίου] δικαίων A

Granting the prayer to the one who prays, he has even blessed the years of the righteous, because not by strength is a man mighty.

10a יהוה יחתו מריבו [מריביו]

The LORD: His adversaries shall be shattered.

a¹ יהוה יחת מר[י]בו מי ק[דוש כיהוה --]

a² [--] אתם בשלמ[ם] אל יתהלל חכם]

a³ [בחכמתו] ואל ית[ה]ל הגבור בגבורתו ואל יתהלל עשיר]

[בעשרו כי בזאת יתהלל המתהלל השכל וידע את יהוה] a⁴
 [ולעשו]ת מש[פט וצדקה בתוך הארץ] a⁵

The LORD shatters his adversary (adversaries). Who is holy like the LORD...
 ... when he repays (?) ... Let not the wise boast of his wisdom, and let not the strong boast of his strength, and let not the rich boast of his riches, but let the one who boasts boast about this: that he has the understanding and knows the LORD and to exercise justice and righteousness in the midst of the land.

κύριος ἀσθενῆ ποιήσει ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ κύριος ἅγιος μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχάσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχάσθω ὁ καυχώμενος συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον καὶ ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς

The Lord will make his adversary weak; the Lord is holy. Let not the clever boast in his cleverness, and let not let the mighty boast in his might, and let not let the wealthy boast in his wealth, but let him who boasts boast in this: to understand and know the Lord and to execute justice and righteousness in the midst of the land.

10aγb עלו [עליו] בשמים ירעם יהוה ידין אפסי־ארץ ויתן־עז למלכו וירם קרן משיחו

The Most High will thunder in heaven. The LORD will judge the ends of the earth; he will give strength to his king, and exalt the power (horn) of his anointed.

[עלה בשמים] וירעם [יהוה ידין אפסי ארץ ויתן עז למלכנו וירם קרן] משיחו []

The LORD ascended to heaven and thundered ...

κύριος ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐβρόντησεν αὐτὸς κρινεῖ ἄκρα γῆς καὶ δίδωσιν ἰσχὺν τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ ὑψώσει κέρας χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ

The Lord ascended to the heavens and thundered. He will judge earth's ends and gives strength to our kings and will exalt the horn of his anointed.

11 וילך אלקנה הרממה על־ביתו והנער היה משרת את־יהוה את־פני עלי הכהן

Then Elkanah went home to Ramah, while the boy remained to minister to the LORD, in the presence of the priest Eli.

Καὶ κατέλιπον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀπήλθον εἰς Ἀρμαθαιμ, καὶ τὸ παιδάριον ἦν λειτουργῶν τῷ προσώπῳ κυρίου ἐνώπιον Ἡλὶ τοῦ ἱερέως

καὶ κατέλιπον – ἀπηλθον] καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτον – ἀπηλθεν G^b | καὶ κατέλιπον – κυρίου] + προσεκυνησαν (–σεν) τῷ κυρίῳ G^t

And they left him there before the Lord and departed to Harmathaim, and the lad was ministering to the face of the Lord, before Eli the priest.

This first overview quickly reveals where the problems lie and where the three versions diverge most: in the transitions to and from the narrative in 1 Sam 1:28 and 2:11, and in vv. 1–3, 8b–10 of the psalm. In contrast, the tradition in the corpus of the psalm in vv. 4–8a is relatively stable. The evidence is interpreted differently by scholars.

In DJD 17, Frank Moore Cross and his students endeavor to explain the problems—as far as possible—using text-critical means. The editors usually assume technical errors in copying, reckon occasionally with

“conflated readings,” and only if it is unavoidable suggest textual supplementation in the course of the copying process.⁸

In contrast, Emanuel Tov emphasizes more the autonomy of the three versions and speaks of “different editions” in the MT, the LXX, and 4Q51.⁹ He rightly includes the transitions to the narrative in 1 Sam 1–2 in the discussion of the textual problems, the importance of which for textual history and literary history had already been pointed out by Julius Wellhausen in his comparison of the MT and the LXX.¹⁰

Following Cross, Tov, and other scholars, Anneli Aejmelaeus notes that the version of 4Q51 in some readings is very close to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX and, like the LXX, often reflects the more original text.¹¹ This more original text was already conjectured in the earlier studies of Wellhausen and Samuel Rollins Driver, who had only the LXX as an aid.¹² The manuscript of 4Q51 has beautifully confirmed their conjectures. Aejmelaeus is, however, inclined to assume a much stronger, deliberate editing in 4Q51. Aejmelaeus attributes this work to the scroll’s scribe, who evaluated the various manuscripts that he had at his disposal in order to produce a manuscript that was as complete as possible. She also assumes three different editions: an older one in the LXX, a corrected one in the MT, and an enhanced one in 4Q51.

In the following, I would like to examine the evidence to determine whether it allows further conclusions to be made about the literary history and a possible earlier (not *the* original but a more original) form of the psalm. To this end, I will discuss in turn the purely text-critical phenomena (orthographic variations, scribal errors, and variants), the major differences in the text (pluses and minuses), and, finally, the internal indications of textual supplementation and the relationship between external and internal evidence.

8. Frank M. Cross et al., eds., *Qumran Cave IV.XII: 1–2 Samuel*, DJD XVII (Oxford: Clarendon, 2005), 30–38 (hereafter DJD 17).

9. Emanuel Tov, “Different Editions of the Song of Hannah and of Its Narrative Framework,” in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999) 433–55.

10. Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871), 42.

11. Anneli Aejmelaeus, “Hannah’s Psalm in 4QSam^a,” in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History*, ed. Philippe Hugo and A. Schenker, VTSup 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 23–37, esp. 36–37.

12. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*; Samuel R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel: With an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1913).

3. Orthography, Scribal Errors, and Variants

A number of differences between the three versions of the Song of Hannah can be explained by text-critical means, beginning with orthography, such as the Qumranic כִּיא and the plene spelling in 4Q51 (1:28 בּוּל; 2:2 כּאֵלוּהִינוּ). Textual criticism also includes scribal errors and variants, in which textual history occasionally merges into literary or compositional history. For clarity, I will deal with both categories together, following the order of the verses in the Hebrew Bible.

1:28 כִּיא הוּא לַיהוָה שְׂאוּל לַיהוָה is to be translated “all the days, which he was, he is given to the Lord.” Since “tense and meaning are incongruous,” Wellhausen had conjectured, with reference to the LXX, that the text should be אֲשֶׁר הוּא אֲשֶׁר חִי הוּא הוּא instead of הוּא אֲשֶׁר הוּא.¹³ 4Q51 is not preserved here; the restored text in brackets follows the LXX and the conjecture of Wellhausen. In my opinion, the doubling of הוּא, as suggested by Wellhausen, does not seem to be necessary. The error can be readily explained by the confusion of ה and ח, incorrect word partitioning and a dittography involving ה.

