

CHAPTER 2

RECONSTRUCTING ARCHETYPICAL SECONDARY WITNESSES

Method for Reconstruction

Ideally, the steps of the model just described would be applied to each particular versional tradition to determine as nearly as possible the original text. However, that task is beyond the scope of the present study, so traditional methods alone will be employed to determine a standard text for each tradition. This step is particularly important for those versions that do not have critical texts (e.g., the Cambridge edition of LXX, which prints a diplomatic text), but the variants in those traditions with critical texts will also be checked. First, though, a brief textual history of the four secondary witnesses will be given in order to ascertain the relationships of these witnesses to one another and to MT.¹

LXX has the most complex textual history of the secondary witnesses. It also exhibits both the greatest number of witnesses and the greatest number of variants within the tradition. The term LXX is often used rather loosely. Though it originally referred to a particular translation of the Pentateuch, it was extended to include the Greek translation of the other books in the OT. Herein lies the problem, for not *one*, but *many* different Greek versions existed in the ancient world. Though Paul Kahle proposed the theory that various Greek “targums,” in use among different Jewish communities, lay behind the main LXX tradition,² the theory that won the day was that of Paul de Lagarde, who proposed a single original translation of the Hebrew, from which the different Greek traditions developed.³

¹Johann Cook, “Die pluraliteit van ou-testamentiese tekste en eksegetiese metodologie,” paper presented at the annual meeting of Die Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap van Suid-Afrika, 1988, pp. 1-2, stresses the importance of having a grasp of the history of the text before textual criticism (or exegesis) is undertaken:

[n tekshistoriese perspektiewe] kan enersyds die gevolg wees van bepaalde teoretiese uitgangspunte waarvolgens die tekskritiek, die wetenskaplike dissipline war oa gerig is op die ontstaans- en teksgeskiedenis van bepaalde tekste, tot bepaalde voorarbeid beperk word. . . . Andersyds, let 'n oordrewe klem op die finale vorm van die teks (die sg. strukturele metode) en/of op die uitweking van die teks op die ontvanger van die boodskap van die teks (resepsie-kritiek) tot 'n onderwaardering van die tekstuele sy van die teks.

²Paul E. Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 132-79. His first statement of his theory was in idem, “Untersuchungen zur Geshichte des Pentateuchtextes,” *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 88 (1915): 399-439.

³For a discussion of Lagarde’s views, see Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968; repr., Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1989), 5-9. It is better to

Lagarde believed that three recensions of LXX existed by the third century C.E.—associated with the names of Origen, Lucian, and Hesychius—and that all extant mss of LXX present mixed texts, preserving readings from all of these recensions. Many modern scholars question the existence of a Hesychian text, though they accept the Origenic (Hexaplaric) and Lucianic texts.

The focus of many modern discussions of the history of LXX is the recovery of the Old Greek (OG) text, the original LXX that lies behind all existing mss. Though no single ms is believed to contain a perfect OG text, those that show little evidence of Hexaplaric or Lucianic readings are believed to be fairly good representatives of it. A problem arises, however, in the text of the four books of Kingdoms in LXX (i.e., Samuel and Kings in MT). Henry St. John Thackeray demonstrated that the text of the major uncial mss was not uniform throughout these books, but represented a mixture of two different Greek versions.⁴ He divided the books into the following sections: α (1 Kingdoms), ββ (2 Kgdms 1:1-9:13), βγ (2 Kgdms 10:1-3 Kgdms 2:11), γγ (3 Kgdms 2:12-21:29), and γδ (3 Kgdms 22:1-4 Kgdms 25:30). Sections α, ββ, and γγ he identified as authentic OG sections. Sections βγ and γδ represented another version with different characteristics.⁵ Barthélemy built on Thackeray's theory with evidence from a ms found at Nahal Hever by suggesting that the sections βγ and γδ do not contain a Greek translation independent of OG but rather a revision of OG, called the *kaige* recension.⁶ He later modified his view somewhat under the influence of studies by Robert A. Kraft and Sebastian Brock, suggesting that another layer of revision, which is sometimes called proto-Lucian, probably underlay the *kaige* recension. The *kaige* text in turn was the basis for the versions of Aquila (α'), Symmachus (σ'), and Theodotion (θ').⁷ As its name indicates, proto-Lucian is a layer of the text that many scholars find underneath the Lucianic

speak of original *translations* of LXX, since different translators were responsible for the various books.

⁴Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 2d ed. (London: Oxford University Press, 1923).

⁵R. W. Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 25. The use of the LXX title Kingdoms instead of the Hebrew Samuel and Kings explains the names Thackeray gave to the sections; the Greek letters represent their numerical values, e.g., βγ contains parts of 2 and 3 Kingdoms. Thackeray dates the Old Greek sections to the late second century B.C.E. and the *kaige* sections to sometime after the turn of the era; Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 1, *Introduction, Orthography and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1978), ix.

⁶Barthélemy, *Devanciers d'Aquila*, 126-27. The *kaige* recension is sometimes called proto-Theodotion or *kaige*-Theodotion; *ibid.*, 144-57.

⁷Idem, "Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11,2 - 1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des 'Devanciers d'Aquila,'" in *1972 Proceedings*, ed. Kraft, 28. The reviews of his book by Kraft and Brock are: Robert A. Kraft, review of *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, by Dominique Barthélemy, in *Gnomon* 37 (1965): 474-83; Sebastian P. Brock, "Lucian *Redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les devanciers d'Aquila*," *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968): 176-81. This view is further developed in the commentaries by McCarter and Klein, as well as in numerous other studies.

readings, itself a revision of OG.⁸

The importance of these finds to the present study is that they show the importance of the Lucianic text-tradition (mss boc_2e_2 in the Cambridge edition) as an independent witness to an early form of the Hebrew text. This summary of the history of the Greek text has been necessarily brief, since what is of primary importance here is the relationship of the various Greek witnesses to their Hebrew *Vorlagen*.⁹ Aside from OG itself, (proto-)Lucianic readings that are revisions of OG toward a Hebrew text will be important, especially since it has been shown that this Hebrew text had substantial differences from the later MT.¹⁰ Similarly, though Origen (LXX^O), α' , σ' , and θ' all revised their Greek texts toward a Hebrew text very similar to MT, they will be examined to see if their respective Hebrew exemplars varied at all from it. All the readings from Greek witnesses outside the OG tradition will be considered partial secondary witnesses, since they are not independent translations of their Hebrew exemplars.

Unlike the textual history of LXX, on which scholars exhibit general agreement, that of P is hotly debated. The date, provenance, and translators of P are all contested issues. These issues, however, are closely related to one another. Scholars who see a Jewish origin for P believe that it was first used in the province of Adiabene, on the border of the Roman Empire, in the middle of the first Christian century. The rulers of Adiabene had been converted to Judaism about 40 C.E. and needed a translation of the Bible. Other scholars posit a Jewish-Christian origin for P, also in Adiabene, but somewhat later, when missionaries first reached the area with the gospel. Still others place the origin of the version in Edessa, the most important city in Syria (outside of Antioch, which was largely Greek). Some Syriac traditions point to a Christian origin for P in Edessa. The discovery of two Old Syriac gospels has also raised the issue of whether P in the OT also had an Old Syriac predecessor.¹¹

The resolution of these issues also involves identifying the type of text from which

⁸Natalio Fernández Marcos, "The Lucianic Text in the Book of Kingdoms," in *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honor of John William Wevers on His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. A. Pietersma and C. Cox (Mississauga, ON: Benben, 1984), 166-71; Sebastian P. Brock, "The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel," D.Phil. diss., Oxford University, 1966. Tov expresses doubts that a separate proto-Lucian can be distinguished from Lucian, believing instead that Lucian itself is a direct revision of OG; Emanuel Tov, "Lucian and Proto-Lucian," *Revue biblique* 83 (1976): 51-54.

⁹For a fuller discussion of the Greek text, see James Donald Shenkel, *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 1 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 5-21.

¹⁰Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 257-59.

¹¹*IDB*, Supplementary Volume [hereafter *IDBS*], s.v. "Syriac Versions," by A. Vööbus, 848-49; Bleddyn J. Roberts, *The Old Testament Text and Versions* (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1951), 217-23; *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk*, s.v. "Bibeln," by C.-M. Edsman, col. 256; *ibid.*, s.v. "Gamla Testamentet," by Ivan Engnell, col. 654; J. B. Segal, *Edessa: The Blessed City* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970), 42-43, 165.

P was translated. Several scholars have noted parallels between P and T, both in language (Western Aramaic elements embedded in the Eastern Aramaic version) and content (certain shared deviations from other witnesses), and have concluded that P was originally transcribed into Syriac from a Western Aramaic Palestinian targum. Subsequently, the text was brought more and more into conformity with the proto-MT tradition. However, not all scholars have accepted this reconstruction of P's textual history. M. D. Koster, in his study of P in Exodus, comes to the conclusion that P was originally translated from a Hebrew text similar to MT; it was only later that targumic additions were made to the text. Both M. J. Mulder and Johann Cook support Koster's position, explaining that similarities between P and T might come from a shared Jewish exegetical tradition, rather than direct influence of T on P. Another theory, which stands in the middle of these two, is proposed by Alexander Sperber. He believes that a real textual connection between P and Targum Onkelos does exist, but rather than seeing P as a revision of a Palestinian targum stripped of its paraphrases, he says that both P and Onkelos derive from a common ancestor, and the characteristic targumic paraphrases are later additions to the targum tradition.¹² The question must be said to be still unresolved, particularly with regard to 1 Samuel, since recent studies have focused on the Pentateuch.

One other note about the text of P must be addressed, namely, its relationship with LXX. The text of P has often been denigrated as being of little value to the textual critic. Since readings shared with LXX have been seen as the result of the influence of LXX on P, readings in P have only been considered valuable in conjunction with LXX. However, Cook points out that though LXX did influence P to some extent, its influence has been greatly overestimated in the past.¹³ Mulder goes even farther, asserting the essential independence of LXX and P.¹⁴ In this study, each reading of P will be examined individually in order to determine its relationship with other versions and, more importantly, the likelihood that it is a witness to an independent Hebrew reading in certain places.

¹²A. Vööbus, "Der Einfluss des altpalästinischen Targums in der Textgeschichte der Peschitta des Alten Testament," *Le muséon* 68 (1955): 215-18; Paul E. Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 272-73; M. D. Koster, *The Peshitta of Exodus: The Development of Its Text in the Course of Fifteen Centuries*, *Studia Semitica Neerlandica*, no. 19 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1977); idem, "Which Came First: The Chicken or the Egg? The Development of the Text of the Peshitta of Genesis and Exodus in the Light of Recent Studies," in *The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History. Papers Read at the Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden 30-31 August 1985*, ed. P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder, 147-68, *Monographs of the Peshitta Institute*, Leiden, no. 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988), 99-126; M. J. Mulder, "The Use of the Peshitta in Textual Criticism," in *La Septuaginta*, ed. Fernández Marcos, 52; Johann Cook, "The Composition of the Peshitta Version of the Old Testament (Pentateuch)," in *The Peshitta: Its Early Text and History. Papers Read at the Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden 30-31 August 1985*, ed. P. B. Dirksen and M. J. Mulder, 147-68, *Monographs of the Peshitta Institute*, Leiden, no. 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1988), 153-59; Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:409-17.

¹³Johann Cook, "Composition of the Peshitta," 159.

¹⁴Mulder, "Use of the Peshitta," 53.

The various targums have long traditions lying behind their commitment to parchment or papyrus. Oral renderings of the OT in Aramaic probably originated in the synagogue at a time when the general populace no longer understood Hebrew.¹⁵ The *meturgemanîn* (translators) were careful to preserve traditional interpretations of the texts, but, as is clear from a comparison of the targums to the Pentateuch (Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, Neofiti, the Fragmentary targums, and the fragments from the Cairo Geniza), conflicting renderings did develop in different places and at different times. The state of affairs with Targum Jonathan is somewhat different from that of the targums to the Pentateuch. It is the only Aramaic targum preserved in the prophets (except for a number of fragments and glosses), though many scholars believe that Palestinian targums of this material once existed as in the Pentateuch. Jonathan, like Onkelos, attained its final form in Babylonia and served as the official targum of the books it contained. The wording of Jonathan was definitively established sometime in the fifth century after a long and complex history.¹⁶ Though many of the traditions underlying Jonathan antedate the choice of the proto-Masoretic tradition as the official text for all Judaism about 100 C.E., it was revised toward that official tradition, so that few variations from MT remain. Because of this revision, though, any variations that do remain will be important if it can be shown that they probably reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from MT.

The textual history of V is probably the least complicated and controversial of all the secondary witnesses, though it is not as simple as it might appear at first glance. Jerome was commissioned by Pope Damasus I to produce a Latin version of the Bible about 382. His translation proceeded in two steps. First, he revised existing Old Latin texts according to the Greek text of Origen. Dissatisfied with this initial effort, he then began to translate the entire OT directly from the Hebrew, and the end result was V. Since the Hebrew text Jerome used as the basis for this second translation was very similar to the present MT, it might seem as though the textual history of V were straightforward and that V would be of little use as an independent witness to the text. However, the situation is somewhat more complicated. In the first place, the scribes who transmitted the text of V were often less than faithful copyists, frequently mixing various *it* readings into their texts (not to mention numerous scribal errors). As a result, comprehensive revisions of the text began before V had supplanted *it* as the preferred Latin version. The most important early revisions are associated with the names of Cassiodorus (sixth century), Alcuin (eighth century), and Theodulf (eighth century).¹⁷

¹⁵On the basis of fragments of Palestinian targums from the Cairo Geniza, Kahle states that a targum existed in Palestine by the second century B.C.E. at the latest; Paul E. Kahle, *Cairo Geniza*, 207.

¹⁶Würthwein, *Text of OT*, 78; B. J. Roberts, *OT Text and Versions*, 207-9.

¹⁷*IDB*, s.v., "Versions, Ancient," by Bruce Manning Metzger, 752-53; B. J. Roberts, *OT Text and Versions*, 259-60; Fischer, *Biblia Sacra Stuttgartensia*, 1: xx-xxi.

