

## CHAPTER 5

### CONSIDERATION OF VARIANTS FROM PRIMARY WITNESSES

After attempting to determine the original text of each of the secondary witnesses and sorting through the hundreds of variants to determine those that are significant, all that remains to do in compiling the significant variants is to list the variants from the primary witnesses. Once these are obtained, they may be set alongside the significant variants from the secondary witnesses for further consideration in determining the oldest form of the Hebrew text possible. The primary witnesses for the text of 1 Samuel 3 fall into two main categories: Masoretic variants and non-Masoretic variants, that is, variants from 4QSam<sup>a</sup>.<sup>1</sup> The Masoretic variants can be further divided into three groups. The first group consists of those mss identified by Goshen-Gottstein as those whose readings diverge enough from the mass of Masoretic mss to warrant further investigation (mss 70, 89, 174, and 187).<sup>2</sup> The second group is the *qere* readings found in the margins of the mss. The third group is the *tiqqune sopherim*, or scribal corrections, listed in the rabbinic literature.<sup>3</sup>

The variants listed in this chapter may be divided into two groups: purely orthographic variants, and those that are more substantial, the latter of which are treated as significant. In each section, the orthographic variants, where present, will be listed before the substantial variants.<sup>4</sup> All variants are collated against MT (ms L, as reflected in BHS) as the base text.

---

<sup>1</sup>For a complete list of the contents of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, see Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 271. In 1 Samuel 3, the ms contains portions of verses 1-4 and 18-20.

<sup>2</sup>Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 287.

<sup>3</sup>For the entire book of Samuel, other primary witnesses would include the *puncta extraordinaria* (special points), *sebirin*, and *itture sopherim* (scribal omissions). See Würthwein, *Text of OT*, 17-20.

<sup>4</sup>In his discussion of orthography in the Masoretic mss, Barr concludes that the spelling patterns of MT suggest that one ms (or a few mss) are the basis for the entire Masoretic tradition, so little evidence remains of the orthography of the original form of most books. Another implication of his study would seem to be that few purely orthographic variants are true reflections of the spelling found in a particular ancient Hebrew ms, though scribes involved in the earliest transmission of the standard text after the first century C.E. might have introduced orthographic variants (especially defective spelling) independently of any ms tradition. Cf. James Barr, *The Variable Spellings of the Hebrew Bible*, Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1986 (Oxford: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1989), 204-8.

Variants in Masoretic Manuscripts

Important Manuscripts as Identified by Goshen-Gottstein

Although Goshen-Gottstein states that no extant medieval mss “may be termed ‘valuable’ or be worthy of our attention more than any other,”<sup>5</sup> he does identify four mss which “stand out” and “have to be considered” in Samuel.<sup>6</sup> Since some way of identifying these mss is necessary, the phrase “important manuscripts” will be used, though Goshen-Gottstein’s doubts concerning them are recognized. At this point, no attempt is made to differentiate which variants in these mss, if any, might possibly go back to times before the standardization of the text in the first few centuries C.E. and which arose in medieval times, though of course all of the orthographic variants probably belong to the latter category.<sup>7</sup>

Before listing the variants, however, a brief description of each of the four important mss is in order.<sup>8</sup> Ms 70 contains the former prophets, was written at the beginning of the fifteenth century, and is housed at Oxford. Ms 89 is a full Bible (OT) ms, with a Spanish character. It is often difficult to distinguish the letters ך and ך and the letters ם and ם. This ms contains about twelve thousand variants from the majority of the Masoretic mss. It was written at the beginning of the thirteenth century and is found at Cambridge. Ms 174 contains the former prophets. In it, the letters ך and ך and the letters ך and ך are sometimes similar. Frequent *qere* readings are present in the (*kethib*) text. Written in 1346, it is housed at Copenhagen. Finally, ms 187 contains the former prophets, Megilloth, Jeremiah, and Isaiah. It has a German character and comes from the end of the thirteenth century. It is kept in Milan.

*Orthographic Variants*

1	3:2	89 במקמו ןבמקומו
2		89 174 ועיניו ןועינו
3		187 כהת ןכהות
4	3:3	174 שוכב ןשכב
5	3:6	174 ויוסף ןויסף
6		174 קרוא ןקרא
7	3:8	174 ויוסף ןויסף

<sup>5</sup>Goshen-Gottstein, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts,” 277.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 287, n. 3.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. the discussion in *ibid.*, 274-76. It is Goshen-Gottstein’s opinion that none of the variants in Masoretic mss can be connected with any non-Masoretic tradition; *ibid.*, 277.