2:1 כִּי שְׂמַחְתִּי בִישׁוּעַתְךָ פִּי עַל־אוֹיְבֵי כִי שְׂמַחְתִּי בִישׁוּעַתְךָ פִּי, ἐπὶ ἐχθρούς τὸ στόμα μου. The כִּי is out of place and not provided in the LXX. The word order in the LXX (apart from G^o) leads us to suppose that the MT also originally read פִּי, which was corrupted to כִּי, or perhaps was read as a final *mem* of אוֹיְבֵים (LXX) and was therefore added at the front,¹⁴ or that two distinct readings were combined in the MT. Other scholars propose a prosaic supplement.¹⁵ Also attractive is P. Kyle McCarter’s assumption that in the LXX and 4Q51 the following ἔτι or כִּי is to be found in the *kaph* of בִּישׁוּעַתְךָ, one of two exceptional cases of direct address in the psalm, with the text originally reading: כִּי שְׂמַחְתִּי בִישׁוּעַתְךָ “I rejoice in *my* vindication, *For*.”¹⁶

2:1 בִּיהוָה עֵץ, ἐν θεῷ μου (בְּאֱלֹהֵי). The LXX variant is usually preferred because of the variety of expression. A clear decision is not possible in such cases.

2:2 כִּי אֵין בְּלֶתֶךָ אֵין, οὐκ ἔστιν ἄγιος πλὴν σοῦ (without כִּי but with קְדוּשָׁה). This is more likely to be a variant than a scribal error.

2:2 וְאֵין צוֹר כְּאֱלֹהֵינוּ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (וְאֵין צְדִיק). The rendering of צוֹר with δίκαιος in the LXX is probably not a variant that is based on a different, independent Hebrew *Vorlage*.¹⁷ It can either be traced

13. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 42. The reading is also found in some Hebrew manuscripts (see *BHS*).

14. Thus Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis Text*, 42–43.

15. P. Kyle McCarter, *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*, AB 8 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), 68.

16. *Ibid.*

17. DJD 17, 36; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 68–69.

back to a scribal error (caused by a slip of the pen changing צור into צדיק) or represents the translator's deliberate avoidance of the divine epithet.¹⁸

2:3 אל־תרבו תדברו גבהה גבהה, μή καυχᾶσθε καὶ μὴ λαλεῖτε ὑψηλά. Wellhausen objects to the repetition of the feminine גבהה, which occurs only once in some Hebrew manuscripts and, in the versions, is usually rendered by a simple plural. He understands the form to be masculine with ה-locale, part of a quotation of proud enemies: "Do not say repeatedly: up high, up high!"¹⁹ This is an inventive solution. I think that it is in any case more appealing than McCarter's explanation; he reckons with a twofold dittography and a conflation of two variants in both the LXX and the MT, one "correct," the other "corrupt."²⁰

2:3 יצא, μὴ ἐξεληθάτω (אל יצא). McCarter prefers the reading of the LXX.²¹ However, we could also be dealing with an additional clarification that the translator either found in the *Vorlage* or made himself. In one Hebrew manuscript the variant עשק before עתק is to be found (see *BHS*); it is probably an explanatory addition.

2:3 בי אל דעת [יהוה, ὅτι θεὸς γνώσεων κύριος, יהוה]. The defective spelling in 4Q51 can be read as singular as well as plural and was later disambiguated with a *mater lectionis* in the MT. The Greek tradition preserves both singular and plural readings.

2:3 ואל תוכן) ואל תוכן) [ולו] נתכנו עללות, καὶ θεὸς ἐτοιμάζων ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ (עללותיו). Wellhausen believes that the reading of the MT (with the *qere*) is original, that of the LXX a simplification under the influence of Ezek 18:25, which explains the suffix in "his/their actions." McCarter believes the opposite.²² The different readings are likely—whichever way they developed—to have been created by a scribal error, namely, by transposition of לא and אל.

2:4 [קשת גבורי]ם חתה, τόξον δυνατῶν ἡσθένησεν, קשת גברים חתים. The reading in the LXX and 4Q51 (adjective sing. fem.) is grammatically correct and is therefore usually preferred,²³ but it could also be a secondary correction. GKC (§146a) explains the plural with a construct connection, in which the predicate sometimes conforms not to the construct noun (*nomen regens*) but to the genitive. With reference to Mitchell Dahood, McCarter postulates a defectively written plural masculine *qāšōt*.²⁴ The MT has a similar problem in Jer 51:56.

2:5 גשכרו, ἡλαττώθησαν. The translation of שכר with ἡλαττοῦν is peculiar.

18. Tov, "Different Editions," 441; Aejmelaeus, "Hannah's Psalm," 28.

19. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 43. Contra Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, KHC 8 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1902), 15.

20. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 69; see also DJD 17, 36.

21. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 69.

22. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 43; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 69.

23. Aejmelaeus, "Hannah's Psalm," 24–25.

24. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 69.

Wellhausen suspects the reason to be a variant of the root ה-ס-ר but gives preference to the MT as the *lectio difficilior* and refers to the parallelism.²⁵

2:5 חדלו עד-עקרה is a *crux interpretum*. The NRSV translation “are fat with spoil” apparently reflects an understanding in which the root ה-ד-ל here means “to be fat” and עד “spoil” or “food.”²⁶ This is an attractive solution to the problem. Also widespread is the assumption of letter loss and the reconstruction חדל עבד, “And they that were hungry, stop working.”²⁷ Or can we read עד, “that is still barren”? The reading of the LXX (παρήκαν ὄζον ἐγγύς) is not a variant but an attempt at interpretation: it adds an object and understands עד in terms of בי.²⁸ Most unlikely, in my opinion, is a ditto-graphy or conflation of חדל, once in the sense of “to forsake” and then as “world” (= חלד).²⁹ See Jer 15:9 on the formulation.

2:7 מוריש as the opposite of to “be rich” is unusual; a form of רוש, “being poor,” would be closer. For this reason, Budde assumes a scribal error and suggests מריש (*hiphil* of רוש).³⁰

2:8 להושיב, καθίσαι, G^A and some other codices καθίσαι αὐτον, a Hebrew manuscript להושיבי (see BHS). The variant is also found in Ps 113:8, where 1 Sam 2:8 is cited fully and the MT reads the suffix of the first person, the LXX the suffix of the third person singular. I suspect that initially the suffix of the third person was added for clarification and then ו and י were confused. In any case the suffix of the first person is secondary; it relates the statement to the supplicant and removes its universality.

2:8 מאשפת, καὶ ἀπὸ κοπρίας. Since the two parallel cola are connected in vv. 4–6 by a copula, the copula may also be original here or based on harmonization.³¹ A final decision is not possible.

2:8 עם-נדיבים, μετὰ δυναστών λαῶν, G^{LO} μετὰ δυναστων λαου. The expansion of the expression is encountered also in Ps 113:8 (LXX 112:8): להושיבי עם-נדיבים עם נדיבי עמו (τοῦ καθίσαι αὐτὸν μετὰ ἀρχόντων μετὰ ἀρχόντων λαοῦ αὐτοῦ). The variant is probably secondary.

2:9 [חסידין] חסידין, or רגלי חסידין. The variant in 4Q51 is aligned with the text of Prov 2:8 (וּדְרֹךְ חֲסִידוֹ [חֲסִידוֹ] יִשְׁמַר) and is therefore secondary.

2:10 יהוה יחת, κύριος ἀσθενῆ ποιήσει ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ, יהוה יחתו מריבו [מריבין] מר[י]בו. The more difficult construction in the MT (*casus pendens*) requires the plural (*qere*; cf. NRSV). The following singular suffix in [עליו], however, clashes with this. The variant in the LXX and 4Q51 has Yhwh as the subject and understands the object as a singular, like the *ktiv* of the MT.

25. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 43.

26. Cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 72.

27. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text*, 25.

28. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis Text*, 43.

29. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 69.

30. Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, 15.