As Metzger notes, “the more than eight thousand MSS of the Vulg. known today exhibit the greatest degree of bewildering cross-contamination of textual type.”¹⁸ Thus, before V can be consulted, a relatively pristine form of the text must be produced, either by Quentin’s method (see below, p. 66**) or by some other. Another problem is the identity of the sources of the various readings Jerome used in V. Though he attained a good knowledge of Hebrew, he himself admitted in letters to friends that he frequently consulted with rabbis in the vicinity of Bethlehem (where he was working on his translation). This contact accounts for some similarities between V and T. He also had access to Origen’s Hexapla and to mss of the secondary Greek versions, and he often relied on them to clarify a difficulty. Finally, the various *it* versions (no official *it* version ever existed) undoubtedly played a strong role in his decisions.¹⁹ Thus, the textual affiliations of V are quite complex, and agreements between V and other ancient versions must be considered carefully before one can conclude that a Hebrew text different from MT lies behind a reading in V.²⁰ Nevertheless, a reading in V that supports that of another witness at least testifies to the authenticity of that reading in the fifth century, and an independent reading is of great value. Further research would be necessary to see where and to what extent each of the versions mentioned influenced Jerome’s text.

Now that the history of the text of each of the secondary witnesses has been reviewed, a method for reconstructing their texts can be stated briefly. For the text of those witnesses that do not have an eclectic critical text (i.e., LXX, P, and T), each variant given in the critical apparatus of the diplomatic text will be evaluated to see if it is preferable to that of the basic text. This evaluation will be done primarily on intrinsic grounds, though extrinsic grounds will be a factor in some cases. Other editions of the version will also be consulted where appropriate, especially in the case of LXX. The text of V, which has two eclectic critical texts, will be easier, since the variants have already been evaluated. Nevertheless, all the variants in the critical apparatuses will be checked again, and the two critical editions of the text will be compared with one another, to see if any differences in evaluation have been made.

Finally, the partial secondary witnesses will be presented in fragmentary form. All attested readings from α' , σ' , and θ' will be presented. In the case of LXX^O, only those readings that deviate from both MT and OG will be evaluated. The entire text of LXX^L will be reconstructed, but only those readings that vary from OG will be considered in Chapter 3. The full analysis applied to the complete secondary witnesses will not be done for the partial secondary witnesses. Instead, their variants will be evaluated in a more

¹⁸Metzger, “Versions, Ancient”, 753.

¹⁹Ibid.; Würthwein, *Text of OT*, 92-93.

²⁰Friedrich Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel: Ein Handbuch für Vorlesungen und Selbstunterricht*, (Paderborn, Germany: F. Schöningh, 1928), 123; cited in Würthwein, *Text of OT*, 93.

traditional way.²¹

Location of Textual Data

The primary source for the textual data of LXX will be the text and apparatus of the Cambridge edition, but Rahlfs's smaller edition will be considered as well, especially since Rahlfs makes a preliminary attempt to create a more eclectic text. The editions of LXX edited by Holmes and Parsons and by Swete will also be checked.²² Variant readings from the daughter versions of LXX will be drawn primarily from the critical apparatus in the Cambridge edition, though several of them will be checked to determine the accuracy of citation; however, only secondary text-traditions will be analyzed in detail.

The Leiden edition of P provides a diplomatic text of P, along with a critical apparatus. This will be the text of P used in the study.

Sperber's edition of T presents the text of one ms as the basic text, with other readings in the apparatus, and it will serve as the text of T for this study. Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini, in the introduction to their translation of T, note the variation present in the different mss of T, saying that "the individual manuscripts of what we call *Targum Jonathan* tend almost to constitute separate works."²³ Many of these variations, though, are simply haggadic or halakic expansions, so are of little value in indicating the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

V is the only secondary witness published as an eclectic critical text, so the basic text has already been evaluated by scholars and determined to be as close as possible to the original. Thus, little reconstruction need be done, except to evaluate the variants presented in the apparatus and to compare the critical edition from the Abbey of St. Jerome with the Stuttgart version, which does have some variations in both the basic text and in the apparatus.

For the partial secondary witnesses, the readings of α' , σ' , and θ' will be culled from both Field's edition and the apparatus of the Cambridge LXX. The readings of

²¹The importance of the partial secondary witnesses for reconstructing the text of the OT may be seen in Driver's comment on the Lucianic text: "Whether these renderings were derived by him from MSS. of the LXX of which all other traces have disappeared, or whether they were based directly upon Hebrew MSS. which had preserved the genuine reading intact, . . . is a matter of subordinate moment: the fact remains that Lucian's recension contains elements resting ultimately upon Hebrew sources, which enable us to correct, with absolute certainty, corrupt passages of the Massoretic text"; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, xlix. The *absolute certainty* of the reconstructions may be questionable, but the importance of LXX^L and other partial secondary witnesses cannot be denied.

²²Robert Holmes and James Parsons, eds., *Vetus Testamentum Graecum cum variis lectionibus*, 5 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1798-1827); Henry Barclay Swete, ed., *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, 3 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1887-1912).

²³Daniel J. Harrington and Anthony J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*, The Aramaic Bible, vol. 10, ed. Kevin Cathcart, Michael Maher, and Martin McNamara (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987), 2.

LXX^L will be taken from Lagarde's edition of the Lucianic text²⁴ and the Cambridge apparatus. LXX^O will also be taken from the Cambridge apparatus, particularly from mss Acx.

Presentation of Reconstructed Witnesses

The reconstructed secondary witnesses will not be presented in their entirety. Instead, only those readings that have a reasonable claim to being original (to the version) and that differ from the collating bases (Cambridge LXX, Leiden P, Sperber's T, and V^R) will be listed, along with an explanation of the reason for the choice. For the partial secondary witnesses, all the fragments of α', σ', and θ' will be given, along with their corresponding LXX reading. Since some mss refer to these three witnesses as a group or rather vaguely, a separate section will be devoted to listing all those readings that might belong to the three but are not clearly indicated. The readings of LXX^L that deviate from LXX will be given in the next section. Finally, all the variants of LXX^O from LXX will be listed.

The variants will be presented in a form compatible with most textual apparatuses, but a few notes about sigla are in order. The reading of the base text will be given first, followed by the witnesses that support that reading, followed in turn by a right bracket ']''. If more than one such reading occurs in the verse, the one in question will be identified by a numeral followed by a small superscript *o*: '1^o', '2^o', and so forth. Next, the variant reading(s) will each be given, along with the witnesses that support the reading. Each of the variants following the base reading will be separated from the previous one by a vertical bar '|'. Witnesses will be listed in the following order: mss in the base language, versional witnesses, patristic sources. Mss in the base language will be separated from other witnesses by a semicolon in order to avoid possible confusion. Witnesses that support the variant in most respects (or the most important respects) but differ in small details will be enclosed in parentheses '()'. Witnesses that are inferred from the list of extant witnesses given in the apparatus of the base text but that are not explicitly listed will be enclosed in braces '{}'. Transposition of words from the base text or transposition combined with omission will be signified by numerals representing the variant word order (e.g., 132 signifies that the second word in the base text is the third word in the variant). Next, the symbols '+' and '>' represent an addition and an omission with respect to the base text, respectively. The abbreviations 'pr' and 'post' mean that the variant precedes or follows the word or phrase given as the base text, respectively. Finally, 'idem' indicates a reading that is identical with the base text.

²⁴Paul de Lagarde, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canoniorum*, vol. 1 (Göttingen: Aedibus Dieterich, Arnold Hoyer, 1883).

Septuagint

As a general introduction to the evaluation of LXX readings, the following additional LXX resources should be mentioned: Hatch and Redpath's concordance, Swete's introduction, and Conybeare and Stock's grammar. Bo Johnson's study of hexaplaric mss is also helpful, for he identifies certain family groups within LXX mss of 1 Samuel, namely, B (sometimes associated with mss ya_2), Acx (hexaplaric mss), boc_2e_2 (Lucianic mss), $d+ [l]$ (referred to as d+ [l is lacking in the chapter]), and $fmsw$ (referred to as f+). The other mss (MVAeghijnvb₂, and often ya_2) do not fall into any clear group.²⁵ In addition to Greek mss and daughter versions, the church fathers Theodoret (Thdt) and Chrysostom (Chr) are sometimes cited.

3:1 κυριω {By_{a2} Acx boc_2e_2 d+ f+ MNaeginvb₂}} προσωπω κυριου h

Despite only one witness to this reading, it is interesting because it preserves Semitic, not Greek, idiom. However, it seems likely that the scribe was imitating the idiom found in both P and T in the same place, an idiom current in Hebrew as well. The only other two occurrences of $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\omega$ in Kingdoms with God as the object are 1 Kgdms 2:11, 18. 2:11 reads $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\gamma\omega\nu\ \tau\omega\ \pi\rho\sigma\omega\pi\omega\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\upsilon$, and 2:18 reads $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\gamma\omega\nu\ \epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\upsilon$. In both cases a circumlocution occurs, so the scribe of h could have been simply conforming his text to the idiom of LXX itself.

3:2 $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\omicron$ B* c] $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ { ya_2 } A{x} { boc_2e_2 d+ f+} B^{ab}MN{aeghijnvb₂}; *arm cop eth syh*

The reading $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\omicron$ is attested only by the original hand of B and by one fifteenth century ms. It could be argued that $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\omicron$ should be preferred as the reading different from similar statements in the context (i.e., 3:3, 5 *bis*, 6, 9) and from MT. Furthermore, a closer examination shows that $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\omicron$ here refers to Eli, whereas all examples of $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ and related forms refer to Samuel. It is possible that a Hebrew scribe (or the translator) could have misread 'ב' ש'כ'ב' as 'ב' 'ש'ב' '. However, the extreme paucity of external support makes the preference of $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\omicron$ questionable. A scribe transmitting the Greek text could just as easily have misread $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ as $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\omicron$.²⁶ If $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ is

²⁵Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897-1906; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1983) [hereafter HR]; Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, with an Appendix by Henry St. John Thackeray, rev. Richard Rusden Ottley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989); Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*; Bo Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta*, *Studia Theologica Lundensia*, no. 22 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1963). For a summary of the family groups in LXX, see *ibid.*, 19. In the following pages, LXX evidence for particular readings will be grouped according to Johnson's family groups. Mss y and a_2 , when supporting reading in the absence of the other ms or B, will be listed with the ungrouped mss.

²⁶Cf. a similar error in the Ethiopic of 3:3, where $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\eta\tau\omicron$ is apparently read for $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$.

indeed original, the scribes responsible for B and c could well have made the graphic error independently of one another or of any text in the direct genetic line between the two. Thus, the majority reading $\epsilon\kappa\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon\nu$ is to be preferred, with Rahlfs.

3:2 $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron$ {Ba₂ Acx bc₂e₂ f+ Mghiv}] $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ o d+ Naenyb₂

At issue in this reading is whether the subject of the verb is Eli, thus requiring a singular verb, or Eli's eyes, requiring a plural verb. Though the main reading of both MT and V is singular, one ms of each has a plural. Both readings are well attested in Greek mss. It is likely that $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron$ was influenced by the plural verb $\eta\rho\chi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$ in the same verse to become $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$. However, a similar change could have happened in Hebrew just as easily. The agreement of the plural with the mss from MT (ms 187, one of the mss Goshen-Gottstein says perhaps contains some non-Masoretic readings) and V suggests the possibility that the plural did exist in an early Hebrew ms; however, the original Greek was probably $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\omicron$.

3:3 $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ {Ba₂ Acx dpqt MNaeghnb₂}] + η boc₂e₂ f+ vyz; Thdt

3:7 $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ Ba₂] + η A{cx boc₂e₂ d+ f+} MN{aeghinvyb₂}

These two readings need to be considered together, inasmuch as the preferred reading in one place is likely to be the same as in the other. The simple $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ is predominantly an Attic reading, whereas the compound $\pi\rho\iota\nu \eta$ is originally Ionic; however, the latter reading predominates in the *koine*.²⁷ $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ is well attested in verse 3 (apparently read by Ba₂ Acx dpqt MNaeghnb₂) but is poorly attested in verse 7. If the normal *koine* form $\pi\rho\iota\nu \eta$ were original in both places, later Atticizing scribes might have omitted the η to create a more Atticistic reading. It is unlikely that later scribes would have corrected an original Attic reading in the direction of the *koine*, especially in the numbers attested in verse 7. As far as the difference in the attestation patterns between the two verses, two mss (c and x) read $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu$ rather than $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota$ in verse 3; since even Attic idiom allowed $\pi\rho\iota\nu \eta$ before an infinitive (both of Homer's uses are before infinitives), it is possible that Atticistic revisers, after changing $\pi\rho\iota\nu \eta$ to $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ in verse 3, would have considered the $\pi\rho\iota\nu \eta$ of verse 7 perfectly acceptable. Though the difference in the verb is attested in only two mss, other such mss may have exercised their influence on the reading of the preposition in some extant mss. Whichever reading is to be preferred,

²⁷Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2d ed., trans. and ed. William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979) [hereafter BAG], s.v. " $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ "; *ibid.*, s.v. " η ." Bauer characterizes the compound form as an "Ionism, very rare in Attic wr., but common in the Koine" in the latter article. Smyth notes that though the compound form occasionally occurs in Homer and Herodotus, it is rare and suspect in Attic Greek; Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, ed. Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956), 555.

both verses probably originally read the same. Rahlfs's decision to read $\pi\rho\iota\nu$ in verse 3 and $\pi\rho\iota\nu \eta$ in verse 7 seems to have been due to the combined witness of A and B in the former passage and their split witness in the latter. Nevertheless, it seems preferable in light of both internal and external evidence to read $\pi\rho\iota\nu \eta$ in both verses.

3:3 $\nu\alpha\omega$ {Bya₂ f+ MNaeghinvb₂}] οικω κυριου Ac | + κυριου x boc₂e₂ d+

Since MT here reads יהיה ליהיכל, it seems likely that the third variant is a correction to a similar Hebrew text. This supposition is strengthened when one realizes that the mss that support this reading are the Lucianic group (boc₂e₂) and the group that Johnson calls d+, both of which often correct the Greek text in the direction of the Hebrew.²⁸ The hexaplaric ms x also supports the reading. Harder to account for is the second reading, supported only by the hexaplaric witnesses Ac. Though the addition of κυριου supports MT in part, οικος renders יהיכל in only one other instance out of hundreds of occurrences of οικος in the books of Kingdoms (4 Kgdms 20:18). יהיכל is rendered much more frequently by ναος. These factors suggest that οικω κυριου represents a correction of OG to the reading of a Hebrew text different from MT. The first reading, ναω, is almost certainly the OG reading.

