INTRODUCTION

Research Problem

The text-tradition of the OT that has played the most important role in modern exegetical, historical, literary, and theological studies, as well as that which forms the basis for most translations, is the Masoretic Text (MT). MT owes its distinction to a variety of factors: (1) it is part of the text-tradition used almost exclusively by the Jews since about 100 C.E.; (2) it is the only complete witness in the original languages to the entirety of the Jewish Scriptures (the Protestant OT) that is extant; (3) it was the only Hebrew witness to the text known to scholars before the rediscovery of the Samaritan Pentateuch in 1616 and the ms discoveries of the past century (e.g., the mss of the Judean desert and the Cairo Geniza);[1] (4) it was the text Luther and other reformers turned to after their rejection of the Latin Vulgate (V).[2] MT, then, has occupied and continues to occupy a privileged place among witnesses to the text of the OT. In the books of Samuel and Kings, however, scholars have long accused MT of poor quality in many places, and they have turned to the Septuagint (LXX) and other witnesses as valuable tools for understanding the text.

Several recent studies have analyzed MT (or some other witness) with little or no regard for other text-traditions. James A. Sanders makes the valuable observation that each text-tradition was viewed by its tradents as *the* text of Scripture, and thus it was understood without reference to other texts. Thus, modern interpreters can benefit from an understanding of the meaning(s) present in a single witness.[3] Nevertheless, the goal of textual criticism is "to produce a text as close as possible to the original,"[4] and this process

---

[1]Cf. *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* [hereafter *IDB*], s.v. "Samaritan Pentateuch," by Bleddyn J. Roberts; Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Old Testament Text," in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970) 1: 159-99; Paul E. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959).

[2]For a synopsis of the debate over the value of MT from the Middle Ages to the early twentieth century, see Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, vol. 1, *Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, no. 50/1 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1982; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), *1-*40.

[3]"You must learn to respect each of the witnesses before you doubt them"; lecture delivered at the University of Stellenbosch, South Africa, 17 August 1989. Cf. also Sanders, *From Sacred Story to Sacred Text* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 127-51, esp. p. 134, "All versions are to some extent relevant to the communities for which translated"; Hans Joachim Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis*, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, vol. 8, pt. 1 (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1973), 31: "[Der Exeget] muß sogar jede Rezension zunächst für sich genommen und so weit wie möglich aus sich verstanden werden."

[4]Paul Maas, *Textual Criticism*, trans. Barbara Flower (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958), 1.

necessarily involves the reconstruction of a presumed "original text." The fact that the reconstructed text is not exactly the same as the autograph should not dissuade the textual critic, nor should the assertion that the new "eclectic" text does not represent the text used in any one community deter him or her.[5]

Much text-critical work has focused on a specific verse or word without regard for the larger context. For example, many scholars have proposed emending the pointing of וְאָמַר in Isa. 40:6 MT to וְאֹמַר, partially on the basis of the LXX reading καὶ εἶπα.[6] However, the LXX reading here does not clearly indicate that the translator had a different understanding of the *Vorlage* (nor a different *Vorlage*), for a priest, rather than a prophet, is speaking in verses 1 and 2, and the translator may have placed the words of the second half of the verse in the mouth of the priest rather than the prophet.[7] Furthermore, the translation technique of LXX Isaiah has often been described as free or even paraphrastic.[8] The textual critic must be especially cautious about assuming that an apparent variant in a free translation indicates a difference in the *Vorlage*.[9]

---

[5]Of course, the textual critic may choose to reconstruct the text used by a particular community at a particular time rather than to reconstruct the original archetype. But the charge that a "new" text has been created which has no historical worth is simply invalid. The textual critic's goal, by definition, is to attempt to recreate earlier, non-extant forms of the text, not to reproduce a form of the text that was actually used and interpreted by a specific community (though the latter goal is legitimate both in itself and as an intermediate step toward the recovery of a more ancient text). Since the transmission history of the OT is so complex, many have sought to reproduce a form of the text other than the original. For example, the Committee for the Textual Analysis of the Hebrew Old Testament, working under the auspices of the United Bible Societies, has identified four possible texts toward which their committee could work: (1) the original oral or written form; (2) the most primitive form attested by extant witnesses; (3) the normative Jewish text after 70 C.E.; (4) MT as determined in the ninth or tenth century. With the exception of Proverbs, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, they have sought to reconstruct the text as described in the second stage above; see Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, 1:*69. The OT textual critic must also be aware of the overlap between textual criticism and literary criticism when dealing with the early stages of the transmission of the text, since some traditions continued to grow after their form at one stage was recorded. Cf. Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Textual Study of the Bible—A New Outlook," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975), 332-36; Emanuel Tov, "Some Sequence Differences between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 13 (1987): 151-60.

[6]For example, D. Winton Thomas in K. Elliger and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*, 2d ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1983) [hereafter *BHS*] and Rudolf Kittel in Rudolf Kittel, ed. *Biblia Hebraica*, 3d ed. (Stuttgart: Privegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937) [hereafter *BHK*].

[7]Sanders, Lecture.

[8]Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Jerusalem Biblical Studies, no. 3 (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981), 63; chapters 36-39, however, are relatively literal; ibid., 51. See also Isac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1948), passim.