31. The variant is found also in the Hebrew manuscripts (see BHS).

This variant is more in accordance with the continuation of the MT and is to be preferred.³²

2:10 [עליו] בשמים ירעם עליו, κύριος ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐβρόντησεν, [עלה] בשמים] וירעם. The MT refers [עליו] עליו to the aforementioned opponents of Yhwh: “he thunders against him [them] in heaven”; the LXX starts with a new sentence and takes up the subject κύριος (יהוה) once more after the long insertion. Without the inserted text we have two variants [עליו] ... ירעם and [עלה] ... וירעם. The NRSV translation “The Most High” points in another direction, conjecturing an abbreviation or a slip of the pen for עליון to lie behind עליו.³³ Today we are more inclined to think of an old Ugaritic name for God עלי (‘ēli), from which the variants in the versions have developed.³⁴ This is also a possibility, especially as the error can be easily explained by the frequent confusion of י and ו. But it seems to me that the reading in the LXX and 4Q51 (with the *Wiederaufnahme* of the subject, the finite verb, and the copula before וירעם) is more likely to be related to the insertion than to the name of God (see §4 below).

2:10 יהוה ידין, αὐτὸς κρουεῖ (הוא ידין). The LXX variant is probably related to the addition and other changes in v. 10 (see below). The personal pronoun is adequate following the resumption of the subject at the beginning of the sentence in v. 10b.

2:10 למלכו, τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν. The LXX assumes not only a suffix in the plural (“our”) but also י as *mater lectionis*. The variant collectivizes the psalm and is therefore probably secondary.

These are the orthographic variations, scribal errors, and variants, which can be easily multiplied by further intra-Greek variants. All this is in line with what we usually find in manuscripts. In themselves, errors in the text contribute little to the question of textual supplementation. All the same, rudiments of text editing can be detected here and there even in the errors (e.g., v. 10), whether it be that the revision of the text produces errors or variants, or that an error has led to further revision. The variants in particular show that the text remained in this processing flow for a long time and was being continually reworked. Although we can hardly place all this under the category of textual supplementation, the phenomenon does come quite close in some cases, especially if the scribe or translator turns into a producer of variants and additions.³⁵

Above all, we must not make the mistake of seeing scribal errors and variants merely as post-history and the offshoots of textual history.

32. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 70; Aejmelaeus, “Hannah’s Psalm,” 25.

33. See Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, 16, who assumes a vocalization error and changes the reading of ירעם to ירעם (from the root רעע) according to Ps 2:9. The location “in the heavens” speaks more for “thunder.”

34. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 70–71, 73.

35. See the contribution of Marc Z. Brettler in this volume.

As the external evidence from Elephantine (TAD A4.7–8) or from Qumran shows, errors and variants appear in the text with the correction of the first writing or with the first copy. They begin very early and run through the entire history of a text. To a certain extent, they accompany text creation, lie on different levels, and cannot always be neatly separated from the changes induced by the text's literary growth. The literary growth, however, is indicated mainly by the pluses and minuses of textual tradition.

4. Pluses and Minuses

Dealing with textual errors and variants has already confirmed our first impression that textual problems occur mainly at the outer edges of the psalm: at the transitions to and from the narrative (1:28; 2:11), and in vv. 2–3 and 8b–10. The tradition in the middle part in vv. 3–8a is, in contrast, relatively uniform. The same picture is reflected also by the pluses and minuses in the text. They occur in 1 Sam 1:28; 2:1–2 and massively in 2:8–10. This seems to me to be a first indication of the psalm's genesis. The distribution of the textual problems suggests the assumption that the (older) core of the psalm is to be sought in vv. 3–8a, while the verses at the edges were processed more vigorously and in some cases added later. We will examine this assumption in the following discussion.

The Narrative Framework (1 Sam 1:28 and 2:11)

Wellhausen pointed out that the Song of Hannah was inserted into the MT and the LXX in two different places: in the MT after a man's proskynesis (Elkanah) and before Elkanah's departure; in the LXX before Hannah hands over the boy to the priests and her departure. The relinquishing of the boy to the priests is missing in the MT, and the proskynesis is missing in the LXX (except G^L in 1:28 and 2:11). The two versions confirm Wellhausen's suggestion—which he had pointed out on the basis of 1 Samuel 1:24–28—that we are dealing with two different versions in the MT and the LXX: one version in which Hannah is the main actor and another version in which Hannah and Elkanah together are the actors.³⁶ The two versions, however, got mixed up: in 1 Sam 1:24–28a the MT represents the version with Hannah, the LXX the version with Hanna and Elkanah as active subjects; in 1:28b and 2:11, it is the other way around: the subject is Elkanah

36. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 41–42. See Tov, "Different Editions," 434–41.

in the MT (according to some versions both parents in pl.), in the LXX it is Hannah (in sing.) or according to some manuscripts, both parents (in pl.).

MT (Elkanah or both parents)

1:28b וישתחו שם ליהוה (SV pl. וישתחו שם ליהוה)

2:11 וילך אלקנה הרמתה על־ביתו והנער היה משרת את־יהוה את־פני עלי הכהן

LXX (Hannah or both parents)

1:28b —

(G^L + και προσεκυνησεν (-σαν) εκει τω κυριω)

2:11 G^B Καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς Ἀρμαθαίμ
καὶ τὸ παιδάριον ἦν λειτουργῶν τῷ προσώπῳ κυρίου ἐνώπιον Ἡλὶ τοῦ ἱερέως

(G^L Pl. κατέλιπον; + προσεκυνησαν (-σεν) τω κυριω; ἀπηλθον)

Manuscript 4Q51 confirms the version of the LXX in almost every respect, both in the case of 1 Sam 1:24–28a, where the active subject is Elkanah or both parents, and in 1:28b (or 2:11), where Hannah is the active subject. The Qumran manuscript has a slightly different text, however, and inserts the Song of Hannah again at another location. It contains both the relinquishing of the child (like the LXX but with a shorter text) and the proskynesis (like the MT) and places the Song of Hannah—different from the LXX but with the MT—*after* the handover and proskynesis and *before* Hannah's departure. LXX 2:11 is therefore partially *before* the Song of Hannah, that is, at the position of 1:28b: [ו]תשתח[ו] שם ותעזב[ו] [ליהוה].

1:28/2:11 and the Song of Hannah 2:1–10

MT: proskynesis (he = Elkanah) — Song of Hannah — departure (Elkanah)

LXX: (G^L proskynesis in sing./pl.) — Song of Hannah — handover and departure (G^B sing. = Hannah, G^L handover, proskynesis and departure in pl.)

4Q51: handover and proskynesis (Hannah) — Song of Hannah — departure (Hannah)

While the evidence is not entirely straightforward, it is on the whole clear. First, it proves that the Song of Hannah is not original here but was added secondarily at two different places in the narrative context. Furthermore, the evidence shows that the narrative was edited, presumably before the insertion of the song. As a consequence, the evidence cannot be explained primarily by text-critical (mechanical) means, but only by redaction-critical means.

Thus, the plus in the LXX and 4Q51 in 1 Sam 1:24–28a is clearly proven to be a secondary textual supplementation ascribing a special role to Elkanah in the occurrences previously dominated by Hannah; the MT

provides the older text here.³⁷ In the following (1:28b; 2:11), the LXX and 4Q51 seem to have preserved the older text in which Hannah plays the active role, while the MT reflects the influence of the revision that highlights Elkanah's role. The MT therefore presupposes the revision in 1 Sam 1:24–28b that is witnessed in the LXX and 4Q51. Of the three actions in 1:28b/2:11, the departure is in any case more likely to be original, which, before the insertion of the Song of Hannah, is preceded by the proskynesis (MT), only by the relinquishing (LXX), or by both (4Q51; G^L). The different variants were probably created by the song's insertion.³⁸ The versions were then subject to various efforts of alignment that put verbs into the plural and named both parents as active subjects.