3:4 και 1° {Bya₂ Acx d+ fmw aeinb₂}] pr εκατεστη g | pr και κατεστη boc₂e₂ s (M)Nhv; (it^v)

The second and third readings may be taken together, since the omitted και in the second is probably the result of haplography. The first reading is clearly the better attested of the two main readings, containing all of Johnson's groups except the Lucianic mss, as well as a few mss that do not fit in any particular group. The third reading is attested by two uncials, the Lucianic mss, and a few other mss. It is also supported by a similar reading in an *it* ms: *et astitit ei dominus et clamabat*. One could argue that the third reading originated from the first as the result of assimilation to verse 10. The first reading may also claim precedence on the grounds that it is the shorter reading. Scribes might also have considered God's call of Samuel abrupt, leading them to introduce God's words with mention of his arrival in the sanctuary.

On the other hand, the omission of και κατεστη (or even και ηλθεν και κατεστη, cf. verse 10) could be due to parablepsis (και ... και). The possibility that the shorter reading represents a correction to a Hebrew text similar to MT seems unlikely, for, though some of the witnesses are hexaplaric (Acx) and others sometimes have hexaplaric readings

²⁸Johnson says of the group d+, "d+ zeigt gelegentlich, besonders bei Eigennamen, eine Textform, die besser mit MT übereinstimmt, als es bei A cx der Fall ist. Dagegen hat d+ kaum eigene Varianten von hexaplarischem Charakter aufzuweisen." Johnson, *Hexaplarische Rezension*, 107.

(d+, f+), there is little evidence that B is ever corrected toward a Hebrew text.²⁹ If the longer reading is taken to be original, another factor must be considered, namely, that the subject *κυριος* must also be displaced, since a text (*και ηλθεν*) *και κατεστη και εκαλεσεν κυριος*, though perfectly acceptable in Greek, does not represent normal Hebrew idiom, since the subject is too far from the initial verb (cf. verse 10: *και ηλθεν κυριος και κατεστη και εκαλεσεν*). It may be questioned why, if *και κατεστη* is a harmonizing addition, the subject was not moved forward in the sentence to match verse 10. The answer may be that the Greek scribes, unfamiliar with Hebrew idiom, felt no discomfort at the distance of the subject from the initial verb. A Greek form of the works of Ephraem Syrus, preserved in the apparatus of Holmes and Parsons, provides a form of the text that may also have some bearing on the question of the position of the subject. Ephraem reads *και κατεστη Σαμουηλ, και εκαλεσε κυριος*. Although “Samuel” cannot be the original subject, its presence is an attempt to clarify the subject of *κατεστη*, an indication of the difficulty Ephraem (or the scribes) felt with the dangling verb, so the reading presupposes a text identical with the third reading above. Thus, if a longer reading was original in OG, it was probably not that of the third reading. Since internal evidence is ambiguous, it is perhaps best to rely on the reading that has the most, the oldest, and the most diverse witnesses. Though some doubt must exist because of the possibility of parablepsis, the reading of OG was probably that of B and its congeners.

3:5 *καθευδε* {Bya₂ A dpqt i} pr και cx aehnb₂; *arm* | και *καθευδε* *τεκνον* boc₂e₂ z msw Mg_v; *it* | + *τεκνον* Nf

3:6 σε Bya₂ i; *cop eth^f*] *τεκνον* 244 | + *υιε μου* Acx d+; *arm* | + *τεκνον* {boc₂e₂ f+} MN{aeghnb₂}

3:6 *καθευδε* {B*y A dpqt i} pr και cx boc₂e₂ z f+ B^{ab}MNaeghnva₂b₂; *arm*

3:9 *καθευδε* B A qt i} pr και {ya₂ cx boc₂e₂ dpz f+} MN{aeghnb₂}; *arm eth*

All these variants must be considered together from two perspectives, first looking at the presence or absence of *και* between *αναστρεφε* and *καθευδε* in verses 5, 6, and 9; and next looking at the presence or absence of *τεκνον* (or *υιε μου*) in each of these verses. First, it may be noted that the majority of the witnesses in each verse include *και*, whereas MT does not have a conjunction between the corresponding words. When one looks at the grouping of witnesses, it is surprising to see that the hexaplaric mss cx consistently include the *και*, with A alone omitting it. The group d+ (except z, which often has Lucianic affinities) omits *και* in the first two instances, but two of its members, dp, apparently join the majority in the third instance. The group f+ and the Lucianic group include *και* in all

²⁹ Johnson, *Hexaplarische Rezension*, 53: “Zusammenfassend wäre zu sagen, dass B nur in sehr geringen Umfang Stellen enthält, die auf hexaplarische Korrekturen hindeuten könnten. . . . Hexaplarische Korrekturen können in vereinzelt Fällen eingedrungen sein, doch lassen sich die betreffenden Stellen auch auf andere Weise erklären.”

three cases. What does this evidence imply? It is clear from an examination of both Greek and Hebrew mss that the addition or omission of a conjunction is common, so it is impossible to tell for certain whether the change occurred before or after the initial translation into Greek. Though Hebrew uses conjunctions with great frequency, asyndeton in certain constructions is fairly common. Such a construction occurs here, where the first imperative בשׁו is almost an auxiliary to the main idea expressed in the second verb בשׁב .³⁰ However, similar constructions do appear with the conjunction. It may have seemed to a scribe or translator that the addition of a $\kappa\alpha\iota$ between the imperatives provided a better balance to the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ that was between the indicatives in the next phrase. Since internal evidence is questionable, it seems best to go with the preponderance of external evidence in this case, which favors the inclusion of the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in the first instance and strongly favors its inclusion in the last two instances.³¹

With regard to the question of the inclusion or exclusion of $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ or $\upsilon\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\nu$ in verses 5 and 6, the shortest text, supported by the group Bya_2 in both cases, excludes the terms, while MT includes בני in verse 6. It is significant that in verse 9, all Greek mss include $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ after $\kappa\alpha\theta\epsilon\upsilon\delta\epsilon$, but there is no corresponding Hebrew term in MT. The easiest issue to address is the expression $\upsilon\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\nu$ in verse 6, an obvious correction to a Hebrew text similar to MT by the hexaplaric and $d+$ groups. $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ is a common translational equivalent for בן , rendering it twenty times in Kingdoms (in A, nineteen times in B), though always in sections that are not *kaige*. It is not nearly as common as $\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$, however, which renders בן some eight hundred times, in both OG and *kaige* sections. Thus, $\upsilon\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\nu$ is an attempt to yield a text closer to the Hebrew. The short reading $\sigma\epsilon$ in verse 6 is the key to determining the OG reading in verses 5 and 6. Though supported by only a small number of witnesses, both Greek and versional, this reading is almost certainly the OG reading. If original, it is easy to understand that the longer text of the third reading could be an assimilation to verse 9 or to some non-Masoretic Hebrew text that added בני , but it is difficult to explain the origin of the shorter text if the longer were original. If some scribe felt the need to add $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ or בני in verse 6, or to assimilate the verse to verse 9, the same process could have occurred in verse 5, where the group $d+$ joins the witnesses to the shorter text. Therefore, it appears that the shorter text without $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ or $\upsilon\epsilon\ \mu\omicron\nu$ is the OG reading in both verses 5 and 6, but $\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu$ in verse 5 could very well reflect a Hebrew text different from MT.

3:6 $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ { Ba_2 Acx $d+$ }] $\epsilon\tau\iota$ y | $\epsilon\tau\iota$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\Sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$ MNaghb_2 | + $\epsilon\tau\iota$

³⁰E. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, trans. A. E. Cowley, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), § 120g.

³¹Jellicoe, along with many others, believes that the Lucianic witnesses, which consistently include the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in all three verses, sometimes preserve primitive readings which have disappeared from most or all other witnesses, including B. See Jellicoe, *LXX and Modern Study*, 168-71.

- i | + ετι καλεσαι τον Σαμουηλ boc₂e₂ f+ env
- 3:6 εκαλεσεν {Bya₂ boc₂e₂ f+ MNaeghinvb₂}} + ετι Acx d+
- 3:8 κυριος 1° {Bya₂ Acx boc₂e₂ d+ f+ MNaeghinv}} + ετι b₂; *arm it*
- 3:8 Σαμουηλ {Bya₂ Mehinvb₂}} pr τον a | pr επι Acx | pr ετι d+ | pr ετι τον f+ | + Σαμουηλ boc₂e₂ Ng

The repetition and variation in the story is evident again in verses 6 and 8. At the beginning of verse 6, MT reads $\text{וַיִּסַּף יְהוָה קְרָא עוֹד}$; it lacks an equivalent for the ετι in verse 8. The first item to note is the two forms of the clause that appear in the third and fifth variants in the first unit of variation. Both of these variants conflate the text by adding a clause closer to the Hebrew text that lay before the scribes, namely, the reading of MT. The result is an unwieldy and redundant sentence that certainly is not original.³² Little doubt can exist that καλεσαι τον Σαμουηλ is an addition not present in OG.

The next bit of variation involves the position of ετι in verses 6 and 8. In verse 6, does it belong before κυριος, after κυριος, or after εκαλεσεν? Or should it be omitted altogether, with Ba₂? The hexaplaric and d+ groups place ετι in a position equivalent to that of וַיִּעַן in MT. Most other witnesses put it only in the first clause, either before or after κυριος. The variety of position suggests that ετι is a later addition to the text and that the OG reading is that of Ba₂.³³ In verse 8, each of Johnson's groups supports a different reading: Bya₂ variant one, hexaplaric variant three, d+ variant four, f+ variant five, and Lucianic variant six. (Only those readings in v. 8 that deal with ετι will be discussed here; see below for the other variants in this verse). The base text is equivalent to MT, so there is no question of other groups altering the text toward one with the same reading as MT. The third reading επι is clearly an inner-Greek error for ετι, so variants three, four, and five may be considered together. As in verse 6, the hexaplaric and d+ groups support the inclusion of ετι after a form of καλεω, and they are joined by the f+ group. However, the two possible positions for ετι in the verse, and the likelihood of assimilation to the readings of verse 6, make the reading questionable. The failure of the Lucianic group to support the reading also tends to make one suspect that it is not original. Probably, then, ετι is original in neither verse 6 nor verse 8.

It may be noted quickly that the omission of κυριος in verse 6 (variant 2) is

³²Ms g omits the second phrase και εκαλεσεν Σαμουηλ, but this omission is probably due to parablepsis rather than a conscious effort to improve the text.

³³There are three main occasions for transposition. The first is when a scribe simply inverts the order of words or phrases that are adjacent or nearly so. The second is when a unit of material is accidentally omitted by a scribe, only to be added back by another scribe in the wrong place. Cf. Albert Curtis Clark, *The Descent of Manuscripts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1918; reprint, Norwich: Fletcher and Son, 1969), 256. The third occasion for transposition occurs when an addition is made to the text, often as the result of a scribal gloss in the margin. See Shemaryahu Talmon, "Aspects of the Textual Transmission of the Bible in the Light of Qumran Manuscripts," *Textus* 4 (1964): 100-103, who discusses the marginal and interlinear notes in Qumran biblical mss and their role in the production of conflated readings.

probably the result of haplography (perhaps omitting the first word of $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ και).

3:6 και 3^o {Bya₂ boe₂ f+ MNaeghinvb₂} | pr και ανεστη 44 | pr και ανεστη Σαμουηλ
Acx c₂ d+; *arm eth*^s

The third variant is equivalent to the reading of MT, and it appears in the hexaplaric and d+ groups, plus c₂ and two versions. The real questions are (1) whether και ανεστη Σαμουηλ is an addition added as an assimilation to verse 8 or a clause omitted by parablepsis (Σαμουηλ . . . Σαμουηλ) and (2) whether the assimilation or parablepsis occurred in Hebrew or in Greek. Verse 6 MT at this place reads ויקם שמואל וילך, but verse 8 reads ויקם וילך (also reflected in ms 44 in v. 6). It is clear that if the longer text of verse 6 is the result of assimilation, it is not perfect assimilation, since Σαμουηλ is missing. Rather than imperfect assimilation, it seems more likely that και ανεστη Σαμουηλ (or its Hebrew equivalent) was accidentally omitted. The descriptions of Samuel's actions the first three times God calls him are all different in detail, but in MT Samuel always does two things. In verses 4 and 5, Samuel says, "Here I am!" and then runs to Eli. In verses 6 and 8, Samuel gets up and then goes to Eli. This balance is destroyed if verse 6 omits his getting up, but if both actions are included, the variety of presentation is preserved by the presence of Samuel's name a second time in verse 6 (και ανεστη Σαμουηλ).

It is difficult to decide where in the process of transmission the parablepsis occurred, in a Greek or a Hebrew ms. However, if the longer reading was present in OG, then disappeared, it apparently left no trace in the ms tradition, since the hexaplaric and d+ groups probably derived the reading from Origen's correction to the Hebrew. It is possible that a trace might remain in the Lucianic witnesses c₂ *arm*, but it is more likely that these, too, reflect the influence of the Hexapla. It seems probable, then, that the parablepsis was already present in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of OG, so the first variant represents the OG text.

3:6 το δευτερον {Bya₂ Acx d+ i} | εκ δευτερου boc₂e₂ f+ MNaeghnvb₂

The first reading το δευτερον is closer to normal Greek idiom (though the article is usually omitted in classical Greek) than the second.³⁴ εκ δευτερου occurs twice more in Kingdoms—2 Kgdms 14:29 and 3 Kgdms 19:7—both times for לְשֵׁנִי ; both of these occurrences are also adverbial. 2 Kgdms 16:19 is also adverbial and renders לְשֵׁנִי in MT as το δευτερον, but the adverbial idea is different: "moreover" rather than "a second time." 3 Kgdms 9:2 renders לְשֵׁנִי , "a second time," as δευτερον. A broader look at the word δευτερον in LXX reveals that the Pentateuch uses (το) δευτερον exclusively to render

³⁴Smyth, *Grammar*, 288. Cf. also p. 317, where he notes that εκ is sometimes used with numerals as partitive genitives; the use of εκ with an ordinal to represent an adverbial idea does not seem to be idiomatic, at least in classical Greek.