<sup>8</sup>The descriptions of these mss are taken from Benjamin Kennicott, *Dissertatio generalis in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum; cum variis lectionibus, ex codicibus manuscriptis et impressis* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1780), 77-87.

8		בשל ישית נבשל ישת 70 89 174 187
9	3:9	במקמו נבמקומו 89
10	3:11	תצילנה נתצל ינה 70
11	3:13	שופט נשפט 174
12	3:17	יסיף ניוסיף 174
13	3:18	בעיניו נבעינו 174
14		בעיני נבעינו 89
15	3:21	ויוסף נויסף 70
16		בשילה נבשלה 174 187
17		בשילו נבשלו 70

### Substantial Variants

18	3:2	נהחלו > 89
19		ולא נלא 187
20		יוכלו ניוכל 187
21		כהות לראות נלראות 70
22	3:3	האל הים נ <sup>2</sup> אל הים 89
23	3:5	בני + mg [קראתי 70
24		לך + [קראתי 187
25	3:6	ויאמר הנני + נ <sup>1</sup> שמואל 70
26		> 89 187 [ויקם שמואל
27		> 174 [2 <sup>2</sup> שמואל
28		> 70 [בני
29		וילך וישכב + [שכב 70
30		verse 6 <i>fin</i> ] + verse 6 (repeated) 70
31		70 ויאמר 2° (in repeated occurrence of verse 6)]
32	3:8	שמואל + [ויקם 174
33		עוד + נ <sup>1</sup> קרא 70
34	3:9	אל שמואל נלשמואל 70
35	3:14	> 89 [ל בית
36	3:15	> 70 [נהבקר
37		> 187 [2 <sup>2</sup> את
38		89 אל נ <sup>2</sup> את
39	3:16	89 174 אל נאת
40	3:17	> 70 [אשר דבר
41		21 187 [נא תכחד
42		> 70 [כה יעשה לך אל הים וכה יוסיף אם תכחד ממני
43		187 הדברים נהדבר

44	3:18	האלה + [הדברים] 174
45		[הוא] > 174
46	3:20	בית יהוה [ל יהוה] 174
47	3:21	אל מנוח + [להראה] 70
48		[נגלה יהוה אל שמואל בשלו] > 187
49		[בשלו] > 89
50		כדבר [בדבר] 89

No attempt will be made here to evaluate each of the substantial variants, since they are by definition significant, occurring as they do in Hebrew mss that are deemed important. However, it is clear at a glance that most of these variants are inner-Masoretic developments, either scribal errors (e.g., parablepsis in variant 42), reading *qere* for *kethib* (orthographic variants 2 and 13, both in ms 174 [see description of this ms above]), or other common scribal modifications (e.g., interchange or omission of particles and prepositions [variants 37, 38], addition or omission of a conjunction [variant 19], explanatory additions [variant 24]). Two of the most interesting readings are found in ms 70: (1) the twofold inclusion of verse 6, with differences between the two occurrences (variants 25, 28, 29, 30, 31), and (2) the addition of the words “to Manoah” (variant 47), an apparent reference to Judges 13.

### Kethib-Qere

#### *Orthographic Variants*

51	3:2	Q [ועיניו] K ועינו
52	3:18	Q [ועיניו] K ועינו

### Tiqqune Sopherim

#### *Substantial Variants*

53	3:13	אלהים [להם] <i>tiq soph</i>
----	------	-----------------------------

### Variants in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>

Part of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> was published in a preliminary fashion by Cross in 1953,<sup>9</sup> but he only discussed that part of the scroll containing 1 Sam 1:22-2:6 and 2:16-25. Both Ulrich and McCarter refer to portions of chapter 3 in the scroll, though neither gives the full

<sup>9</sup>Cross, “New Qumran Biblical Fragment,” 15-26. See Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 9-10, for a description of the scroll. David Noel Freedman describes the orthography of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> as proto-Samaritan; David Noel Freedman, K. A. Mathews, and R. S. Hanson, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll (11QpaleoLev)* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns for the American Schools of Oriental Research, 1985), 56, cf. 61-62.