Verse 1

We now come to the psalm itself, and vv. 1–2 and vv. 8–10 in particular. In all three versions the heading presupposes Hannah as the active subject. The LXX reads a simple “and she said” (*Καὶ εἶπεν* = *והאמר*), which agrees with the fact that here, as well as in 4Q51, no change of subject has occurred and Hannah is the subject in 1:28. The MT is different. In this text, after the proskynesis in 1:28 with a male subject (Elkanah), Hannah is introduced as supplicant in 2:1, resorting to 1:26 *והתפלל חנה והאמר* (likewise G^L *καὶ προσηύξατο ἀννα*). The longer heading in the MT is thus secondary and based on textual supplementation.

Verse 2

In v. 2, we can observe the transition from a variant, possibly a scribal error, to textual supplementation. Among the textual witnesses that are available to us, we find the following variants:

- MT *אין-קדוש כיהוה כי אין בלתך ואין צור כאלהינו (כי?)*
 4Q51 *כ]יא אין קדוש כיה[וה] + x [כי אין/ואין (קדוש) בלתך] ואין צור כאלהינו*
 LXX *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος ὡς κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος πλὴν σοῦ*
 G^L *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος ὡς κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος πλὴν σοῦ*
 G^O *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἅγιος ὡς κύριος καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν πλὴν σοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν*

37. See Kratz, “Bibelhandschrift oder Midrasch?,” 161–62.

38. Before the insertion of the song, the sequence “relinquishing – Hannah’s departure” could have been the original order. In the LXX the song was placed before these two actions. The MT presupposes the revision, which highlights Elkanah’s role and therefore, with the insertion of the song, differentiates between the role of Hannah (song) and Elkanah (departure, 2:11). The previous relinquishing of the child was replaced by the proskynesis of Elkanah in 1:28b, which underlines Elkanah’s role before Hannah takes the floor and is introduced as supplicant and speaker. 4Q51 combines both readings but retains Hannah as the subject throughout. All other variants can be understood as secondary alignments.

We can distinguish three components in these variants:

a אין־קדוש כיהוה (כי)

b אין־קדוש בלתך b' אין בלתך

c ואין צור כאלהינו c' και οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (witnessed only in Greek, see under §3 above)

These three components are arranged differently: *abc* in the MT, *axbc* in 4Q51, *ac'b'* in the LXX and G^L, *abc'* in G^O.³⁹ There are also differences in the introductory כי and the copula ו. Common to all versions is that *a* is in the first position and most likely belongs to the core. Also relatively stable is the order *abc* if we disregard the variants *b'* and *c'*, and the addition of another element (*x*) in 4Q51. Only this order explains the additional element קדוש in *b'*, which is taken from the immediately preceding term *a* and was most probably added secondarily in the *Vorlage* of the LXX.⁴⁰ Based on this, the variants in the LXX and G^L would also be classified as secondary.⁴¹ If we then take into account that *b'* is not a Hebrew but merely a Greek variant, then G^O already assumes the translation and harmonizes this with the arrangement in the MT and is therefore probably secondary as well. Thus, component *c* and its position at the end in the MT and 4Q51 are also proved stable and, like *a*, could likewise belong to the core. Both 4Q51 and the secondary variants in the Greek tradition presuppose the core and the sequence *abc* in the MT.

The changes in the versions appear to have begun with the expansion of the second component *b*, which is witnessed in the LXX. They continue in 4Q51 in the unknown but, on the basis of the space, required textual supplementation of the MT. 4Q51 might already presuppose the supplementation of *b* in the order of MT but not the transposition to the last position in the LXX. If the *x* we are dealing with in 4Q51 is one of the components *a-c* (most likely *c*) we could explain this more easily by text-critical means as a contamination of two readings, or as a result of a deliberate comparison and combination of different textual traditions. If, however, we are dealing with a separate fourth variant *d* (even if it exists only in component *c'* in the Greek tradition) it would be preferable to assume textual supplementation over a mechanical explanation such as scribal error or text adjustment. The supplementation and subsequent positioning of *b* and the addition of another component could suggest

39. See Tov, "Different Editions," 441–42; Tov speaks of three "versions (editions)" but leaves the question open of how they originated. Aejmelaeus considers the possible alternatives of scribal error ("Hannah's Psalm," 27–31). See also DJD 17, 36 and 38; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 68–69.

40. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 43.

41. A different explanation is provided by Aejmelaeus, who believes the order of the LXX to be original ("Hannah's Psalm," 30–31).

that all of *b* is secondary and that the original text contained only *a* and *c*:
(כי) אין־קדוש ביהוה ואין צור כאלהינו

Verse 8

The next major plus, encountered in v. 8, is witnessed by both the MT and 4Q51 but is completely missing in the LXX.

כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת עליהם תבל
כי ליהוה מצוקי ארץ וישת עליהם תב[ל]

There is a broad consensus that this is textual supplementation. Verse 8b stands out both in style and content, and it would certainly be classified by most scholars as secondary, even without external evidence. The external evidence of the LXX only makes the decision easier.⁴² The plus inserts a cosmic dimension into the psalm, pursuing a tendency to universalize.

Verse 9

The versions also differ in v. 9. Besides the variants in the MT and 4Q51 (see §3), the MT and the LXX each offer shorter texts, 4Q51 a longer text.

MT

... רגלי חסידו [חסידיו] ישמר ורשעים בחשך ידמו ...
— b
כי־לא בכח יגבר־איש c

4Q51

ודרך ח[סידיו] ישמור ורשעים בחשך ידמו
b נתן נד[ר] ל[גוד]ר ויברך ש[נות צדיק]
c כי לוא בכח יגבר איש

LXX

a —

b διδούς εὐχὴν τῷ εὐχομένῳ καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἔτη δικαίου (G^A δικαιῶν)

c ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἰσχύι δυνατὸς ἀνὴρ

The external evidence suggests that element *c*, which is witnessed in both the MT and the LXX and probably in 4Q51 (on the basis of space), represents the older text, supplemented by element *a* in the MT and by ele-

42. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 43: "Das letzte Glied überfüllt den Vers, liegt dem Zusammenhange nicht nahe und fehlt mit Recht in LXX." See Tov, "Different Editions," 442–44; Aejmelaeus, "Hannah's Psalm," 31; and perhaps also DJD 17, 38, where v. 8b is missing, although the evidence is not discussed anywhere. In contrast, McCarter believes the version of 4Q51 to be original and for vv. 8b–10a expects massive text loss in both the MT and the LXX: "4QSam^a shows that both MT and LXX have suffered losses of material here" (*I Samuel*, 69–70). The loss of v. 8b is not explained, and its omission in the LXX and the possibility of a plus are not even discussed.

ment *b* in the LXX or the *Vorlage* of the LXX. 4Q51 accordingly represents a secondary combination of the two additions *a* (with text variant according to Prov 2:8) and *b*.⁴³ This explanation clearly deserves preference over the view that 4Q51 represents the original text, with the text in the MT and the LXX understood to have been corrupted by haplography and “losses of material,” though without proof or a reconstruction of the individual processes using the text.⁴⁴

The pluses comment on the Song of Hannah and on its content concerning God’s actions in different ways. Element *a*, that is, v. 9a MT, places the reversal of circumstances through God in the theological opposition between the “pious” and the “wicked.” We can speak of a “piety revision” here. Those responsible for element *b*, that is, v. 9a LXX, would apparently like to include the narrative of Hannah in the hymn and therefore insert the idea of fulfillment of vows and the blessing of the righteous with old age.⁴⁵

I assume, with Tov, that both pluses have entered independently into the text. Accordingly, the emergence of the verse can be reconstructed approximately as follows:

Originally v. 9b (element *c*) was connected directly to v. 8a.