𐤓𐤓𐤗 when it means “a second time,” a total of nine times. On the other hand, the other books almost always render 𐤓𐤓𐤗, “a second time,” by *εκ δευτερου*.³⁵ It is interesting that B omits two of these occurrences, Josh 5:2 and 1 Chr 29:22. The only occurrence of *δευτερον* to render 𐤓𐤓𐤗 outside the Pentateuch and Kingdoms is B’s text of Jer 40:1 (Heb 33:1), but A has *εκ δευτερου*. It appears, then, that the tendency of LXX outside the Pentateuch is to use *εκ δευτερου*, but B differs three out of eight times. Since B sometimes displays a tendency towards Atticism (see above, pp. 39-40, on *πριν* vs. *πριν η* in verses 3 and 7), and since it elsewhere avoids *εκ δευτερου*, it seems more likely that the scribe of B, or some previous scribe, would have changed *εκ δευτερου* to the more idiomatic *το δευτερον* than vice versa.

3:7 θεον {Bya₂ MNaeghinb₂}] pr τον Acx βοc₂e₂ d+ f+ r

θεος occurs frequently in Kingdoms both with and without the article. When the examination is restricted to the accusative θεον, the vast majority of anarthrous cases fall into one of two types. The first common use of θεον without the article is in the expression (τον) κυριον θεον *x*, where *x* is a pronoun or noun in the genitive case (e.g., κυριον θεον σου [1 Kgdms 7:8], κυριον θεον του Ισραηλ [3 Kgdms 15:30]). On one occasion, 1 Kgdms 5:7, the similar construction Δαγων θεον ημων occurs. The second common use of the accusative of θεος without the article is in plural references to other gods (e.g., 1 Kgdms 28:13; 3 Kgdms 14:9). Once these cases are eliminated, only thirteen instances of the anarthrous θεον remain, ten of them in 4 Kingdoms (a *kaige* section). Of eleven occurrences of the accusative of θεος with the article, two are plural references to other gods (1 Kgdms 7:3; 2 Kgdms 5:21) and one is in the expression κυριον τον θεον Ισραηλ (3 Kgdms 16:13), though AN and many other witnesses do not have τον before θεον. Only two cases of θεον with the article occur in *kaige* sections (2 Kgdms 12:16; 22:7). It appears, then, that, apart from the expression κυριον θεον *x* (genitive), the singular accusative references to θεον in Kingdoms generally use the article in OG sections (six of nine times with the article) and generally do not in *kaige* sections (ten of twelve without the article, all in 4 Kingdoms). Nevertheless, θεον without the article is still fairly common in OG, occurring in 33% of the cases, 40% if this case is considered anarthrous. Furthermore, one of the other instances of anarthrous θεον is in the same chapter, 1 Kgdms 3:13. It seems best, then, to omit the article here, taking its inclusion as an attempt to conform to the more usual pattern.

³⁵Josh 5:2; 1 Chr 29:22; Jon 3:1; Hag 2:2; Zech 4:12; Jer 1:13. Dan 2:7 LXX renders the Aramaic 𐤓𐤓𐤗𐤓 with *εκ δευτερου*, while Theodotion uses *δευτερον*.

3:7 ἀποκαλυφθῆναι {Bya₂ Acx p*qtz} | pr πρην p^b? | pr πρην η boc₂e₂ d f+
MNaeghnv₂ | pr πρην η και i | *antequam adaperiret* ; it

The second, fourth, and fifth variants in this unit of variation should be seen as witnesses to the reading of the third variant, πρην η, the second and fourth variants being inner-Greek corruptions of the reading. The real textual question, then, is whether the preposition πρην η appears once or twice. MT reads ׀ַ׀ before both verbs, so the second πρην η could be seen as an attempt to conform the Greek text to one similar to MT. Whereas Hebrew prepositions usually govern only one word,³⁶ Greek prepositions frequently govern more than one object.³⁷ Another reason for the second πρην η, then, might be conformity to Hebrew idiom. It is particularly significant that the hexaplaric mss Acx agree with B against MT. Thus, it is probable that the reading of the base text is the original reading of LXX.

3:8 Σαμουηλ {Bya₂ Mehinb₂} | pr τον a | pr επι Acx | pr επι d+ | pr επι τον f+ | +
Σαμουηλ boc₂e₂ Ng

The variants that concern επι have been dealt with above, but it remains to consider the article and the second Σαμουηλ. The second Σαμουηλ is probably an assimilation to the previous two accounts of God's attempt to communicate with Samuel, verses 4 and 6. In both of those cases, and in the Lucianic witnesses here, Σαμουηλ is clearly considered to be a vocative. The insertion of the accusative article in variants two and five indicates an understanding that here Σαμουηλ is the direct object of the infinitive. The article was probably inserted to clarify this point. Therefore, the reading of the base text is to be preferred.

3:9 ειπεν {Bya₂ f+ Maghivb₂} | + αυτω Nen; eth^{vid} | + τω Σαμουηλ d | + *Heli ei* ;
cop | + Ηλει τω Σαμουηλ Acx boc₂e₂ pqtz

Readings two through five present four different attempts to specify the participants in the action. The longest reading, supported by the hexaplaric, d+ (-d), and Lucianic groups, is the same as MT. Since no reason seems to exist for shortening the text, all of the longer readings can be seen as attempts at specification or at conformity to a Hebrew text similar to MT. The variety of readings also suggests that none of the longer texts is original.

³⁶But see Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 119hh. O'Connor calls this phenomenon prepositional override, citing 1 Sam 15:22 as an example. See Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 222-23; M. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1980), 310-11.

³⁷Smyth, *Grammar*, 369-70.

3:9 σε {Bya₂ A dpqt ein}} + ετι cx | + ο κλωων boc₂e₂ z f+ MNaghvb₂; Thdt

Two hexaplaric mss again add ετι, almost certainly secondarily. More significant is the longer reading that includes ο κλωων and is supported by many witnesses, including the f+ and Lucianic groups. Although no equivalent for ο κλωων appears in MT, it is conceivable that the reading could have arisen from a Hebrew text whose verb could be read as a participle rather than an imperfect.³⁸ The reading seems to be an attempt to specify the subject of the verb, though in a rather unusual way. A participle used in proximity to a verbal form of the same word is probably a Hebraism, but Greek scribes were certainly capable of creating their own Hebraisms. Since the Lucianic text is known for expansions of this type, it is probable that the variant is secondary and within the Greek tradition, so the first reading is preferable.

3:9 λαλει {Bya₂ x a*hi*b₂}} + κυριε boc₂e₂ d+ f+ AMNa^a?cegnvx^a; *arm eth*^{a39}

3:10 λαλει {Bya₂ A o dpqt fm*sw MNaeghinb₂}} + κυριε cx bc₂e₂ z m^bv; *arm*

These two sets of variants exist because scribes were troubled at the lack of agreement between what Samuel was supposed to say and what he actually said. The fact that many witnesses that support the longer reading in the first unit of variation support the shorter reading in the second unit suggests that scribes attempted to correct the problem either by deleting κυριε in the first instance or adding it in the second. On the other hand, κυριε might have been added in verse 9 or omitted in verse 10 in order to conform the text to a Hebrew text similar to MT. However, other units of variation indicate that most scribes were more concerned with consistency than conformity to a Hebrew text, especially since few scribes could read Hebrew.⁴⁰ The hexaplaric witnesses are usually an exception to this rule, but here they are split, indicating the importance of internal consistency to at least two of the scribes (the scribes of cx or their predecessors, though x* does read λαλει alone in verse 9). These considerations, plus the stronger external support for the longer reading in verse 9 and the shorter in verse 10, indicate that these readings should be preferred, with Rahlfs.⁴¹

³⁸The possibility that LXX was translated from Old Hebrew script rather than square script has been raised by various scholars. If so, the present case may be explained as a confusion of the ך of the imperfect with a ך, taken as an article, since the two letters are similar in the older script (ך and ך, respectively). Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, "Ancient Hebrew Alphabet," in *Mélanges Delcor*, 387-402.

³⁹Thdt reads λαλει κυριε μου; Natalio Fernández Marcos and José Ramón Busto Saiz, *Theodoretus Cyrensis quaestiones in Reges et paralipomena*, Textos y estudios "Cardinal Cisneros", no. 32 (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1984), 12.

⁴⁰Cf. Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 4-5.

⁴¹Several commentators refer to ms B in v. 9 as though it were the LXX reading. The fact that B here may not be the original LXX reading illustrates the importance of analyzing the variants within LXX before using one of the mss to reconstruct the original Hebrew text. Cf. P. Paul Dhorme, *Les livres de Samuel*, Études bibliques (Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1910), 43; R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 30.

3:10 ως απαξ και απαξ {Bya₂ f+ MNaeghinb₂} Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ d | ως απαξ και δις M^{mg}; *it* | ως απαξ Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ cx | ως απαξ και δις Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ boc₂e₂ | + Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ A pqtz; *arm*

MT here reads למוש למוש בפעם בפעם, which corresponds to the sixth variant, supported by A, d+ (-d), *arm*. The variants which substitute δις for the second απαξ clearly preserve an attempt to produce a better Greek text. It is interesting that in the only verse where MT reads למוש למוש, most Greek mss do not (cf. vv. 4, 6). Since the addition of Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ can be explained as an attempt to conform to the common Hebrew text, the shorter text (variant one) is preferable to the others.

3:11 παντος Bya₂] pr ωστε A(cx) MN {boc₂e₂ d+ f+ aeghinb₂}; *arm eth*

Though the vast majority of mss have ωστε, it seems more likely that it was added to make the text closer to a Hebrew text similar to MT (which reads ׀שס) than that it was deleted by Bya₂. A similar expression appears in two other passages in LXX: 2 Kings 21:12 and Jer 19:3. Though ωστε is found in both these passages, other elements of the formula are different, indicating the lack of a fixed form for this stock phrase. Of course, it is possible that ωστε was omitted by haplography, but B elsewhere lacks a tendency to conform to the Hebrew text where others do (cf. v. 6). In addition, the omission of the conjunction is supported by T. Thus, the shorter reading is to be preferred.

3:13 ανηγγελκα Bya₂ Nhi(v)b₂] ανηγγειλα boc₂e₂ z | ανηγγελη dpqt | αναγγειει cx | ανηνεγκα A | απηγγελκα M {f+ aegn} | *praedixi*; *it*

The *it* reading is not particularly helpful in determining which Greek reading it reflects, so it must be set aside. The reading of A seems to be an error, perhaps an aural confusion of the first variant. The other variants reflect two sets of differences: aorist or perfect tense, and a prefix of αν- or απ-. The perfect tense, being used less frequently than the aorist, is more probable because scribes would be more likely to change perfect to aorist than vice versa. External evidence also supports the originality of the perfect. The choice between the prefixes is not so easy. Both prefixes are well represented, though αν- appears in a variety of forms. A survey of αναγγελλω and απαγγελλω in Kingdoms reveals that απαγγελλω is more common than αναγγελλω in the OG sections (fifty-seven and twelve times in A, sixty-seven and seven times in B, respectively), but αναγγελλω is more common than απαγγελλω in the *kaige* sections (thirty-one and seventeen times in A, thirty-one and twenty-one times in B, respectively). Furthermore, απαγγελλω is somewhat more frequent in LXX as a whole. These figures suggest that, in the OG sections especially, scribes would have a greater tendency to replace αναγγελλω with απαγγελλω than vice versa. B in particular strongly favors απαγγελλω in the OG sections. The fact that B keeps αναγγελλω here, perhaps along

with a predecessor of A, indicates that the first variant, the reading of the base text, is the best.

3:13 τον {Bya₂ cx Maehin₂}] pr επι A boc₂e₂ d+ f+ Ngv

MT here reads **על** בִּישָׁפֵט אֲנִי אֶת־בֵּיתוֹ, with no preposition such as **על** corresponding to επι. In fact, there seem to be no cases in MT of the verb **שָׁפֵט** with a preposition before the personal object (excluding **בין**, used of deciding between parties). However, **εκδικω** frequently takes επι after it (in about 16 of 36 cases), particularly when rendering **פָּקַד** (whether with or without **על** in MT, in about 14 of 25 cases). It seems, then, that επι was added during the process of transmission of the Greek text and that the shorter reading is preferable.

3:13 αουτου 2° {Bya₂ Acx Mag}] *quas ipsi scivit* ; *it^b* | + ας εγνω b´ dpqt f+ Nhinvb₂; Chr^{vid} | + ας εγνω bc₂e₂ z | + ας εγνω e | + εν ας εγνω o | *quas ego scio* ; *it^v*

All of the variants that differ from the base text are modeled on the phrase found in MT, **אֲשֶׁר־יָדַע**. Variants five and seven change the subject of the verb to God (“which I knew”), probably by inner-Greek and/or inner-Latin corruption. The main Lucianic reading, ας εγνω, differs from the majority reading, ας εγνω, because the case of the relative pronoun has been attracted to that of its antecedent, **αδικιας**.⁴² The additional εν found in variant six is apparently a corruption of the main Lucianic reading. The second variant is basically equivalent to the majority reading. Thus, all the other variants from the base text are derived from the third variant. It is more likely that the phrase ας εγνω was added to agree with a Hebrew text similar to MT than that it was deleted, since no problem with the reading is evident. Thus, the base text should be accepted as original.

3:13 υιοι B Ac c₂e₂ N] pr οι {ya₂ x bo d+ f+} M{aeghinb₂}; Chr

3:15 οικου {Bya₂ A dp MNaeghinb₂}] pr του cx boc₂e₂ qtz f+

3:15 Ηλει Bya₂] pr τω A{cx boc₂e₂ d+ f+} MN{aeghinb₂}

The ease with which scribes added and omitted articles has been mentioned above, so it is difficult to have any certainty with regard to them. However, since articles were present more often than not, lacking evidence of haplography, it seems more likely that a scribe would have added the article than omitted it. Construct relationships like the first case occur 17 times with the article and 5 times without in the chapter, excluding this one, so it is likely that a scribe would have changed the reading of his exemplar in favor of the more common reading. In the second case, the phrase **οικου κυριου** occurs three other times in Samuel, none of which has an article. The addition of the article in this case was a

⁴²Smyth, *Grammar*, 567.

move in the direction of more articles, which reflected better Greek idiom. Thus, the article should be omitted in the first two cases.

