

Elijah (EGL 2022)  
© E Bruce Brooks, 2022

### HANDOUT: STYLOMETRIC TABLES

1. Are these stories stylistically close? Here are the BIRD<sup>1</sup> results:

<i>Elijah</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>J</i>
	125	199	174	328	356	248	129	175	250	96
<i>A</i>	~	0.63	0.60	0.72	0.51	0.73	0.67	0.59	0.77	0.70
<i>B</i>	0.63	~	0.85	0.48	0.57	0.81	0.40	0.67	0.36	0.66
<i>C</i>	0.60	0.85	~	0.59	0.65	0.50	0.62	0.63	0.76	0.59
<i>D</i>	0.72	0.48	0.59	~	0.70	0.80	0.62	0.59	0.29	0.52
<i>E</i>	0.51	0.57	0.65	0.70	~	0.46	0.55	0.58	0.69	0.74
<i>F</i>	0.73	0.81	0.50	0.80	0.46	~	0.58	0.69	0.70	0.58
<i>G</i>	0.67	0.40	0.62	0.62	0.55	0.58	~	0.47	0.58	0.49
<i>H</i>	0.59	0.67	0.63	0.59	0.58	0.69	0.47	~	0.62	0.53
<i>I</i>	0.77	0.36	0.76	0.29	0.69	0.70	0.58	0.62	~	0.46
<i>J</i>	0.70	0.66	0.59	0.52	0.74	0.58	0.49	0.53	0.46	~

2. With some small adjustments, we get:

<i>Elijah</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>Ir</i>	<i>J</i>
	125	199	174	328	356	248	129	175	177	96
<i>A</i>	~	0.63	0.60	0.72	0.51	0.73	0.67	0.59	0.69	0.70
<i>B</i>	0.63	~	0.85	0.48	0.57	0.81	0.40	0.67	0.55	0.66
<i>C</i>	0.60	0.85	~	0.59	0.65	0.50	0.62	0.63	0.72	0.59
<i>D</i>	0.72	0.48	0.59	~	0.70	0.80	0.62	0.59	0.35	0.52
<i>E</i>	0.51	0.57	0.65	0.70	~	0.46	0.55	0.58	0.75	0.74
<i>F</i>	0.73	0.81	0.50	0.80	0.46	~	0.58	0.69	0.72	0.58
<i>G</i>	0.67	0.40	0.62	0.62	0.55	0.58	~	0.47	0.67	0.49
<i>H</i>	0.59	0.67	0.63	0.59	0.58	0.69	0.47	~	0.55	0.53
<i>Ir</i>	0.69	0.55	0.72	0.35	0.75	0.72	0.67	0.55	~	0.44
<i>J</i>	0.70	0.66	0.59	0.52	0.74	0.58	0.49	0.53	0.44	~

<sup>1</sup>See Brooks **Hebrew**. BIRD results are D (difference) numbers. **Low** values (0.50 or less) imply narrative continuity, or an author thinking of another piece. **Normal** values (0.51 to 0.75) might be separate chapters in a work; that level of similarity is easily reached by a second author. **High** values (0.76 to 0.99) imply increasing doubt about same source; **Extreme** values (1.00 or above) are prohibitive for that conclusion.

3. Omitting the seemingly aberrant C, we have the following picture . . .

<i>Elijah</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>H</i>	<i>Ir</i>	<i>J</i>
	125	199	328	356	248	129	175	177	96
<i>A</i>	~	0.63	0.72	0.51	0.73	0.67	0.59	0.69	0.70
<i>B</i>	0.63	~	0.48	0.57	0.81	0.40	0.67	0.55	0.66
<i>D</i>	0.72	0.48	~	0.70	0.80	0.62	0.59	0.35	0.52
<i>E</i>	0.51	0.57	0.70	~	0.46	0.55	0.58	0.75	0.74
<i>F</i>	0.73	0.81	0.80	0.46	~	0.58	0.69	0.72	0.58
<i>G</i>	0.67	0.40	0.62	0.55	0.58	~	0.47	0.67	0.49
<i>H</i>	0.59	0.67	0.59	0.58	0.69	0.47	~	0.55	0.53
<i>Ir</i>	0.69	0.55	0.35	0.75	0.72	0.67	0.55	~	0.44
<i>J</i>	0.70	0.66	0.52	0.74	0.58	0.49	0.53	0.44	~

. . . where the elite narrative shows significantly greater continuity. The Kings version is then an elite narrative, based on, but only at one point preserving the original character of, excerpts from a popular tradition.