8a מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון להושיב עס־נדיבים וכסא כבוד ינחלם
9b כי לא בכח יגבר איש

Element *b*, the plus in the LXX, which in the Hebrew *Vorlage* requires a participle, connects perfectly from a grammatical perspective to the Hebrew text in v. 8a and does not yet seem to be aware of the pluses in the MT, vv. 8b, 9a.⁴⁶

8a מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון להושיב עס־נדיבים וכסא כבוד ינחלם
9a [נתן נדר] לנודר ויברך שנות צדיק
9b כִּי־לֹא בכח יגבר־איש

43. See Tov, “Different Editions,” 444–48. Similarly Aejmelaeus, “Hannah’s Psalm,” 32–33, who, however, believes only the MT to be secondary compared to the LXX and hence holds the originality of element *b*.

44. See McCarter, *I Samuel*, 69–70; contra Tov, “Different Editions,” 448 n. 44. DJD 17 seems to assume that only the last element *c*, which is common to all the witnesses, is secondary (37–38). Reasons are not given. See, however, Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, 16.

45. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 44: “Es sieht aus, als ob dieser Text den Psalm der im Alter mit Kindern noch gesegneten Hanna als Danklied für die Erfüllung ihrer Bitte mundgerechter machen wollte. Denn worüber Gott hier nach dem Zusammenhänge des *Liedes* gepriesen wird, das ist sein Ueberschwänglichthun über alle Bitten, nicht sein *διδόναι εὐχὴν τῷ εὐχομένῳ*; sein Erheben des Verachteten auf den Fürstenthron, nicht sein *εὐλογεῖν ἔτη δικαίου*.”

46. See Aejmelaeus, “Hannah’s Psalm,” 32.

8a ἀνιστᾶ ἀπὸ γῆς πένητα καὶ ἀπὸ κοπρίας ἐγείρει πτωχὸν καθίσαι μετὰ
 δυναστῶν λαῶν καὶ θρόνον δόξης κατακληρονομῶν αὐτοῖς
 9 διδοὺς εὐχλὴν τῷ εὐχομένῳ καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἔτη δικαίου ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ἰσχύι δυνατὸς
 ἀνὴρ

The plus in v. 9a (MT) connects, for better or for worse, to the help for the poor in v. 8a, as well as to the universalistic plus in v. 8b, and is particularly formulated toward v. 9b: It is the wicked who set the power of man above the power of God.

8a מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון להושיב עס־נדיבים וכסא כבוד ינחלם
 כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת עליהם תבל
 9a רגלי חסידו [חסידיו] ישמר ורשעים בחשך ידמו
 9b כי־לא בכח יגבר־איש

Both additions are included and combined in 4Q51. In this context, the plus in the LXX, which is focused on Hannah's story, also serves the opposition of the "pious/righteous" and the "wicked," to which the psalm and God's actions described in it are related secondarily. The intra-Greek variant in G^A makes this interpretation explicit by changing the singular "the righteous" to the plural.

If this reconstruction of textual supplementation in vv. 8–9 is reasonably accurate, we can then ask ourselves whether v. 9b, that is, the element *c* (כי־לא בכח יגבר־איש), witnessed in all versions, also represents a plus. The verse responds to the elevation of the poor, whom God helps, to great honor. It really almost goes without saying that this is not the work of man, and that a man cannot become great by his own power. It only needs to be said if it is intended to give the psalm a parenetic note (cf. Ps 33:16; Zech 4:6) or if something else follows that is devoted to the same topic (v. 10).

Verse 10

This brings us to v. 10 and the last place in the Song of Hannah where the versions diverge. Here the LXX provides a large plus missing from the MT.

10a יהוה יחתו מריבו [מריביו]
 10a κύριος ἀσθενῆ ποιήσει ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ
 + κύριος ἅγιος μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ φρόνιμος ἐν τῇ φρονήσει αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω
 ὁ δυνατὸς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ
 ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν κύριον καὶ
 ποιεῖν κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς

10b עלו [עליו] בשמים ירעם יהוה ידן אפסי־ארץ ויתן־עז למלכו וירם קרן משיחו

10b κύριος ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐβρόντησεν αὐτὸς κρινεῖ ἄκρα γῆς καὶ δίδωσιν ἰσχύν τοῖς βασιλευσιν ἡμῶν καὶ ὑψώσει κέρασ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ

The plus is more or less identical to Jer 9:22–23, the difference being that in 1 Samuel humans should exercise righteousness and justice in the land, whereas in Jeremiah it is the Lord, who exercises mercy, justice, and righteousness. Jer 9:22–23 reads:

22 Τάδε λέγει κύριος Μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ
23 ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὅτι ἐν τούτοις τὸ θέλημα μου λέγει κύριος

Since the reproduction is different, we can rule out the possibility that the translator took the plus from Jeremiah. Hence, we can assume an appropriate *Vorlage* in the book of Samuel. This Hebrew *Vorlage* seems to be witnessed in 4Q51, but only fragments have survived, which, incidentally, contain a slightly different text. At this point it is necessary to delve a little deeper into textual tradition and to deal with the paleographic evidence.⁴⁷ DJD 17 provides the following transcription of 4Q51 II, 29–35:

[-- דוש כיהוה --] 10a¹ (29)
[--] a² (30) [--] אַל יתהלל חכם
[בחכמתו] ואל ית[ה]ל[ל] הגבור בגבורתו ואל יתהלל עשיר] a³ (31)
[בעשרו כי בזאת יתהלל המתהלל השכל וידע את יהוה] a⁴ (32)
[ולעשו] תמש[פט וצדקה בתוך הארץ] a⁵ (33)
[יהוה עלה בשמים] וירעם [יהוה ידין אפסי ארץ ויתן עז למלכנו וירם קרן] 10aγb (34)
[[]] משיחו (35)

The reading and conjecture in v. 10¹ (line 29) are daring but quite plausible in view of the beginning of the Greek plus: κύριος ἄγιος. The plus apparently refers back to v. 2: *כִּי־אֵין קדוש כִּיהוה*.

The reading]תם בשלמ[in v. 10a² (line 30) is clear but has no counterpart in the MT or the LXX. If DJD 17 is correct and, in the LXX and 4Q51, we are dealing with the same plus, then it has been increased here by another line! What was read here can no longer be reconstructed.⁴⁸

47. Relevant here are the photos of the Leon Levy Dead Sea Scrolls Digital Library B-480676 and -5 (pl. 998, frag. 5 = 4Q51 col. II, lines 26–31) and B-840684 and -5 (pl. 998, frag. 7 = 4Q51 col. II, lines 33–34).

48. See Andrew Fincke, *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran: 4QSam^a Restored and Compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam^c*, STDJ 43 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 9, 34; he reads: השלמים בשלמותם.