The third unit of variation is somewhat different, both in the scantiness of external support for the base text and in the fact that the use of the article with the dative of the direct and indirect objects is a special case. Since most Hebrew names are indeclinable as transliterated into Greek, those forms of the dative that cannot take prepositions (i.e., the pure dative) have no way of indicating case without the article. Since the article is not used in Hebrew, its use in LXX is clearly a semantic indicator inserted by the Greek translators. Of about twelve other cases of proper names used as datives of direct or indirect objects in the first twelve chapters of 1 Samuel, all of them have the article. Thus, it seems probable that the article should be included in the present case as well.

3:17 θεος Ba₂; *cop it*] + και ταδε προσθειη A(x) {c boc₂e₂ d+ f+} MN{aeghinvyb₂};
arm (eth)

The expression ταδε ποιησαι . . . και ταδε προσθειη occurs eleven other times in LXX: ten times in Kingdoms and once in Ruth. In each of these cases the full expression is found; και ταδε προσθειη is never omitted. Though it is conceivable that the second part of the phrase could be omitted as being unidiomatic in Greek, none of the mss ever do so in any of the other cases. On the other hand, και ταδε προσθειη could have been added to conform the passage to the usual expression and to match the Hebrew, but if the omission is original in LXX, the reason for this uncommon readings would still be unexplained. It seems more likely, then, that the original και ταδε προσθειη was omitted by B or one of its predecessors, perhaps because of some graphic similarity between ταδε ποιησαι and ταδε προσθειη.⁴³

3:17 λογων Ba₂ A] > cx e₂ b₂; *eth*^{vid} | pr των {boc₂ d+ f+} MN{abeghinovyc₂}

In this unit of variation, the omission in the second variant is the result of parablepsis. Since more nouns have articles than do not, one's initial reaction, in spite of the extremely thin external support, might be to exclude the article as a later addition. However, two factors argue against this evaluation. First, MT here reads בַּרְבֵּי, so the third variant cannot be an attempt to conform to MT (at least not completely), since בַּרְבֵּי is singular and λογων is plural. Second and more importantly, the meaning of εκ παντων λογων των λαληθεντων is not really appropriate to the context, for the phrase

⁴³ A possible two step sequence of events that could lead to the omission of the phrase is as follows. First, the scribe might have accidentally written ποιησαι a second time for προσθειη. The resulting phrase would be ταδε ποιησαι σοι ο θεος και ταδε ποιησαι. Since this new phrase would make no sense to a second scribe reading the exemplar, the easiest correction he could make would be to omit και ταδε ποιησαι.

means, “from all conceivable words that were spoken,”⁴⁴ but the context clearly indicates that specific words (i.e., God’s words) are being requested. The article probably dropped out as a result of parablepsis.

3:17 σοι 2° {Ba₂ Acx dpqt i}] προς σε y | > boc₂e₂ z f+ MNaeghnv₂; *arm cop*

MT here reads $\text{ך' לִסְ$; it has nothing that corresponds to $\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \omega\sigma\iota\nu \sigma\upsilon$. Since σοι (or προς σε) functions as the equivalent of $\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \omega\sigma\iota\nu \sigma\upsilon$, the longer Greek text found in the first variant is redundant. It is possible that σοι is a simple equivalent of the circumlocution $\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \omega\sigma\iota\nu \sigma\upsilon$ and that the longer Greek text is a conflation of these two equivalents.⁴⁵ Even so, the question remains whether the conflation occurred subsequent to the original translation or whether it was taken from the Hebrew *Vorlage*. If the longer text were in the *Vorlage* of LXX, no good reason exists for the omission of σοι. However, if the shorter text represented OG, later scribes might well have added σοι to bring the Greek closer to a text like MT. It is important to observe that among the mss that support this apparent addition are the hexaplaric mss and group d+, which often has hexaplaric readings. The fact that Ba₂(y) also support the longer reading demonstrates the occasional secondary readings of the group in general, and of B in particular. προς σε is probably an inner-Greek variant, but it could also be an independent correction to the same Hebrew text. It seems, then, that the shorter text represented by the third variant has a greater claim to originality.

3:18 απηγγειλεν Σαμουηλ {Bya₂ v}] απηγγειλεν αυτω Σαμουηλ Acx boc₂e₂ d(p)qtz; *arm* | + τω Ηλει f+ MNaeghin₂

The second variant, though supported by many witnesses, should be considered an assimilation to a text similar to MT. It is supported by the hexaplaric, d+, and Lucianic groups, all of which either occasionally or frequently correct their Greek texts toward the reading of Hebrew texts. The third variant represents an alternative attempt to specify to whom Samuel was speaking, and so is secondary. This variant presupposes the first, rather than the second, variant as the text which needed correction. Thus, the first variant is to be preferred.

3:21 προφητης γενεσθαι {Bya₂ Acx dpqtz* aein}] 21 MNgb₂; *eth it^v* | του γενεσθαι εις προφητην boc₂e₂ f(h)msvwz^{a?}; *arm* | *et factum est profetam; it^b*

Nothing in 1 Sam 3:21 MT corresponds to this phrase. However, it is possible

⁴⁴Smyth, *Grammar*, 296.

⁴⁵For a possible parallel, see 1 Sam 1:23. MT reads, in part, $\text{וְיָקִים יְהוָה אֱתָדְבָרָו}$, and LXX reads $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha \sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\iota \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron \epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\nu \epsilon\kappa \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \sigma\upsilon$. Many commentators contend that וְיָקִים is a simplification of $\tau\omicron \epsilon\zeta\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\nu \epsilon\kappa \tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \sigma\upsilon$, but cf. S. D. Walters, “Hannah and Anna,” 400, 410-11.

that the phrase $\epsilon\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\theta\eta$ $\Sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$ $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omega$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ (or whichever is original) is itself a variant of $\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\Sigma\alpha\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta\lambda$ $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\nu$ $\tau\omega$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ in 3:20, probably a variant based on a different Hebrew text (or different pointing of the same consonantal text). If so, the $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in the third variant should be seen as assimilation to the previous verse. The genitive article is a matter of Greek idiom rather than Hebrew *Vorlage*.⁴⁶ Once these matters are settled, all that remains is to determine the original word order. Though the reading of the base text has much stronger external support than the second variant, the third and fourth variants also put the verb before the noun. However, the word order in the third variant may be explained as better Greek style, so the first variant may be preferred on the basis of its external support.

3:21 $\tau\omega$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ B $\gamma\alpha_2$ Nm] $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ boc_2e_2 h | *domini* ; *eth it^b syhⁱ* | $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ x | > c | $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$
Magb₂ | $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ A {d+ fsw einv}

A look at the rest of the books of Kingdoms reveals that the phrase $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ ($\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ one of these times) occurs seven times outside this chapter, and the similar phrase $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\text{B}\alpha\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota\mu$ occurs four times. No other occurrences of $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$ ($\tau\omega$) $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ appear, so it is evident that the genitive construction is much more common than the dative. The question is whether an original ($\tau\omega$) $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ was corrected toward the more common $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ or whether ($\tau\omicron\upsilon$) $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ was corrected toward the $\tau\omega$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ of the previous verse. The similarity of the phrases in verses 20 and 21 might suggest that the correction was made toward the $\tau\omega$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ of verse 20. However, if the theory is true that the phrase in verse 21 is really a variant of that in verse 20, the two phrases should actually be very similar to one another, and later scribes, without an extant Hebrew text to prevent modifications of OG, would have been more inclined to substitute the more common construction. Thus, the reading of the base text is probably the best.

3:21 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 3° B boc_2e_2] > { $\gamma\alpha_2$ } A {cx d+ f+} MN {aeghinvb₂}; *arm cop eth it*

It is better Greek style to write $\alpha\pi\omicron$. . . $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ than $\alpha\pi\omicron$. . . $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, which is a Hebraism. It is apparently better style in the languages of the various daughter versions of LXX as well. That $\kappa\alpha\iota$ is omitted for stylistic reasons in these versions is evident from a comparison of the same pattern in verse 20, where the same versions omit the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ in $\alpha\pi\omicron$ $\Delta\alpha\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ $\text{B}\eta\rho\sigma\alpha\beta\epsilon\epsilon$, but with Greek support only from ea_2 . The multitude of Greek witnesses that join the versions in the present case can again be explained by the apparent lack of an extant Hebrew text for the purposes of comparison, since scribes that would have a tendency to correct towards the Hebrew would not be able to. Thus, though the omission of the $\kappa\alpha\iota$ has many more witnesses supporting it, the reading of B and the Lucianic witnesses should be preferred.

⁴⁶Smyth, *Grammar*, 451.

Summary of Deviations from the Base Text

- 3:2 εκαθητο] εκαθευδεν
 3:3 πριν] + η
 3:5 καθευδε] pr και
 3:6 το δευτερον] εκ δευτερου
 3:6 καθευδε] pr και
 3:7 πριν] + η
 3:9 καθευδε] pr και
 3:9 λαλει] + κυριε
 3:15 Ηλει] pr τω
 3:17 θεος] + και ταδε προσθειη
 3:17 λογων] pr των
 3:17 σοι 2^ο] >

Peshitta

The family of mss dependent upon 9a1 displays frequent deviations from the text of 7a1 that are best explained as improvements in the direction of more authentic Syriac style. In addition, several deviations seem to be in the direction of a Hebrew text similar to MT. Because of these observations, deviations in 9a1*fam* will not be considered apart from other supporting witnesses. A second identifiable group of Syriac mss consists of those mss based on 12a1, referred to as 12a1*fam*. This group shows a strong affinity for agreement with a third group, the witnesses to the standard Nestorian version (9c1, 10c1, 11c1). The corrector of 8a1 is also a witness to the standard Nestorian version, and restored portions of the ms may also sometimes be Nestorian in orientation.⁴⁷

3:1 ܠܡܐ {6h1 6h4 7a1 7h12 7k3 8a1 9c1 9l1 10c1 11c1 12a1}] > 9a1*fam*

The base text of 7a1 agrees with LXX, whereas the omission of ܠܡܐ by 9a1*fam* is in agreement with MT. Since 9a1*fam* often corrects an earlier Syriac text on the basis of mss similar to MT, the reading of the base text is to be preferred here.

3:1 ܠܡܐ {6h1 6h4 7a1 7h12 7k3 8a1 9c1 9l1 10c1 11c1}] ܠܡܐ 9a1*fam* 12a1*fam*

Both ܠܡܐ, an active participle, and ܠܡܐ, a passive participle or adjective, have the same meaning. It is doubtful that variant one can be explained as assimilation to the Hebrew ܠܡܐ as in MT; it is more likely that one form developed from the other within Syriac itself. The form ܠܡܐ is more common in Syriac than ܠܡܐ, so it is probable that

⁴⁷ *OT in Syriac*, VI-VII.

later scribes changed the active participle to the more commonly employed passive participle. This conclusion is supported by the rather free nature of many renderings in 12a1*fam* and especially 9a1*fam*.

3:3 אֲרֹכָה {6h1 6h4 7a1 7h12 7k3 8a1 9c1 9l1 10c1 11c1 12a1}] הַיְהוָה אֲרֹכָה
9a1*fam*

The base text agrees with MT and LXX in reading “the ark of God,” but 9a1*fam* and other mss read “the ark of the Lord God.” An examination of the thirty-four references to the ark in 1 Samuel 4-7⁴⁸ reveals that P agrees with both MT and LXX fourteen times, P agrees with MT against LXX nine times, P agrees with LXX against MT once, P agrees with neither MT nor LXX when the latter two agree seven times, and all three disagree three times. S. R. Driver, in his commentary on Samuel, says that P often agrees with the Lucianic witnesses when both differ from MT, but no significant agreement with LXX^L occurs in these cases.⁴⁹ An examination of the shorter expressions “ark of God” and “ark of the Lord” sheds some light on the solution to the textual problem. When MT and LXX agree in one or the other of these short expressions (nine times), P agrees with them in every case but one (4:11), and this one case is the only time MT reads אֲרֹכָה אֱלֹהִים instead of אֲרֹכָה הַיְהוָה. When MT and LXX differ in these short phrases (seven times), P agrees with MT four times, agrees with LXX once, and goes its own way twice. Since MT and LXX are equivalent in the present case, it seems likely that P agreed with them. This deduction is confirmed by the fact that, though the expression “ark of the Lord God of Israel” is frequent in various mss of P (as well as in 6:3 LXX; 6:2 LXX^{cx}), no other occurrence of “ark of the Lord God” without “of Israel” exists in any of the mss. Thus, the longer expression of 9a1*fam* should be seen as an inner-Syriac variant, and the reading of the base text should be accepted as original.

⁴⁸The second MT and LXX occurrence in 5:10 is missing from P by parablepsis, so is excluded from consideration here.

⁴⁹P agrees with both MT and LXX^L 14 times, P agrees with MT against LXX^L 10 times, P agrees with LXX^L against MT 2 times, P agrees with neither MT nor LXX^L when the latter two agree 2 times, and all three disagree 6 times. It should also be noted that a shift in vocabulary in P occurs in 6:13. Before 6:13, P consistently uses אֲרֹכָה, derived from LXX’s κιβωτος, to render אֲרֹכָה. Frequent divergences from MT (and LXX) occur in these cases, as already noted. From 6:13 on, however, P renders אֲרֹכָה with אֲרֹכָה, clearly derived from Hebrew. In the 8 cases found from 6:13 on, P agrees with MT in every one of them. Before 6:13, P never agrees with MT more than five times in a row.

3:5 ܠܢ {7a1 8a1 9c1 10c1 11c1 12a1}] ܘܠܢ 6h4 9a1fam | + ,ܘ 6h1 7h12
7k3 9a1fam 911

3:6 ܠܢ] ܘܠܢ 9a1fam

Though the addition of the pronominal suffix “you” in both verses might be considered a correction toward LXX, 9a1fam shows no particular tendency to correct toward LXX. Rather, it frequently demonstrates an independence in modifying the Syriac text that lay before it, apparently without the support of another exemplar. Thus, the additional ܘ may also be seen as an independent rendering.