contents of the chapter.<sup>10</sup> Only a small part of chapter 3 has been identified on the fragments of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, namely, 3:1-4, 18-20.<sup>11</sup> A look at a photograph of the scroll indicates that only seventeen words or parts of words have been preserved on two fragments. In order to collate 4QSam<sup>a</sup> with MT, a tentative reconstruction of the two fragments is necessary.<sup>12</sup>

Fragment 1:	וַדְבַר יְהוָה	(3:1)
	בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא וְעַל־י	(3:2)
	לְרַאֲתוֹת וַיִּגַּר	(3:2-3)
	יְהוָה שְׁמוֹנָל	(3:4)
Fragment 2:	כּוֹל הַדְּבָרִים	(3:18)
	יַעֲשֶׂה וַיִּגְדֵּל	(3:18-19)
	אַרְצָה וַיִּדְעַ	(3:19-20)
	לְנַבִּיאַ לַיהוָה	(3:20)

Based on this reading of the fragments, the following variations from MT result.

#### *Orthographic Variants*

1 3:18 כּוֹל נְכַל 4QSam<sup>a</sup>

#### *Substantial Variants*

2 3:3 ]יהוה אשר שם ארון אל הים > 4QSam<sup>a</sup><sup>vid</sup><sup>13</sup>

3 3:4 ]אל > 4QSam<sup>a</sup><sup>14</sup>

<sup>10</sup>Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 63; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 95.

<sup>11</sup>Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 271.

<sup>12</sup>It must be stressed that this reconstruction is tentative, since it is based only on an examination of a photograph of the ms, as well as reference to Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, and McCarter, *I Samuel*. The photograph was provided by the Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center and is courtesy of the Israel Antiquities Authority; Israel Antiquities Authority, “PAM 41.766,” photograph (Claremont: Ancient Biblical Manuscript Center, 1992). Official publication of the scroll will be in Frank Moore Cross and Eugene Charles Ulrich, eds., *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan*, vol. 11 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, forthcoming).

<sup>13</sup>Ulrich notes that the scribe of 4QSam<sup>a</sup> wrote about fifty letters per line, at least in this part of the scroll; Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 63. Though McCarter does not say so specifically, this letter count seems to be behind his suggestion that the scroll omits five words found in MT; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 95. If so, it would agree with LXX in omitting “Yahweh,” but it would be alone in omitting the other words. Though space considerations do not force this exact appraisal, the readings of both ך and ם are certain. Thus, it is clear that the scroll is different from MT at this point, and it is probable that it is about twenty letters shorter.

<sup>14</sup>Both Ulrich, tentatively, and McCarter, without qualification, suggest another variant, namely, that 4QSam<sup>a</sup> agrees with LXX in adding a second “Samuel”; Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 63; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 95. This suggestion, however plausible, is not *directly* supported by the fragment, since no trace of the second שמואל appears, but is based on the omission of אל (variant 3). In light of the fact that MT also omits אל in verse 8 (cf. v. 6), a second “Samuel” is not an assured reading and remains a conjecture.

Though few variants from MT remain in 4QSam<sup>a</sup>, it is noteworthy that the number of variants per word of MT in 4QSam<sup>a</sup> is much higher than that of any one of the Masoretic mss.

### Conclusions: Significant Variants in 1 Samuel 3

The preceding analysis has demonstrated the importance of understanding the translation techniques of the various translators of the secondary witnesses. It has also clarified certain aspects of those translation techniques. A description of the translation techniques of each of the versions will not be repeated here, since they were described and developed in an inductive manner as the study progressed. It is important to note, however, that the summaries given in the text, especially in Chapter 3, are just that: summaries. A more detailed understanding of the translation technique will require study of the statistical tables that describe the data. Nevertheless, an overview of the translation technique of each of the versions can be gathered by reading (1) the description of the preliminary partial translation technique in Chapter 3, (2) the modification of that description after the analysis of the data later in the same chapter, (3) the initial description of the final translation technique in Chapter 4, and (4) the modifications to that description, if any are necessary, later in Chapter 4.

Out of a total of 527 variants analyzed in the secondary witnesses, only 81 were identified as significant, and 45 of those were in LXX, plus another 16 in other Greek witnesses. A list of the significant variants for each of the secondary and partial secondary witnesses follows.