The reading of v. 10a³ is extremely problematic. DJD 17 reads ל[ה]ל[ה]ל[ה], which would be consistent with the LXX and prove that we are dealing with the same plus. This reading, however, is frequently disputed. McCarter and Tov read here: רגלי ח[סידיו ישמור]; Andrew Fincke reads: הגבור ב[חלי]ו.⁴⁹ In my opinion, the reading of Cross in DJD 17 still seems to be best, even if, try as I might, I cannot detect either the second ל or the head in line 30 that lies above; so, in fact, I read: ל[ה]ל[ה].

In contrast, in v. 10a⁵ (line 33) the fragments can be quite clearly correlated with the plus of the LXX: *ποιεῖν κρίμα* = מש[פט]ת [ולעשו].⁵⁰ Before the *mem* of משפט we can clearly see the foot of a *tauw*, so that we must read here not the infinitive absolute (as do Tov and Fincke) but the infinitive construct. Accordingly, v. 10a⁷b witnesses a common text in the MT and the LXX.

So while the situation is not entirely clear, it is clear enough to support the assumption that the plus in the LXX is also witnessed by 4Q51—here, however, enriched by another plus. The correlation of the LXX and 4Q51 is suggested also by the plus being at the same location and by the same variant being found in the 4Q51 as in the LXX: [יהוה עלה בשמים] וירעם corresponds to *κύριος ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐβρόντησεν*; MT has here עלו [עליו] בשמים ירעם.

There is more or less consensus that we are dealing here with textual supplementation.⁵¹ The only exception is McCarter, who maintains that the long text in 4Q51 is original. Yet he can explain neither the earlier text nor the scribal errors: “So this seems to be a case where our usual preference for a shorter reading must be set aside. The scroll, fragmentary as it is, seems to be the only surviving witness to the primitive text.”⁵² If nothing else, the variant in v. 10b (see §3 above) speaks for a plus. The variant is easily explained by the addition at this place. As a consequence of the plus the earlier עלו [עליו] בשמים ירעם lost its link to the aforementioned adversaries (*ketiv*), so that the subject *κύριος* (יהוה) in v. 10a had to be resumed and repeated here. The preposition with suffix עלו [עליו] became the verb עלה; the following ירעם was provided with a copula: *κύριος ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανοὺς καὶ ἐβρόντησεν* = יהוה עלה בשמים וירעם; and, in the following, a personal pronoun sufficed (*αὐτὸς κρινεῖ* instead of יהוה ידין).

It is unclear where the plus came from. Since the passage in the book of Jeremiah is also very likely to be secondary and the text is not com-

49. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 70; Tov, “Different Editions,” 452; Fincke, *Samuel Scroll*, 9, 34. Eugene C. Ulrich also maintains that the surpluses in the LXX and 4Q51 do not have much in common (*The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, HSM 19 [Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978], 49).

50. McCarter reads:]ml[(*I Samuel*, 70).

51. Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*, 44; Tov, “Different Editions,” 448–52; Aejmelaeus, “Hannah’s Psalm,” 33–35.

52. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 70.

pletely identical, we might think of a sapiential tradition—one that was free-floating and was added independently to both places. Although this may well be the case, it is, of course, impossible to prove and indeed, in my opinion, also unlikely. The literary connections in the two versions are too close for an independent emergence. I believe that the plus in Jer 9 is primary, no matter where the formulations came from. While it is true that it fits into the context here just as badly as it does in 1 Sam 2,⁵³ still it is not the only plus of this kind in Jer 8–10. A point of contact here is the polemic against the “wise people” and the “wise” in Jer 8:7–9; there are particular connections to the following polemic against idols in Jer 10:1–16, which is also sapientially marked and stresses the contrast between God, the creator and ruler of the world, and idols, made by human hands.

Keyword associations (“god of knowledge,” “heroes,” “rich,” in 1 Sam 2:3, 4, 7), the idea of pride in v. 3, the universalistic plus in v. 8b (cf. Jer 10:10–13), and, finally, the statement about the powerlessness of people in v. 9b⁵⁴ could have suggested to the scribe that he cite Jer 9:22–23 in 1 Sam 2. The differences are also explained better by the transfer from Jer 9. The change could be due to the context: whereas the version in Jer 9 focuses on the power of God, who is praised in contrast to the people and their “wise ones,” as well as in contrast to idols and the peoples, 1 Sam 2 differentiates between the righteous (pious) ones and those who do wrong. That they rely on their own strength (v. 9) and boast about themselves (v. 10) applies only to the wicked. They are contrasted with the ideal of the pious, who “do righteousness and justice.”⁵⁵ Therefore, it makes complete sense to insert the plus after v. 10a and before v. 10b, and not after v. 9b, because it does not apply to all the people but only to God’s enemies.⁵⁶

5. Reconstruction of the Literary and Textual History

To summarize the external evidence for the Song of Hannah, we have an earlier psalm that entered the narrative context of the story of Sam-

53. DJD 17, 37: “Presumably we are dealing with an anonymous piece of floating tradition. Its prosodic pattern differs from that of the body of Hannah’s Song and, as well, from the surrounding material in Jeremiah 9.”

54. See also the question of comparability in 1 Sam 2:2/Jer 10:6–7; כח in 1 Sam 2:9/Jer 1:12; חחח in 1 Sam 2:10/Jer 8:9; 10:2.

55. Tov (“Different Editions,” 450 n. 49) refers to Isaac Seligmann (*Studies in Biblical Literature*, ed. A. Hurvitz et al. [Jerusalem: Magnes, 1992], 325–26), who believes that the version of 1 Sam 2 is original and that the Hebrew reading of Jer 9 is derived from it and secondary. When we consider the saying in the two versions as such, this makes sense. In my opinion, however, the context speaks more in favor of the direction of tradition as suggested above.

56. Tov finds the placement “inappropriate” and because of this considers a marginal note, which had been integrated incorrectly (“Different Editions,” 199, 452). This is of course a possibility and cannot be excluded with absolute certainty.

uel in 1 Sam 2 secondarily and was enhanced by textual supplementation either beforehand, in the process, or—which is more likely—after its incorporation.

The basic text begins with a supplicant's call to praise God and the triumph over enemies and rescue (v. 1). The following praise comprises three sections, where the first and third sections form a frame around the middle, second section: (1) the juxtaposition of the incomparable God and the proud enemies (vv. 2–3); (2) a hymn to the God who humiliates the strong and brings honor to the weak (vv. 4–8a); (3) the conclusion, which makes reference to the supplicant's call to praise and the first section and juxtaposes God's dealings with his enemies and the ends of the earth, on the one hand, and with his king and anointed, on the other (vv. 9b, 10).

From the conclusion in v. 10 the text reveals itself to be a psalm about or maybe even of a king (*Königpsalm*): it extols the victory of the Lord (Yhwh) over the supplicant's enemies and ends in an intercession for Yhwh's king and anointed one, who might be identical with the supplicant.⁵⁷ Comparing v. 1b with v. 10, it is clear that the supplicant's (king's) enemies are also God's enemies, although it is not clear in v. 10 whether it concerns the opponents of the aforementioned human being (the "man" in v. 9b) or the opponents of Yhwh.⁵⁸ This ambiguity was probably the reason for the additions, which underline the superiority, uniqueness, and holiness of God, on the one hand (vv. 2, 8b, 10), and, on the other hand, make a distinction between the pious and the wicked (vv. 9a, 10). A further plus appears to have emphasized the idea of retribution for the enemies' injustice (v. 10a² in 4Q51). In light of these additions, any statements about the power of God and the salvation of the supplicant, or about the intervention of God for the weak, refer to the righteous and pious, and all statements about the enemies of the supplicant and of Yhwh refer to the wicked. The supplicant thus becomes a prayer leader for the righteous and pious ones.