The additional ,ܘ in verse 5, derived from verse 6, is not found in either LXX or most mss of MT (though many LXX mss add τεκνον after καθευδε; see above, p. 41). Kennicott lists two mss, one of them considered important by Goshen-Gottstein (the margin of ms 70), as adding the phrase, and two *it* mss do as well, according to the apparatus of *BHS*. Since scribes who corrected their Syriac mss with a Hebrew exemplar seem to have used one very similar to MT, the readings of the divergent Hebrew mss and the *it* mss perhaps suggest a different Hebrew tradition at this point in the text, one that has almost disappeared from the extant witnesses. On the other hand, the phrase could have arisen in the various witnesses independently by assimilation to the following verse. Since internal evidence is ambiguous, a look at external evidence will prove helpful. The first and third variants contain about the same number of pre-fifteenth century witnesses, but the third contains the earliest ms, 6h1, a sixth (or fifth) century ms. However, 6h4, another sixth century ms, also omits ,ܘ, though it adds ܘ. It is significant that half of the witnesses that support the first reading are representatives of the standard Nestorian version (9c1, 10c1, 11c1). It is also relevant that, when 8a1 lost two folios, they were replaced with text in a Nestorian hand. Since elsewhere in the first twelve chapters of 1 Samuel the standard Nestorian witnesses show no tendency to correct towards a Hebrew ms similar to MT, their agreement with 7a1 here suggests that the reading is original. Thus, the third reading, despite the support of 6h1, should be seen as an assimilation to the following verse that occurred early within the course of transmission of the book in Syriac.

3:6 ܘܠܢ 1° {6h1 7a1 7k3 8a1 9a1 9c1 911 10c1 11c1 12a1}] + ܘ 6h4 7h12

3:6 ܘܠܢ 2° {6h1 7a1 8a1 9c1 10c1 11c1 12a1}] + ܘ 6h4 7h12 7k3 9a1fam 911

Neither MT nor LXX support the longer readings in either case. The similarity of the ms grouping in the second unit of variation to that of the second unit in the previous set should be noted. The addition of 6h1 to 7a1, 8a1, and the witnesses to the standard Nestorian version makes the ms support of the base text almost overwhelming. The early witness 6h4 does support the second variant in each unit, but the ms elsewhere shows a

tendency to amplify the text for greater specificity (cf. the previous set of variants; 2:28 + חַרְ; 10:14 + לַ). On internal grounds, the shorter reading is preferable, since the longer reading is more specific. Thus, both internal and external probability support the readings of the base text in both cases.

Summary of Deviations from the Base Text

No deviations from the text of 7a1 are considered original in the chapter.

Targum

Sperber groups the witnesses to T that he uses in five groups. The first group, witnesses with Babylonian vocalization, includes the biblical mss p (the base text) and mwxy. Also included among the witnesses with Babylonian pointing are the haphtaroth mss, jk. The second group, witnesses with Tiberian (or no) vocalization, includes the biblical mss acf. The printed editions dbo make up the third category. Sperber's fourth category, fragments of various targum mss, he refers to as Fr. Finally, the fifth group of witnesses, rabbinic citations, includes Aruk of R. Nathan (Ar), Yonah ibn Ganah (Gan), Rashi (Ra), and Kimḥi (K). Sperber uses subscripted numerals to refer to various marginal notes, often additional *toseftoth*, that occur in all the mss (e.g., w₁).

Sperber divides his critical apparatus into two sections, the first dealing with differences in vocalization and the second with differences in the consonantal text. In the present study, differences in vocalization will be ignored unless they indicate significantly different understandings of the Hebrew text. In particular, when one set of consonants allows more than one set of vowel points (e.g., to indicate perfect or participle), the reading of the base text will be accepted, since it is the consonantal text that is being reconstructed. Of course, differences in punctuation are important indicators of how the text is to be understood and of how the translators understood the underlying Hebrew text. However, unless the difference in vowel points in T could reflect a difference in the underlying Hebrew consonantal text, pointing will be ignored.

The history of the development of T raises the issue, discussed above for the Hebrew text, of what text to attempt to construct. Though T was an official targum, it was not a creation *ex nihilo* but relied on centuries of earlier oral and written renderings, particularly from Palestine. In light of this fact, the focus here will be to construct not the earliest form of any given verse but rather the "official" form. This approach will result in the exclusion from consideration of earlier, even pre-Christian, material (e.g., the marginal readings in Codex Reuchlinianus), but in the light of T's textual history, this method seems best.

3:2 לֹא {mp f b}] וְלֹא wy a do

Both the inclusion and the exclusion of the conjunction are supported by Babylonian and Tiberian witnesses. Though the Masoretic ms L does not have the conjunction, Kennicott lists nine mss that include it, one of which (187) is in Goshen-Gottstein's list of important mss. LXX and P include the conjunction as well. It is always difficult to evaluate the inclusion and exclusion of conjunctions, since it was easy for scribes to add or delete them inadvertently. However, because T presupposes a text similar to MT in most cases, and because the conjunction is supported by LXX, P, and some Masoretic mss, it seems likely that it was also original in T and was only later deleted, either accidentally or in an attempt to conform to a Hebrew text like MT.

3:6 לְמִיקְרֵי {mpwy af do}] מִקְרֵי b

3:8 לְמִיקְרֵי {mpwy a do}] מִקְרֵי f b

The lack of a ל before the infinitive corresponds to the lack of a ל in the Hebrew *Vorlage* (also lacking in MT). The weakness of the textual support for the second reading in each instance is evident, especially since b is a printed edition rather than a ms. Also, the tendency of the scribes would normally be to add a ל, since the form without it was uncommon. Thus, the secondary nature of the forms with ל is apparent on both external and internal grounds. However, these readings have significance for the next set of variants.

3:7 לְמַדַּע {p af db}] מַדַּע mwy o

The first variant is clearly to be taken as an infinitive, as the ל prefix indicates. The second variant could be an infinitive (as pointed by w) or a noun (as pointed by myo). The Aramaic construction, אֲוֹלִיף (ל)מַדַּע, is different from that of both MT and LXX, and is certainly the result of the *meturgemanîn*, so there is no question of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* here. The external evidence leans somewhat toward the first variant, since both Babylonian and Tiberian mss support it. As for internal evidence, infinitives with ל are far more frequent than those without. The ל is even retained after prepositions (e.g., מִלְחֻמָּה 3:15; cf. also 10:13; 12:23 *bis*). In fact, the two occurrences of מִקְרֵי in 3:6 and 3:8 appear to be the only infinitives without ל in the first twelve chapters of the book. Let us suppose that the root קִרָּא has some unique tendency toward the lack of a ל, an examination of all the occurrences of the infinitive of קִרָּא in T in the former prophets where there is a corresponding infinitive in MT reveals that the only other two occurrences (1 Sam 22:11; 1 Kings 22:13) do have ל. In two other passages, Judges 18:1 and 2 Kings 5:7, the infinitive of קִרָּא in MT has no corresponding infinitive in T (i.e., some other form of קִרָּא appears). The reason for the omission of the ל in 3:6, 8 is that no ל

was present in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Since the construction found in T varies from that in MT, it is almost certain that the presence or absence of ל was not based on the *Vorlage*. Since the occurrence of infinitives with ל is much more common than those without ל, one would expect the *meturgeman* to use the more common form. It might be argued that since עֲדָם is the more difficult form, later scribes might have added the ל to make the text conform to the normal usage. However, the presence of ל with infinitives is so overwhelming, even in passages that have no corresponding infinitive in Hebrew (e.g., 1:21; 2:1 *ter*, 3 *bis*, 5 *bis*, 6 *bis*, etc.), that it seems more likely that the original ל was dropped by a scribe influenced by the two infinitives without ל in the preceding and following verses (i.e., מִקְרִי). The difficulty that scribes had in accepting עֲדָם as an infinitive may be reflected in the pointing of myo, which take the word as a noun.

3:9 אֲזַ [mpwy f dbo]] אֲרִי a

אֲזַ in T generally renders Hebrew אֲזַ, the word found in most mss of MT. However, two mss listed by Kennicott read אֲרִי, the reading reflected by אֲרִי in a. Both אֲזַ and אֲרִי (taken as a temporal conjunction) fit the context equally well. However, אֲרִי is a more common conjunction than אֲזַ, and the scribe of a might have unconsciously replaced the latter with the former. Alternatively, because of graphic similarity, the scribe might have misread אֲזַ as אֲרִי, especially if the אֲזַ in his exemplar were smudged or faded at that point. These considerations, coupled with the preponderance of the external evidence, clearly indicate that the first variant is to be preferred. Nevertheless, it cannot be ruled out that the second variant reflects a correction to a varying Hebrew text.

3:10 יִקְרָא דִּיּוּי {p a do}} יּוּי mwy f b

The phrase יִקְרָא דִּיּוּי is a common circumlocution for the Hebrew יְהוָה in T.⁵⁰ It occurs particularly frequently when God is portrayed in a manner that might be considered irreverent.⁵¹ The surprising reading is the simple יּוּי, for one might have expected the circumlocution. It is easy to suppose that a scribe confronted with the shorter reading would have inserted יִקְרָא, probably intentionally. It seems highly improbable that the longer reading, were it original, would have been shortened, regardless of the fact that a modern individual might consider the shorter reading closer to MT. The external evidence also supports the shorter reading somewhat. Though both variants are supported by Babylonian and Tiberian mss and by printed editions, the second variant has stronger

⁵⁰Etan Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context*, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, no. 174 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1988), 58-59.

⁵¹Scholars frequently explain such substitutions as attempts to avoid anthropomorphism, but, as Levine notes, many much more blatant anthropomorphisms remain in the targumic texts; Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 55.

Babylonian support. However, it is the internal evidence that is most convincing, and it favors the shorter reading.

3:11 כל {p af d} | כל mwy bo | כל די f

3:11 די שמע יניה {mpwy a dbo} | די שמע ניה f

The external evidence in the first unit of variation favors the second variant, from which the third differs only orthographically. However, it is possible that the $\text{ד}^{\text{י}}$ before כל in f in the first unit of variation is simply misplaced from the beginning of די שמע יניה in the second unit. If so, f cannot be considered to support a deviation from the base text. Moreover, internal factors do not favor the alternatives to the base text. First, the reading of MT, אשר כל , is equivalent to variants 2 and 3. Scribes would have been more likely to change the text to conform with the standard Hebrew text than to delete the $\text{ד}^{\text{י}}$. Second, the inclusion of $\text{ד}^{\text{י}}$ creates a smoother text, connecting and subordinating the following clause to the preceding one. Third, the absence of $\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon$ in LXX mss Bya_2 suggests that a Hebrew text lacking אשר was current at one time (see above, p. 48). Thus, despite the stronger external attestation for the second and third variants, the base text should be preferred on the basis of the internal evidence.

3:16 ל שמואל {mp a bo} | ל שמואל ית wy f d

These two variants could be considered to be simply inner-Aramaic variations, since ל as well as ית can function as the marker of the definite direct object. However, it is more common for T to render אשר with ית , so it is possible that ל reflects a different Hebrew word. In fact, though Codex Leningradensis reads אשר , many Masoretic mss (Kennicott lists twenty-three) read אל . LXX also supports a Hebrew אל by its reading, $\pi\rho\sigma$. It seems likely, then, that some Aramaic scribe, feeling that ל was not quite as literal as might be desired, corrected the text to agree more closely with the dominant Hebrew ms tradition, reflected in most Masoretic mss. The external evidence does not contradict this conclusion, so the first variant should be retained.

3:18 בע ינוהי {mp a do} | קדמוהי wy f b

These two expressions are basically equivalent, but the second is the more exact rendering of the Hebrew בע ינוי found in many Masoretic mss.⁵² The standard rendering of expressions based on בע ינ and referring to people in T is the similar Aramaic phrase בע ינ . This rendering is found consistently in 1 Samuel in all twenty-six cases. When God is the object of the expression (either יהוה , אדני , or a pronominal suffix referring to

⁵²Though L reads the singular בע ינ , many other mss either read the plural in the consonantal text or have the plural as a *kethib-qere* variant in the margin.

God), the standard rendering is קדם (i.e., קדם יוי, קדםי, etc.), occurring all sixty times, excluding this one, in Samuel and Kings. In four of these instances, variants containing בעינן appear in one or two mss (2 Sam 11:27 f; 15:26 a; 1 Kings 11:38 yb; 2 Kings 18:3 a). However, these readings are surely secondary. The solidarity of the ms tradition leads to the conclusion that renderings including בעינן are either corrections to Hebrew idiom or, perhaps more likely, echoes of a lost Palestinian targum. Nevertheless, the official targum represented by T almost certainly read קדם in all these cases, including the present one.

3:19 חד {pwy af do} b לארעא | w₁ | + לארעא m

A look at the whole clause is helpful here: ולא בטיל מכל פתגמוהי חד. MT here has ולא הפיל מכל דבריו ארצה. All the other versions support MT here, except LXX^L, which adds ουδε εν ρημα after επι τη γη. It seems clear that the second and third variants are corrections to MT, and m is a conflation of these two renderings, similar to, but probably not genetically related to, that found in LXX^L. All that remains is the reading of the base text, and it is by far the most strongly attested reading. Thus, it should be retained.

One other item in the chapter that needs some comment is the form כִּהִיא in 3:13. The vowels imply that the form is a pael, meaning “to be dull,” but the context demands a pael, whose meaning corresponds with the Hebrew piel of כִּהִיא, meaning “to rebuke, punish.” Levy compounds the difficulty by citing the form as כִּהִיא, which is anomalous.⁵³ Because the context requires it, this verb is taken to be a pael in the statistics.

Summary of Deviations from the Base Text

3:2 ולא נלא

3:10 יוי ניקרא דיוי

Vulgate

V has the distinction among all the versions being considered, including the Hebrew, of being the only one to have a critical eclectic text. In fact, as noted above, two critical texts of V exist, the smaller Stuttgart version and the larger Roman version. The production of V^R was entrusted to the Benedictine order, and in particular to the supervision of Dom H. Quentin, at different times president of the order and abbot of the

⁵³He designates it a pael, however; J. Levy, *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Targumim und einen grossen Theil des rabbinischen Schriftthums*, 3d ed. (Leipzig: G. Engel, 1866; reprint, Cologne: Joseph Melzer Verlag, 1959), s.v. “כִּהִיא, כִּהִיא”. He mistakenly gives the reference to the present verse as 1 Sam 2:13.

monastery of St. Jerome. Quentin's methodology for determining the original text of Jerome is to divide the mss into families. The three great families he discerns in Samuel and Kings are the Hispanic family (C^ΛL^HX^ΠFG^ΣTOMB), the Alcuinian family (ΦRZGVP), and the Theodulfian family (Θ^{HSAMG}). Three less important groups of mss are the Italian (Ψ^{BDF}), Parisian (Ω^{SJM}), and the Ambrosian (Γ^{AB}) groups. Other mss have mixed texts, but D shares many readings with the Alcuinian family, and E shares readings with the Theodulfian family. The two oldest complete mss, R and A, belong to none of these groups,⁵⁴ having a text that is often reflected in one or more of them but that is more primitive. When these two mss agree, Quentin says, they manifest Jerome's text. When they disagree, an agreement with another old ms, C of the Hispanic group, provides Jerome's text.⁵⁵ Roberts criticizes this approach as too mechanical, but he notes that Quentin himself and the Benedictines who continued his work do not use this method without critical acumen.⁵⁶ Because of this criticism, it will be important to compare the text of the Roman edition with that of the Stuttgart edition.