#### Septuagint

##### *Consistency*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Septuagint</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
3	3:1	ην διαστελλουσα	active	niphal
6	3:2	βαρυνεσθαι	lexeme	
12	3:5	ανεστρεψεν	lexeme	
13	3:6	εκαλεσεν	verb	infinitive
15	3:7	θεον	lexeme	
18	3:9	αναστρεφε	lexeme	
26	3:12	επι	lexeme	
27		εις	lexeme	
30	3:13	ανηγγελκα	perfect	perfect w/c
32		αδικiais	plural	singular
33		θεον	lexeme	

34		και ουδ ουτως	word division
40	3:16	προς	lexeme

*Word Order*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Greek Variant</u>
67	3:16	3	και ειπεν
68	3:19	1	ην κυριος

*Quantitative Representation*

70	3:1	+2	του ιερεως
71	3:2	+1	και 4°
72	3:3	-1	יהוה
74	3:4	-1	אל
75		+1	Σαμουηλ
76	3:5	+1	σε
78	3:6	+1	και 2°
79		-1	עוד
80		+1	Σαμουηλ 2°
81		-3	ויקם שמואל
82		+1	εκ δευτερου
83		-2	בני
84		+1	σε
86	3:7	-1	טרם 2°
87	3:9	-3	עלי לשמואל
89		+1	τεκνον
90	3:10	+1	αυτον
91		-2	שמואל שמואל
92	3:11	+1	μου
93		-1	אשר
94	3:13	-2	אשר ידע
95		+2	υιων αυτου
96	3:15	+4	και ωρθρισεν το πρωι
98	3:16	-2	ויקרא
100	3:17	-2	אל 2°
101		+3	εν τοις ωσιν σου
102	3:18	-2	לו
103		+1	Ηλει
104	3:21	-5	בשלו בדבר יהוה

105	+31	και επιστευθη Σαμουηλ προφητης γενεσθαι τω κυριω εις παντα Ισραηλ απ ακρων της γης και εως ακρων και Ηλει πρεσβυτης σφοδρα και οι υιοι αυτου πορευομενοι επορευοντο και πονηρα η οδος αυτων ενωπιου κυριου
-----	-----	--

Peshitta*Consistency*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Peshitta</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
8	3:3	ܠܝܢ 1°	lexeme	
27	3:15	ܠܝܢ	singular	plural
30	3:17	ܠܡܢܢ	lexeme	
36	3:20	ܠܡܢܢ	lexeme	
37	3:21	ܠܡܢܢ ܘܢܝܢ	plural	singular

*Word Order*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Syriac Variant</u>
48	3:1	1	ܠܡܢܢ ܘܢܝܢ
49	3:6	2	ܡܢܢ

*Quantitative Representation*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Variant</u>
56	3:2	+1	-ܢ 4°
79	3:9	-1	ܡܢܢ-
81		-1	-ܢ 3°
94	3:14	-1	-ܢ 1°
123	3:21	+1	ܡܢܢ-
124		-1	ܡܢܢ ܘܢܝܢ 3°



Targum*Consistency*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Targum</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
24	3:13	יְתִיב	perfect	perfect w/c
30	3:16	-ל	preposition	DDO

*Quantitative Representation*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Variant</u>
46	3:2	+1	-] 4°
56	3:11	-1	וְשֵׁן

Vulgate*Consistency*

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Vulgate</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
28	3:13	<i>praedixi</i>	perfect	perfect w/c

The Lucianic Recension

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation (from LXX)</u>
8	3:6	κυριος ] + ετι καλεσαι τον Σαμουηλ
12	3:7	αυτω ρημα κυριου] ρημα κυριου προς αυτον
20	3:12	εις] και επι
30	3:15	Σαμουηλ 2°] post Ηλει
40	3:19	και 3°] >
46	3:21	Σαμουηλ 2°] >
47		προφητης γενεσθαι] του γενεσθαι εις προφητην
48		τω κυριω] κυριου

The Hexaplaric Recension

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation (from LXX)</u>
1	3:3	ναω] οικω κυριου
2	3:8	Σαμουηλ] pr ετι
3	3:10	λαλει] + κυριε
8	3:15	κυριου] θεου
9		Σαμουηλ 2°] >
10	3:21	τω κυριω] του κυριου
11		και 3°] >

Other Possible Hebrew Readings

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation (from indicated base text)</u>
1	3:2	ηδυνατο] ηδυναντο (LXX)
2	3:5	לַמַּלְאָךְ + ,כִּי (P)
3	3:9	וְיָרֵא (T)

When the 36 substantial variants found in the primary witnesses are added to the total above, a total of 117 significant variant readings have been identified for 1 Samuel 3.