The additions follow two complementary trends: they universalize and theologize the psalm. The additions identify the judge (v. 10) with the creator of the world (v. 8b); furthermore, they refer the conflict of the supplicant (maybe the king) with his enemies in vv. 1–3, 10 and the com-

57. If the supplicant (speaking in the first person singular) is the king, in v. 10 he speaks about himself or the intercession is spoken by someone else as a kind of response; cf. Ps 18:30–50, 51. The complex composition history of Ps 18 consisting of at least three different layers (vv. 4–20, thanksgiving hymn of an individual including a depiction of Yhwh's theophany; vv. 33–51, thanksgiving hymn of a king; vv. 21–32, theological reflections connecting the two thanksgiving hymns) is in many respects similar to the composition of the Song of Hannah.

58. See Aejmelaeus, "Hannah's Psalm," 25.

plementary opposites, which in vv. 4–8a describe the sovereign acts of God, to the confrontation of two theologically qualified, clearly defined parties, the righteous and the wicked. In v. 9 a further intention was to align the psalm with the narrative context in which it entered secondarily. This has led to certain changes at the edges as well as in the narrative itself (1 Sam 1:28/2:1, 11).

Finally, the external evidence also suggests a further assumption, with which we leave the empirical level and turn to the field of internal indications for textual supplementation. As has already been mentioned several times, it is striking that the text-critical problems and the additions cluster in the framing passages in vv. 1–3, 8b–10, where the text varies greatly. In contrast, the central passage in vv. 4–8a is relatively stable. If we disregard the additions indicated by the external evidence and more closely consider the basic text that remains, it becomes clear that vv. 1–3 and 9b–10 also differ in formal and conceptual aspects from the body of the psalm in vv. 4–8a. While vv. 4–8a make general statements about God's actions to man, such as reversing the usual conditions, humiliating the strong and honoring the weak, killing and restoring life, and so on, the framing verses concern the fate of an individual—the king and anointed—and his enemies.

For this reason, I tend to believe that the basic text reconstructed so far on the basis of the external evidence also has a literary history that reaches further back. I see the core in God's statements in vv. 4–8a, an earlier piece of tradition that was related to the king and his enemies secondarily in vv. 1–3 and 9b–10. The starting point was probably the context in vv. 4 and 8b, which use political images that, in the earlier part of the psalm, are examples of the reversal of conditions and, in the framing passages, were related to the king and the actual political domain.

Whether the interpretation and supplementation of the traditional passage were made before or during the insertion into the narrative context of 1 Samuel is hard to say. I suspect the former, since the theme of the king does not fit that well into the context. A later chapter in Samuel–Kings would have been more suitable for this theme. But we cannot of course exclude the other alternative since Hannah, when all is said and done, does give birth to Samuel, the kingmaker. But I suspect that the evidence for the insertion of the psalm in the context was more likely to have been the statement in v. 5b, which best describes Hannah: עקרה ילדה (עד-שבועה).

To conclude this section, I reproduce the different literary layers of the psalm according to the internal and external evidence in a relative chronological order (from the right to left):

External evidence

Internal Evidence

1:28b/2:1 ... וישתחו שם ליהוה ותתפלל חנה ותאמר

... ותעזב[הו שם ותשתח]ו ליהוה ותאמר[

1a עלץ לבי ביהוה רמה קרני ביהוה (באלהי)

1b רחב פי על־אויבי (כי) שמחתי בישועת(ך)

2 (כי) אין־קדוש כיהוה ... ואין צור כאלהינו

[4Q51 + ?] כי אין (קדוש) בלתיך

3a אל־תרבו תדברו גבהה גבהה (אל־) יצא עתק מפיכם

3b כי אל דעות (דעת) יהוה ולא [ולו] נתכנו עללות (ואל תוכן עללותיו)

4 קשת גברים חתים (חתה) ונכשלים אזרו חיל

5a שבעים בלחם נשכרו ורעבים חדלו (עד)

5b (עד־) עקרה ילדה שבעה ורבת בניס אמללה

6 יהוה ממית ומחיה מוריד שאול ויעל

7 יהוה מוריש ומעשיר משפיל אף־מרומם

8a מקים מעפר דל מאשפת ירים אביון

להושיב עם־נדיבים וכסא כבוד ינחלם

8b כי ליהוה מצקי ארץ וישת עליהם תבל

9a רגלי (ו/ודרך) חסידו [חסידיו] ישמר ורשעים

בחשך ידמו

נתן נד[ר] ל[גוד]ר ויברך ש[נות צדיק]...

9b כִּי־לֹא בִכְחַ יִגְבְּרֵ־אִישׁ

10a יהוה יחתו (יחת) מריבו [מריביו]

a¹ מי ק[דוש כיהוה --]

a² [--]תם בשלמ[ם] -- אל יתהלל חכם]

a³ [בחכמתו] ואל ית[ה]ל[ל] הגבור

בגבורתו ואל יתהלל עשיר]

a⁴ [בעשרו כי בזאת יתהלל המתהלל השכל]

וידע את יהוה

a⁵ [ולעשו]ת מש[פט] וצדקה בתוך הארץ]

עלו [עליו] בשמים ירעם

10ayb יהוה ידין אפסי־ארץ ויתן־עז למלכו וירם קרן משיחו

[יהוה עלה בשמים] וירעם הוא/יהוה ידין ...

2:11 וילך אלקנה הרמתה על־ביתו ...

Καὶ κατέλιπον αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀρμαθαιμ ...

6. External and Internal Evidence

In this last section, I would like to address the question of what we learn from the external evidence for identifying textual supplementations in texts for which we have no or very little empirical evidence and must therefore depend entirely on internal evidence. A kind of test question

here could be whether, in the Song of Hannah, we could come to the same conclusion without external evidence that we reached with our comparison of the versions.

The example of the Song of Hannah has taught us that we need to distinguish different types of changes in a text: orthographic variations, scribal errors, textual variants, pluses or minuses. Orthographic variations and scribal errors can be detected and identified without external evidence. For the textual variants we need the external evidence. Without this evidence we would have missed these changes. Yet at each step we must expect all these phenomena in any text right from the beginning. Examples of textual supplementation can also be found in the scribal errors and variations, albeit to a limited extent. Without external evidence we would only notice it when, as in 1 Sam 1:28 or 2:5, it has led to a disruption of the text or a recognizable error and we have the revised text before us. If, however, as in the case v. 10 (עלה ... וירעם and עלו [עלין] ... ירעם), the transitions of textual supplementation have been adjusted, we would probably not notice the variant or amendment. However, a trained eye would not miss the insertion itself, which is recognizable by the *Wiederaufnahme* of the subject.

The clearest traces of textual supplementation are undoubtedly the pluses and minuses in a text, for which there is empirical evidence. But even this evidence is far from clear. In each case, we must consider whether we are dealing with a loss of text or an extension. For (mechanical or deliberate) text loss in the Song of Hannah—contrary to the usual explanation in DJD 17 and McCarter's commentary—no sufficient evidence has been found. But this does not mean that this phenomenon did not occur. Text loss by homoioteleuton and the like, or by a deliberate omission, is documented in manuscripts and parallel versions (rewritings). But text loss must be clearly recognizable and must be able to be accounted for as such. Where this is not the case, we need to think of textual supplementation as being more likely.