When citing mss from a family or subfamily in which each ms has a common Greek letter and different superscripts, the agreement of all the mss with a certain reading will be indicated by giving merely the Greek letter (e.g., Γ = Γ^{AB}). None of the fragmentary mss cited in V^R has any readings in 1 Samuel 3. Printed editions are cited as lower case italic characters (i.e., *agrelvwsc*). Finally, patristic sources are occasionally noted, as follows: Gothic Breviary (Brev.goth.), Gregory the Great (Greg.M.), Isidore (Isid.), Bede (Beda).

3:3 *lucerna* RA C^ΛL^{*}Π^F K^{*} *wc*] *lucernam* {Λ^{L^{mg}}H^XΠ^GΣ^B DΦ EΘ Ψ Ω Γ PHK^{mg}I};
Brev.goth. Greg.M. Isid. Beda

Most mss and many patristic sources prefer the accusative *lucernam* to the nominative *lucerna*, thereby restructuring verses 2 and 3. The deviation is clearly an inner-Latin one, perhaps caused by confusion over whether *lucerna* had a line, representing *m*, over the *a* (*lucernā*). Another possible explanation for the variation is that scribes might have considered the construction with the nominative to be difficult and so substituted the accusative. This latter reason supports the nominative as the more difficult reading, as it seems unlikely that a scribe who had the accusative in his exemplar would have changed it to a nominative. Thus, though the preponderance of mss have the accusative, the nominative read by the early mss RAC and a few others is to be preferred.

⁵⁴Ferdinand Deist suggests that A may be associated with the work of Cassidorus, mentioned above, p. 34; Deist, *Text of OT*, 212.

⁵⁵*Biblia Sacra Romana*, 5:xiv-xv.

⁵⁶B. J. Roberts, *OT Text and Versions*, 261-62.

- 3:4 *Samuhel* {RA CLXPSB DF J^HSAG C W G^A PHKI}] *Samu[h]elem* EJM G^B
- 3:6 *Samuhel* 1° {RA CLXPSB DF J^HSAG C W G^A PHKI}] *Samu[h]elem* EJM G^B
relvsc
- 3:8 *Samuhel* {RA CLXPSB DF J^HSAG C W G^A PHKI}] *Samu[h]elem* EJM G^B *relvsc*
- 3:9 *ad Samuhel* {RA CLXPSB DF^{RZGP} J^HSAG C W PHKI}] *Samu[h]elem* F^V EJM G
K *relvsc*
- 3:11 *ad Samuhel* {RA CLXP DF^{RZGV*P} J^HSAG C W^{SJM} PHKI}] *Samu[h]elem* SB
FV² EJM W^M G *relvsc*

Several mss and most editions treat *Samuhel* as a declinable proper noun, whereas the other witnesses consider it to be indeclinable (or at least they do not distinguish between nominative and accusative).⁵⁷ Though the declinability of the word is an inner-Latin matter, the syntactic use of the indeclinable form is questionable in the first three units of variation. Whereas *Samuhel* in verses 9 and 11 are clearly accusative objects of the preposition *ad* (and thus the phrase *ad Samuhel* functions as the equivalent of a dative of indirect object), the same word in verses 4, 6, and 8 could be either accusative or vocative. Verse 10, where V reads *Samuhel Samuhel* as vocatives, must also be considered. MT in verse 4 reads אֱלֹהֵי שְׂמוּאֵל. In verses 6 and 8 שְׂמוּאֵל is ambiguous, since one would expect the direct object to be preceded by אֶת or a preposition;⁵⁸ it is possible that שְׂמוּאֵל is vocative.⁵⁹ אֱלֹהֵי שְׂמוּאֵל שְׂמוּאֵל in verse 10 are certainly both vocative. LXX clearly assumes a vocative in verses 4 and 6 and a direct object in verse 8 (most mss do not include Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ in verse 10; see above, p. 48). T agrees with MT in all four cases. Only P consistently and clearly renders the word as a direct object in the first three cases, but in verse 10 it reads a double vocative. When the context of V is examined, it seems probable that verse 8 should be taken as a direct object, but verses 4 and 6 could be vocatives. It is interesting that the editions *relvsc* do not have a variant *Samuelem* in verse 4 (or, of course, in verse 10). In conclusion, then, it is certain that the indeclinable form of the name is to be preferred in all the units of variation, but the function that *Samuhel* plays within verses 4 and 6 is debatable.

- 3:5 *et dixit* {RA CΛLHΠΠFGΣTB DΦRZGVP EΘH*SAMG* ΨB ΩJM ΓAB pmg}] + *ei*

⁵⁷Most mss are inconsistent in their use of case endings with *Samuhel*. Cf. v. 16, where almost all mss (except D) read *Samuhelem*, and v. 21, where *Samuheli* and *Samuhelis* are both found. See Stummer, “Einige Beobachtungen über die Arbeitsweise des Hieronymus bei der Übersetzung des Alten Testaments aus der Hebraica Veritas,” *Biblica* 10 (1929): 1-30.

⁵⁸אֶת־קַרְיָאֵל in Samuel and Kings is usually followed by אֶת־, לְ, אֶל, or אֶת־הַ, but cf. 1 Kings 22:13; 2 Sam 5:20; 1 Sam 9:24 (though this last passage may be corrupt).

⁵⁹Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 115b, says, “The object after the infinitive construct must also always be regarded as in the accusative, even when it is not expressly introduced . . . by the *nota accusativi* אֶת־.” This is indeed the case in 1 Kings 22:13. However, a verb like אֶת־קַרְיָאֵל introducing a vocative or direct discourse does not seem to have been considered (cf. 2 Kings 11:14 for an example of direct discourse after אֶת־קַרְיָאֵל infinitive construct).

XΣOM Θ^{H1}G² P*HKI ΨDF Ω^S

3:6 *dixit* {A CΛXΠΣB DΦ EΘ Ψ Ω Γ PHKI} + *ei* R

It was a common scribal practice to provide more details when the context might be ambiguous (and often when it was not). Several mss in the first case, and one the of most important mss in the second case, specify to whom Samuel was speaking. However, these additions are clearly inner-Latin and secondary.

3:5 *revertere* {RA CΛLH*ΠΣT* DΦRZGV Θ^H*SAMG ΨBDF* Ω^{Jm}gM P*K} + *et* Λ^{H2}XΣT²OMB Φ^P EΘ^{H2} P²HI Γ Ψ^{F2} Ω^{SJ}* *agrelvsc*; Greg.M. Brev.goth.

3:5 *et* 3° {R CΛLHXΣT* DΦRZGVP EΘ^{Hm}gAMG ΨBDF Ω^{SJM} Γ^{AB} PHKI} > A ΠΣT²OMB Θ^H*S

The addition and omission of conjunctions in V, as in other versions, was a common scribal practice, and external considerations must of necessity play a larger role in determining the original reading. Nevertheless, internal considerations do have a role to play. In the first unit of variation, a number of mss have a conjunction between the two imperatives. The addition of a conjunction at this point of the text is also found in several LXX mss, and, significantly, the *it*. However, the absence of the conjunction in any of the most ancient witnesses to V suggests that the presence of the conjunction is secondary, perhaps introduced on the basis of *it* texts; alternatively, it could have been added for stylistic reasons.

The absence of the conjunction in the second unit of variation is not supported by as many witnesses as in the first case, but the important ms A supports the variant, as do important Hispanic and Theodulfian mss. However, no witnesses in any other version support the second variant. It is possible that the omission of the conjunction indicates that, in the mind of at least one scribe, *abiit et dormivit* properly belonged to the following phrase *et adiecit dominus vocare rursus Samuhel*. Since the preponderance of external evidence points to the first variant, and since no evidence is compelling enough to suggest preferring the second to the first, the first variant should be accepted.

3:9 *ait* 1° {RA CΣB EΘ Ω PHKI*} *dixit* ΛXΠ DΦ I² Γ Ψ; Greg.M.

These two variants are equivalent, and both *aio* and *dico* commonly render אָמַר. In the first two accounts of God's calling Samuel (verses 4 and 5), after Samuel runs to Eli, *dixit* is used. It is possible that later scribes, influenced by these similar passages, changed *ait* to *dixit* in order to achieve a greater homogeneity. Otherwise, the change might be considered an unconscious lexical substitution, influenced, no doubt, by the earlier passages.

3:10 *loquere* R*A C Θ^{G2} rw] + *domine* R² Θ^G* {ΛXΠΣB DΦ EΘ^{HSAM} Ψ Ω Γ PHKI

agelvsc}; Greg.M.

The second variant agrees with LXX^L, *arm*, and P. More importantly, it reflects Samuel actually saying what Eli instructed him to say in verse 9. The fact that Samuel did not say exactly what he was told to say in many witnesses (including MT, LXX, *it*, and T) caused the scribes some consternation, and some of them remedied the situation by adding “the Lord.” The question here is whether or not *domine* was original with Jerome. The age and importance of mss RAC supporting the first variant outweigh the numerical superiority of the second variant. Furthermore, the intrinsic probability of adding *domine* to an originally shorter text is high, while the probability of dropping an original *domine* is low. Though extant *it* mss agree with MT, their propensity for agreeing with LXX^L suggests the possibility that other *it* mss no longer extant did add *domine*. If so, the second variant might be a correction to this text. Otherwise, it is an independent “improvement” of the text.

3:15 *timebat indicare visionem* {A CΛXΠ DΦ EΘ^{HAMG} Ψ Ω Γ PHKI}] 132 R Σ^{MB}
Θ^S | 213 Σ^{TO}

The variable in these variants is the position of *indicare*. Should it be second as in variant one, third as in variant two, or first as in variant three? The other secondary witnesses agree with the first variant and with MT that *indicare* should be second in the phrase. The origin of the other variants may be a ms of V that inadvertently omitted *indicare* when the text was first written. The same scribe or a later one, noticing the mistake, added the word in the margin next to its proper place. Later copyists, however, unable to discern the exact location (although the infinitive in Hebrew generally follows the verb, Latin has no such constraint), inserted it in a variety of places. Notwithstanding the testimony of R, the first variant should be accepted as the preferred reading on the basis of superior external attestation.

3:17 *ad te* RA C DΦRZGVP² Θ^{M²G²} P*; Goth.Brev.] *dominus ad te* ΛXΠΣB P²HKI Γ
Ψ^{DF} *aelvsc*; Greg.M. | *ad te dominus* Φ^{P*} E²Θ^{HSAM*G*} ΨB Ω

The problem with the first variant is that the subject is unspecified, either in the verse or in the immediately surrounding verses. The implied subject in variant one, in fact, is found in verse 11, six verses earlier. Variants two and three have no such problem, since the subject (*dominus*) is explicit. MT here also omits the subject, as does LXX, but with an important exception. Whereas the pointing in MT indicates an active verb with an implied subject, LXX has a passive verb, το ρημα το λαληθεν προς σε. The passive verb, of course, takes no subject, and so is no problem. LXX^L, apparently still troubled by the lack of specificity, reads το ρημα του κυριου το λαληθεν προς σε. P addresses the problem in a manner similar to variant three, כִּי יְהוָה יִלְכַּח אֵלֶיךָ. It is

unlikely that any direct connection exists between the rendering in P and that in mss of V, but the similar solution does indicate the manner in which scribes in various traditions addressed what they saw as textual difficulties. The variant position of *dominus* in variants two and three suggests that the word might be secondary to the text, as does the observation that the first variant is the most difficult reading. The fact that mss RAC all agree in the omission, as does the *it* ms Belsheim, sets the external evidence on the side of the first variant as well. Thus, the first variant should be accepted as original.

Summary of Deviations from the Base Text

No deviations from the text found in V^R (which agrees completely with V^S in the chapter) are considered original in chapter three.

Aquila

When presenting the readings of Aquila and the other partial secondary witnesses, the reading of LXX (or another complete secondary witness, in the case of other possible Hebrew readings) will be given as the collating base for identification purposes.

Contested Readings

3:3 πριν επισκευασθηναι] πριν σβεσθηναι α³ witnesses | πριν σβεσθηναι ουκ εσβεσθη α¹ witness

The reading πριν σβεσθηναι is reflected in three witnesses, while πριν σβεσθηναι ουκ εσβεσθη is found in only one. This latter variant, since it combines two essentially equivalent phrases, seems to be a conflation of α¹ and another Greek reading related to σ¹. The first of these readings, then, should be preferred as the authentic reading of α¹.

Accepted Readings

1	3:1	διαστελλουσα] διακοπτομενη α ¹
2		πριν επισκευασθηναι] πριν σβεσθηναι α ¹
3	3:3	η] η κατεστη α ¹
4	3:10	απαξ και απαξ] καθοδον εν καθοδω α ¹
5	3:13	ενουθετει αυτους] ημαυρωσεν εν αυτοις α ¹
6	3:21	δηλωθηναι] οραθηναι α ¹

Symmachus

Contested Readings

There are no contested readings in the chapter, aside from minor orthographical differences among mss.

Accepted Readings

1	3:1	τιμιον] σπανιον σ´
2		διαστελλουσα] προσερθομενη σ´
3	3:3	πριν επισκευασθηναι] ουπω εσβεσθη σ´
4	3:4	ιδου εγω] παρειμι σ´
5	3:7	πριν γνωναι] ουπω εγνωκει σ´
6		και αποκαλυφθηναι] ουδε απεκαλυφθη σ´
7	3:8	εσοφισατο] συνηκεν σ´
8	3:21	δηλωθηναι] οραθηναι σ´

Theodotion*Contested Readings*

There are no contested readings in the chapter.