Armed with this list of variants considered to be significant for determining the text of 1 Samuel 3, a few other works may be consulted as an example of how variants from the versions, particularly LXX, are often used in evaluating the text. Schulz implies that the translators of LXX read נפל in 3:19,<sup>15</sup> but the fact that LXX frequently uses the active voice in a causative manner makes Schulz's suggestion questionable. A corollary of the rule that translation technique must be considered before using the evidence of a version is that the text of the version itself must first be determined. So, for example, many commentators assume that ms B is the text of LXX, or at least they use its text as if it were. In fact, it would better to use Rahlfs's text of LXX, since he examines other mss besides B, in lieu of a volume on Samuel in the Göttingen edition. McCarter occasionally uses B as though it were equivalent to the OG, for example, in verse 9 where he accepts the reading "Speak" (without "Lord") on the basis of B, or when he omits "and thus may he add" in verse 17, following only mss Ba<sub>2</sub> (plus *cop it*), but not the vast majority of the Greek mss or Rahlfs.<sup>16</sup> Similarly, Schulz says of verse 17 that "G hat den zweiten Teil (וְכִי יוֹסִיף) nicht übersetzt."<sup>17</sup>

The other versions are not used nearly as often as LXX in textual discussions, but a few examples will show that they are often used in a manner similar to LXX, that is, without considering the translation technique. Caspari, in his discussion of verse 2, says that the text of P implies a *Vorlage* כבדוּת.<sup>18</sup> While it is true that forms of לַמַּלְאָךְ are the regular way of rendering forms of כבד, it does not follow that the occurrence of לַמַּלְאָךְ necessarily implies a *Vorlage* of כבד. In fact, a look at 4:15 shows otherwise: again Eli's eyes are the subject, and this time they are described as "set," קָמָה in MT. Again P reads a form of לַמַּלְאָךְ (this time לַמַּלְאָךְ), so it appears that לַמַּלְאָךְ is a typical way of describing the blindness of eyes, and Caspari's assessment of the text of P does not hold.<sup>19</sup> Caspari says

<sup>15</sup>Schulz, *Bücher Samuel*, 66; cf. Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 76-77.

<sup>16</sup>McCarter, *I Samuel*, 95-96.

<sup>17</sup>Schulz, *Bücher Samuel*, 65. Cf. also R. Fruin, "Oudtestamentische Studiën, *Nieuw theologisch tijdschrift* 20 (1931): 108, who says that the Hebrew text of Judges 18:30 was changed from "Moses" to "Manasseh" before LXX was translated. However, only B reads "Manasseh"; most mss read "Moses."

<sup>18</sup>Caspari, *Samuelbücher*, 53.

<sup>19</sup>Ironically, Caspari fails to mention the reading of LXX in 3:2, which is βαρυνεσθαι and may in fact imply a form of כבד in the *Vorlage* (see above, pp. 86-87; LXX reads επανεστησαν in 4:15,

of verse 8 that P supports an additional עוֹד, but the discussion of variant 71 demonstrates that no such assumption can be made on the basis of P, since the translators were free with their explanatory additions. In verse 4, he says of the word “Samuel”: “Aeth schützt Voc durch לְאַמֵּר.”<sup>20</sup> Though it is a minor point, since *eth* (and *cop*) are witnesses to LXX rather than a Hebrew text, he should say that it points to a reading of λεγοντες; as it stands, his comment gives more importance to the reading of *eth* than it deserves. Schwartz says that מִגַּם תִּזְכֹּר in verse 1 is equivalent to לְפָנַי יְהוָה,<sup>21</sup> but the discussion of variant 2 clearly demonstrates that the text of P implies no other reading than אֵת יְהוָה of MT. Thenius says that V adds יְהוָה after דַּבֵּר in verse 10.<sup>22</sup> As with the examples of equating ms B with LXX mentioned above, the problem here is that Thenius gives the reading of the Clementine Vulgate, which does not contain the best text of V at this point. In verse 19, he claims that V (joined by LXX and Josephus) supports the reading נָפַל instead of MT’s הִפִּיל.<sup>23</sup> Since neither Latin nor Greek can express causative ideas without circumlocution, V does not imply a *qal* in the *Vorlage* any more than LXX does. Such citations of the versions could be multiplied greatly, even for so small a unit as 1 Samuel 3. However, enough have been listed to conclude that the translation technique of the versions must be studied in detail before any evidence from them can be cited.<sup>24</sup>