Textual supplementation is indicated in particular when without the plus the text ends join each other smoothly or when the plus interrupts or disturbs the flow of a text, its syntax, or its train of thought. This is the case with our example in vv. 2 (כי אין בלתיך), 8b, 9, and 10. If we only had the amended text and not a text without the plus, we would certainly have been able to find stylistic, poetic, narratological, or theological reasons for the originality of the interruption or disturbance of the text flow. The external evidence, however, proves that such interruptions or disturbances can just as well be based on text growth. An experienced and astute literary critic would have identified the text components in question as a plus even without the empirical evidence. Moreover, he or she would also have separated vv. 1–3 and 9–10 from the core of the psalm in vv. 4–8a.

Theoretically, mechanical text loss can also indicate textual supplementation, namely, when the plus has been inserted by the technique of *Wiederaufnahme* and has led to an *aberratio oculi* with the next scribe. Such a case would be conceivable for v. 10, if the short text in the MT offered the wording of the LXX and 4Q51: /יהוה יחת מריבו יהוה עלה בשמים וירעם הוא/. יהוה ידן. Text loss, even if it can be detected by external evidence, does not automatically lead us to the original text, but only to the text that preceded the scribal error. There is no definite proof of which option, text loss or growth, applies, not even in cases where we know several versions. Like internal evidence, external evidence is ambiguous and needs interpretation. The generally accepted rule of textual and literary criticism applies here, namely, that preference should be given to the explanation that is the simplest and can most easily be accounted for.

External evidence is also revealing with regard to the quantity of possible layers. In the Song of Hannah, pluses and minuses have led us to at least three literary layers: the basic text, a series of supplementations, and the narrative context. Indeed, there are many more layers if we take into account the scribal errors and variants as well as the differentiation of the supplementations, which, as the evidence in 1 Sam 2:9 shows, do not all lie on one level. Furthermore, there are indications in the external evidence of a further differentiation in the basic text according to internal criteria. The current trend in scholarship to distinguish no more than two or three literary layers in a text thus proves to be false and inappropriate given the complexity of the texts. The extent to which we can determine all the layers is debatable. But the external evidence teaches us that we must assume more rather than fewer layers, even if—with or without external evidence—we miss many in the analysis.

Finally, this example has taught us that, with the manifold changes in the tradition, we are dealing with very different tendencies. We must not expect that textual supplementation always pursues special conceptual or theological interests. Often the scribes were simply concerned to deliver the best or most complete text, which is why they included variants or pluses from other manuscripts in their copy. The manuscript 4Q51 is a good example. Frequently encountered motives for changes are the clarification of the content, the emphasis of statements, and the smoothing or conciliation of contradictions. Occasionally, however, we also find that in textual supplementations importance is given to weighty substantive concerns of the scribe, as shown by the theologizing tendency of the additions in the Song of Hannah. Typical of textual supplementations are universalistic statements about God and the distinction between the pious and the wicked, which theologically and sociologically reinterpret the conflict of the supplicant with his enemies. Another pattern that we observe frequently is that supplementation is provoked by certain statements in a text and points them in a new direction or updates or deepens them.

For literary criticism, this means that differences in tendency should be taken very seriously as evidence of possible textual supplementation, even if there is no interruption or disturbance of the text. Furthermore, in view of the external evidence, we will also pay attention in the internal analysis to less spectacular phenomena, such as clarifications, repetition, harmonization or ulterior motives and must consider these as evidence of textual growth. Even if they do not disturb the text and in the opinion of some exegetes belong to the poetics or narratology style of ancient Hebrew literature, external evidence proves that such phenomena are often the result of textual supplementation. In order to contest disagreeable analyses and hold on to the originality of complex text structures, general methodological or stylistic arguments are not enough.

To demonstrate what an internal analysis of the Psalms looks like, based on the criteria of external evidence, I would like to touch on a few psalms dealt with in detail elsewhere.⁵⁹

Psalm 29: (I) The voice of the weather god, Yhwh over the waters, in the woods, in the desert (vv. 3–9a); (II) Yhwh and the heavenly council (vv. 1–2, 3b, 9b); (III) The people of God (vv. 10–11); (IV) Superscription (v. 1).

Psalm 93: (I) Yhwh-Yam (vv. 3–4); (II) Yhwh-Malak (vv. 1, 5b); (III) Confession and Torah piety (vv. 2, 5a; cf. Ps 19:8; 90:2).

Psalm 97: (I) Theophany of the weather god (vv. 2, 3–5) and Yhwh's enthronement (vv. 1, 2b, 6a, 7b, 9); (II) Peoples and Zion (vv. 6b, 8); (III) Polemic against idolatry (v. 8); (IV) The righteous and the wicked (vv. 10–12).

Psalm 104: (I) Weather god (vv. 1a, 2b, 3–4, 10a, 13a, 14b, 15, 32–33); (II) Sun god (vv. 1b, 2a, 10b–12, 13b, 14a, 20–24a, 24c, 25a, 26a, 27–29a, 30–31, 34); (III) Creator god (vv. 5–9, 16–19, 24b, 25b, 26b, 29b); (IV) Sinners and wicked (v. 35).

Psalm 118: (I) Todah formula (vv. 14, 17–19, 21, 28) and expansions (vv. 15–16); (II) Collective festival hymn (vv. 1–4, 22–27, 29); (III) Trust in God and the righteous ones (vv. 6–13, 15b, 20).

For these examples, too, external evidence is available, albeit it is of a very different kind. The evidence is the religious historical analogies from Syria and Palestine, Mesopotamia and Egypt. These analogies represent the standards on which the literary-critical analysis of the Psalms must

59. See Reinhard G. Kratz, "Gottesräume: Ein Beitrag zur Frage des biblischen Weltbildes," in *Mythos und Geschichte*, 125–40; and, in the same volume, "Der Mythos vom Königtum Gottes in Kanaan und Israel," 141–55; and "Reste hebräischen Heidentums am Beispiel der Psalmen," 156–89.

be measured. The stages of Israelite-Judean religious history can be read in the Psalms in the interaction of religio-historical comparison and literary-critical analysis.⁶⁰

In the oldest stratum of these texts, Yhwh appears in the role of the weather god Baal. Gradually the weather god assumes the traits of the king of the gods, El, the Egyptian sun god, and the Mesopotamian god of creation. Further textual supplementations give the psalms a typical biblical veneer. The dominant tendencies are the same in many respects as what we saw in the Song of Hannah. They can be summarized under the key words of *universalization*, *nationalization*, and *individualization* (or *theologization*) and include issues such as the rule over all nations, monotheism and polemics against idolatry, the relationship of Yhwh to his people (Israel, Zion), the distinction between the righteous and the wicked in God's people, and Torah piety. The literary technique of textual supplementation is the same as what we witness in the Song of Hannah, and the internal analysis of the Psalms evidences nothing that has not also been encountered in the external evidence.

60. See Hermann Spieckermann, *Heilsgegenwart: Eine Theologie der Psalmen*, FRLANT 148 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989); followed and developed by Kratz (see n. 59) and Reinhard Müller, *Jahwe als Wettergott: Studien zur althebräischen Kultlyrik anhand ausgewählter Psalmen*, BZAW 387 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).