Accepted Readings

1	3:8	εσοφισατο] συνετισθη θ´
2	3:13	ενουθετει αυτους] ημαυρωσεν εν αυτοις θ´
3	3:21	δηλωθηναι] οφθηναι θ´

Other Readings Attributed to οι γ´

No evaluation of the readings will be attempted, since it is not clear that different readings in fact represent the same tradition. Purely orthographical variants will be omitted. To avoid confusion, the abbreviation οι γ´ will be shortened to γ´ in the collation.

1	3:1	διαστελλουσα] προερθομενη γ´
2	3:2	βαρυνεσθαι] αμαυρουσθαι γ´
3		βαρυνεσθαι] ημβλυθησαν γ´
4	3:3	πριν η επισκευασθηναι] πριν η κατασκευασθηναι γ´
5		πριν η επισκευασθηναι] πριν κατασκευασθηναι γ´
6		πριν η επισκευασθηναι] πριν η κατασβεσθηναι γ´
7	3:4	και εκαλεσε] και κατεστη και εκαλεσε γ´
8		και εκαλεσε] και κατεστη και ελαλησε γ´
9	3:6	και επορευθη] και ανεστη Σαμουηλ και επορευθη γ´
10		και επορευθη] και ανεστη Σαμουηλ και απηλθεν γ´
11		και επορευθη] και ανεστη και επορευθη γ´
12		σε] + τεκνον γ´
13		σε] + υιε μου γ´
14	3:10	κατεστη] εστηλωθη γ´

15		απαξ και απαξ] απαξ και δις γ´
16	3:13	εν αδικιαις υιων αυτου] εν αδικιαις υιων αυτου ας εγνω γ´
17		εν αδικιαις υιων αυτου] εν αδικιαις υιων αυτου αις εγνω γ´
18		εν αδικιαις υιων αυτου] εν αδικιαις υιων αυτου ας εγνω γ´
19		κακολογουντες] καταρωμενοι γ´
20		ενουθετει] ημβλυενεν γ´
21	3:14	ουδ ουτως] δια τουτο ουν γ´
22	3:18	το αγαθον] το αρεστον γ´
23	3:21	προς Σαμουηλ . . . ενωπιον κυριου] προς Σαμουηλ εν Σηλω κατα ρημα κυριου γ´

The Lucianic Recension

Lagarde's edition of the Lucianic text has been criticized for various reasons, not least because he failed to include a critical apparatus with his text.⁶⁰ Furthermore, he sometimes accepted the reading of one Lucianic witness against the combined testimony of the other three. For these reasons, Lagarde's edition will be used, but all of his readings will not be accepted as being the pure Lucianic text. However, all of Lagarde's readings that are rejected will be listed in a separate section.

Studies on the Lucianic text have shown that the purest witnesses to that form of the text are boc_2e_2 . The witness referred to as b is in fact the consensus of b' and b . Of course, the Lucianic mss frequently agree with other groups of mss, but some individual mss occasionally agree with the main Lucianic mss on occasions in which all others differ. The ms which agrees the most often when others do not is z . In the collation below, the reading of LXX, as determined above, is given first, followed by the reading accepted as Lucianic.⁶¹ The Lucianic mss that support the reading will be listed, as will any mss or versions that agree uniquely with LXX^L or are joined by only one more witness. If more than five other witnesses agree with the Lucianic reading against LXX, this fact will be indicated by the word "many" in parentheses. The agreement of from three to five mss with LXX^L against LXX will be indicated by "few" in parentheses. It should be noted that any Lucianic reading that has no non-Lucianic witnesses listed in the collation as agreeing with it is a uniquely Lucianic reading.⁶²

⁶⁰Jellicoe, *LXX and Modern Study*, 7-9; Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, 2d ed., vols. 1-3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965), 3:29.

⁶¹The Lucianic reading will be determined primarily on external grounds, by counting the number of Lucianic mss that support the reading and taking the majority reading. If the witnesses are split two to two, the reading that differs from the main LXX will be accepted.

⁶²That is, no other LXX witnesses or daughter versions of LXX support the reading. A unique Lucianic reading may be supported by a witness in another tradition (e.g., P) or by one or more of the minor Greek witnesses.

Readings Accepted as Lucianic

- 1 3:1 λειτουργων] λειτουργουν *bc*₂
- 2 3:3 επισκευασθηναι] κατασκευασθηναι *boc*₂*e*₂; *Thdt*
- 3 ναω] + κυριου *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 4 η 2^ο] *pr ην boc*₂*e*₂ *z; arm*
- 5 3:4 και 1^ο] *pr και κατεστη boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 6 3:5 και 3^ο] ο δε *boe*₂ *z*
- 7 καθευδε] + τεκνον *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 8 3:6 κυριος] + ετι καλεσαι τον Σαμουηλ *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 9 σε] + τεκνον *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 10 3:7 θεον] *pr τον boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 11 αποκαλυφθηναι] *pr πριν η boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 12 αυτω ρημα κυριου] ρημα κυριου προς αυτον *boc*₂*e*₂
- 13 3:8 Σαμουηλ] + Σαμουηλ *boc*₂*e*₂ *Ng*
- 14 ανεστη] + Σαμουηλ *boc*₂*e*₂
- 15 3:9 ειπεν] + Ηλει τω Σαμουηλ *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 16 σε] + ο καλων *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 17 3:10 και απαχ] και δις Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ *boc*₂*e*₂
- 18 λαλει] + κυριε *bc*₂*e*₂
- 19 3:11 παντος] *pr ωστε boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 20 3:12 εις] και επι *boc*₂*e*₂; *eth*
- 21 επιτελεσω] συντελεσω *boc*₂*e*₂
- 22 3:13 ανηγγελκα] ανηγγειλα *boc*₂*e*₂ *z*
- 23 τον] *pr επι boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 24 αυτου 2^ο] + αις εγνω *bc*₂*e*₂ *z*
- 25 ουδ] ουθ *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 26 3:14 αδικια] αμαρτια *boc*₂*e*₂
- 27 και] η *boc*₂*e*₂
- 28 αιωνος] *pr του boc*₂*e*₂
- 29 3:15 οικου] *pr του boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 30 Σαμουηλ 2^ο] *post Ηλει boc*₂*e*₂
- 31 απαγγελαι] αναγγελαι *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 32 3:16 Σαμουηλ 2^ο] > *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)
- 33 3:17 ρημα] + κυριου *boc*₂*e*₂ *z*
- 34 σε] + την νυκτα τεκνον *boc*₂*e*₂ *z*
- 35 εκ παντων των λογων των λαληθεντων εν τοις ωσιν σου]
post εμου 1^ο *boc*₂*e*₂
- 36 3:18 απηγγειλεν] + αυτω *boc*₂*e*₂ (many)

37		αυτου 1°] + ρημα boc ₂ e ₂ z
38		αγαθον] αρεστον boc ₂ e ₂ (few)
39	3:19	κυριος] pr ο bc ₂ e ₂
40		και 3°] > boc ₂ e ₂
41		γην] + ουδε εν ρημα boc ₂ e ₂ z
42	3:20	Βηρσαβεε] Βηρσαβεαι boc ₂ e ₂ A
43	3:21	δηλωθηναι] του δηλωθηναι αυτω boc ₂ e ₂ M ^{mg}
44		Σηλωμ] Σηλω boc ₂ e ₂ (many)
45		οτι] και boc ₂ e ₂ z ^{a?}
46		Σαμουηλ 2°] > boc ₂ e ₂
47		προφητης γενεσθαι] του γενεσθαι εις προφητην boc ₂ e ₂ (many)
48		τω κυριω] κυριου boc ₂ e ₂ h (many read του κυριου)
49		ακρων 1°] + οριων boc ₂ e ₂ gz ^{mg}

Readings from Lagarde's Edition Not Considered to Be True Lucianic Readings

3:2		βαρυνεσθαι] αμαυρουσθαι b z ^{mg}
3:2		ηδυνατο] ηδυναντο ο (many)
3:3		επισκευασθηναι] κατασβεσθηναι (no LXX witnesses)
3:7		Σαμουηλ] + εδουλευε b; <i>it</i>
3:8		εσοφισατο] συνηκεν b M ^{mg}
3:13		εκδικω] εκδικησω b (many)
3:13		υιοι] pr οι bo (many)
3:20		Βηρσαβεε] idem b' (many) ⁶³

The Hexaplaric Recension

The hexaplaric text-tradition arose historically out of Origen's monumental work in creating the Hexapla. In the fifth column of this work, he included the text of LXX common in his day, but he made some changes. When he found a section in LXX that was not reflected in his Hebrew text in column one, he marked the section with an obelus (÷). When he found a section in the Hebrew not reflected in his text of LXX, he added it, usually from one of the minor Greek versions, and marked the section with an asterisk (Ē). The hexaplaric text arose when scribes copied the fifth column of Origen's work, either ignoring or not paying careful attention to the asterisks and obeli. Even if the original

⁶³The reconstructed Lucianic text used in this study may be found in Appendix 1, below, p. ***. Except for minor matters such as orthography, punctuation, versification, and the use of square brackets, it agrees with the Lucianic text reconstructed by Bernard Taylor, *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns*, vol 1: *Majority Text*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 50 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 9-12, in all respects except one: the text reconstructed in the present study reads υιοι in v. 13, whereas Taylor's text reads [οι] υιοι.

copyists were faithful to preserve the text-critical marks, later copyists were not. The result was the creation of a hybrid text, based on LXX, but supplemented from other Greek versions closer to the proto-Masoretic text.

The importance of hexaplaric readings for textual criticism is two-fold. First, its renderings that vary from OG (especially the pluses) often reflect readings of one or more of the minor Greek versions, which are only preserved in fragments and glosses scattered over several mss. Second, and more important for this study, any renderings that differ from both OG and MT might reflect a correction to a Hebrew text somewhat different than MT. Thus, it is only this latter category of readings that will be considered here.

Determining the hexaplaric text is problematic, since most mss and versions contain at least some hexaplaric readings. However, the studies of Bo Johnson help to isolate those witnesses that are particularly likely to preserve hexaplaric readings. In particular, Johnson concludes that the Greek mss Acx and, to a lesser extent, family d+ are the best representatives of the hexaplaric text in 1 Samuel.⁶⁴ It is important to note that, since the hexaplaric readings are being compared with MT as well as LXX, a reading which reflects only variation from LXX will not be listed, even if it might be the authentic hexaplaric Greek text. This limitation is legitimate in light of the fact that the hexaplaric text-tradition is a partial secondary witness rather than a complete secondary witness. Two other important witnesses to the hexaplaric text in 1 Samuel are *arm* and *syh*.⁶⁵ Those hexaplaric readings that will be considered in this study are listed below, collated in the same manner as the Lucianic text was above.

Accepted Hexaplaric Readings Differing from LXX and MT

1	3:3	ναω] οικω κυριου Ac
2	3:8	Σαμουηλ] pr επι d+ f+; (<i>arm</i>) ⁶⁶
3	3:10	λαλει] + κυριε cx b+; <i>arm</i> (few)
4	3:13	εκδικω εγω] εκδικησω A; <i>arm</i> (cx b; <i>cop</i> read εκδικησω εγω)
5		του] pr επι A d+ (many)
6		κακολογουντες] εκακολογουν cx; <i>arm</i> ^{vid} <i>it</i> ^b

⁶⁴Johnson, *Hexaplarische Rezension*, 88.

⁶⁵Ibid., 88-89. *Syh* is a translation of the fifth column of the Hexapla, including the diacritical marks. The textual history of the Armenian version is somewhat complex, having gone through three major stages: translation from Syriac, translation from Greek, and translation from another Greek text-tradition. The last stage, when it was translated from a hexaplaric Greek text, is the most evident in the present Armenian text, but remnants of the earlier history of the version remain. These can be observed in agreements between *arm* and P and between *arm* and non-hexaplaric Greek texts. See Bo Johnson, *Die armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge im 1. Samuelbuch*, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series, no. 2 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1968), 13-17, 158-60.

⁶⁶Acx reads επι instead of the επι of d+ f+, almost certainly an inner-Greek corruption rather than a rendering of a Hebrew לָע or לָע. *Arm*, along with b₂ and *it*^v, places the equivalent of επι before the infinitive; cf. Johnson, *Armenische Bibelübersetzung*, 86.

- 7 3:14 εν 2°] > cx d+; *it*
 8 3:15 κυριου] θεου cx
 9 Σαμουηλ 2°] > cx d
 10 3:21 τω κυριω] του κυριου A d+; *syhj eth it^b* (c omits phrase, x reads θεου)
 11 και 3°] > Acx; *arm* (many)

Rejected Readings from Hexaplaric Witnesses

The following list contains those readings that are shared by at least two Greek hexaplaric mss but are not considered the true hexaplaric text. Other instances of witnesses that are often hexaplaric but that have unique or almost unique readings (especially readings found in *arm* and no other hexaplaric witness) are numerous but are not listed.

- 3:8 καλεσαι] λαλησαι cx
 3:9 καλεση] καλεσει cx (many)
 σε] + ετι cx
 3:11 τα] pr παντα cx
 3:14 ωμοσα] ωμωσω cx
 ει] η cx Ne₂*
 3:17 κρυξης 1°] κρυξεις cx b'
 3:21 πρεσβυτης] πρεσβυτερος cx fm

All these readings are unique to cx, among Hexaplaric witnesses. In each case, the reading of cx is an inner-Greek development from the main LXX text and so is textually inferior. These readings will not be considered further.

- 3:17 των λογων] > cx b₂e₂; *eth^{vid}*

The omission of των λογων here is probably the result of parablepsis, so this reading should not be considered an authentic hexaplaric reading.

Other Possible Hebrew Readings

In this final section, other readings from witnesses that might possibly reflect a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the reading of MT are given. Only those variants are listed that are not reflected in any other secondary or partial secondary witness.

- 1 3:2 ηδυνατο] ηδυναντο Nadenopqtyzb₂
 2 3:5 לַאֲנָשִׁים] + , לַאֲנָשִׁים 6h1 7h12 7k3 9a1*fam* 9l1
 3 3:9 אֲנָשִׁים] אֲנָשִׁים a