While it is easy to identify certain treatments of the secondary witnesses as invalid, it is not as easy to decide one particular set of cases. When a significant variant has been identified in one of the witnesses, should variants in other witnesses that seem to agree with it, but have been deemed nonsignificant, be cited as supporting the reading? For example, *BHS* cites V as a witness to be consulted for the reading כַּדְבַּר יְהוָה (MT reads בַּדְבַּר יְהוָה) in verse 21. However, the discussion of variant 47 above (pp. 152-53) concludes that V shows too much freedom in its use of prepositions to consider this variant significant. Since the variant כַּדְבַּר is significant, though (it is read by many Masoretic mss, including the important ms 89), is it permissible to cite V in support of the reading, despite Jerome’s somewhat cavalier approach to rendering prepositions? The answer to this question is a qualified yes. The adage that there is strength in numbers applies to this situation: borderline readings that have been classified as nonsignificant might warrant

---

supporting MT [but cf. LXX<sup>L</sup>, εβαρυσθησαν]).

<sup>20</sup>Caspari, *Samuelbücher*, 54.

<sup>21</sup>Schwartz, *Syrische Uebersetzung*, 11.

<sup>22</sup>Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 17.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup>Lest the singling out of these sources as negative examples be seen as an overall negative evaluation of their work, it should be noted that at least they studied the text and tried to make intelligent decisions. They were not content to rely without question on the traditional text (i.e., MT).

reevaluation if a similar reading elsewhere turns out to be significant. Even if, upon further consideration, the reading remains nonsignificant, it can and should be cited alongside the evidence of the significant variant, though due caution concerning its relevance should be noted.<sup>25</sup> For example, in 1 Sam 3:12 McCarter advocates reading עַל־עַל, which is supported by all the secondary versions. However, the only variant that is significant is in LXX, since the semantic ranges of לְ and לִּ are larger than that of עַל, and since the *adversum* of V may be another instance of Jerome's freedom in rendering prepositions. Since LXX does have a significant variant here, the other versions may be cited in support, but it should be noted that their testimony is not as weighty as that of LXX. Thus, a comment such as "reading עַל־עַל with LXX (*epi ēlei*); cf. P, T, V" would be preferable to "reading עַל־עַל with LXX (*epi ēlei*) and Syr., Targ., Vulg."<sup>26</sup> One option would be always to cite the readings of the versions in their own languages, rather than (or before) giving the Hebrew equivalent, since giving the Hebrew leaves the impression that their *Vorlage* did indeed read what is listed. This suggestion applies as much to critical apparatuses as to commentaries and studies, if not more so.

The first two steps of the proposed text-critical methodology, namely, (1) determining the lexical, grammatical, and stylistic characteristics of the secondary witnesses, and (2) determining the literary, theological, and historical characteristics of those witnesses, are now complete, and the significant variants from the secondary witnesses have joined the readings of the primary witnesses as claimants to the title of earliest recoverable text. It should perhaps be noted once again that identifying variants as significant does not imply that they should be preferred to the text of MT in any or all cases. That determination is the goal of the remainder of this study.

---

<sup>25</sup>Some nonsignificant readings that support significant readings in other witnesses should *not* be cited, for example, when the reading is a common one that probably arose independently (such as the addition or omission of a conjunction) or when the reading probably arose as a result of intra-witness contamination (e.g., an inner-Greek error). When nonsignificant variants are cited as supporting a particular reading, they should be distinguished in some way from those readings considered significant. See, below, Chapter 8, for a suggested way of citing nonsignificant variants alongside significant variants.

<sup>26</sup>McCarter, *I Samuel*, 96. Driver also cites the support of all the versions, but it is unclear whether his "Pesh. Targ. לְ" is supposed to be an Aramaic/Syriac reading given only in Aramaic characters or an indication of the Hebrew text underlying the two versions; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, 43.