[9]In a discussion of the history of the indiscriminate use of textual variants, M. H. Goshen-Gottstein remarks sardonically, "Textual critics were at liberty to plough through the collations [of Hebrew mss] and to dig up what they thought useful for their purpose. They have done so ever since"; M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts: Their History and Their Place in the HUBP Edition," *Biblica* 48 (1967): 253.

Some scholars, while accepting the validity of textual criticism, believe that it should be done only after each of the distinct text-traditions has been examined from a literary standpoint for consistency and "fit" in the context.[10] However, this approach seems to confuse the roles of textual critic, literary critic, and interpreter. Though he or she should consider the literary qualities (or lack thereof) and internal consistency of a textual witness, the textual critic is not primarily interested in an aesthetic evaluation of the various witnesses. The fact that a witness "makes sense" as it stands does not imply its originality, much less its independence from the stream of tradition.[11] Moreover, the meaning of a particular reading as enshrined in a "real" text-tradition is not necessarily that of the archetype of the tradition. Many factors, both intentional and unintentional, can produce variant readings, each of which makes perfectly good sense in the context.

Other scholars contend that one must begin with analysis of the text before literary analysis is of any value. For example, Emanuel Tov says, "It is absolutely mandatory to start the analysis with the textual evidence."[12] He points particularly to the necessity of determining a witness's translation technique before evaluating its readings, and he sets forth five criteria for determining the relative literalness of the translation.[13] Once the translation technique of each witness is determined, the probability of accurate retroversion into Hebrew (or other source language) can be determined to a large degree, and an approximate retroversion can be produced. Tov also discusses the problems of retroverting translated material.[14]

A final approach to textual criticism is the genealogical approach, which attempts to reconstruct a tree that depicts the origin of the different extant states of the text as found in the various witnesses. Vinton A. Dearing, an English professor who has edited the text of

---

[10] Cf., e.g., David W. Gooding, "An Approach to the Literary and Textual Problems in the David-Goliath Story," in *The Story of David and Goliath*, by Dominique Barthélemy et al., Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, no. 73 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1986; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986), 59-82; cf. p. 83, "The *final* question is one of textual criticism" (italics mine). See also Stanley D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 385-412.

[11] *Contra* S. D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna," 410: "Internal coherence and consistency must have at least equal weight with genetic consideration." It is not a question of the value of this evidence, but of its relative importance in the text-critical task. Does LXX's version of Samuel really represent a tradition entirely separate from that of MT, and was there no single original text behind the two traditions? (cf. pp. 410-11).

[12] "The Story of David and Goliath in the MT and LXX," in *David and Goliath*, by Barthélemy et al., 130. He details his arguments on pp. 130-34.

[13] Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 54-60. See below, chap. 1, for an elaboration.

[14] Ibid., 97-158. For an analysis of some of the problems involved in retroverting one version of a biblical book back into the language of its *Vorlage*, see John Russiano Miles, *Retroversion and Text Criticism: The Predictability of Syntax in an Ancient Translation from Greek to Ethiopic*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 17 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985).

various English authors' works, provides the most detailed explanation of this method.[15] He also propounds an algorithm for determining the tree, and he discusses the use of computers in analyzing the data. The genealogical approach is extremely important in determining the origin and relationship of the various extant witnesses to classical texts and other works which exist in relatively few distinct states,[16] and it is this approach which is advocated in books dealing with the textual criticism of classical works.[17] The construction of stemmata (genealogical trees) for works which have hundreds or thousands of extant witnesses (such as NT mss), however, is highly problematical, and the issue of how to deal with translations (a vital matter when dealing with the witnesses to the OT) is not directly addressed by this model.

In view of the diversity of approaches, it is clear that no unanimity exists concerning the proper methodology for the study of the text of the OT. Therefore, some model needs to be designed to evaluate accurately the various text-traditions. Each of these competing models will be evaluated further in the first chapter of the present study, and a working model will be developed which will then be applied to the data from 1 Samuel 3.

No study of the text of Samuel would be possible without the benefit of critical texts of the various witnesses. In the seventeenth century Louis Cappel contributed the earliest study of the OT text in modern times, producing a list of variant readings and suggested emendations.[18] In the following century, a fresh collation of all known Hebrew mss was produced by B. Kennicott and supplemented by G. B. de Rossi. In 1875, Frederick Field published the fragments of Origen's Hexapla preserved in various mss, versions, and church fathers.[19] The latter half of the nineteenth century and first decades of the twentieth century also saw the maturation of Septuagintal textual studies in the work of Paul de Lagarde and Alfred Rahlfs. The two great modern editions of LXX are the Cambridge Septuagint (1906 onward, presented as a diplomatic text, usually based on Codex Vaticanus [B] or Codex Alexandrinus [A], with variants indicated in the lower margin) and the Göttingen Septuagint (1931 onward, presented as a critical, eclectic text,

---

[15] Vinton Adams Dearing, *Manual of Textual Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959). His method is updated and revised extensively in his later book, *Principles and Practice of Textual Analysis* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974).

[16] A "state" is defined as a distinct form of a text which differs from all other forms in some way. Thus, in the modern era, an entire printing of a work, since all copies are identical, constitutes only one state.

[17] For example, Maas, *Textual Criticism*.

[18] Louis Cappel, *Commentarii et notae criticae in Vetus Testamentum*, Amsterdam: Jacobus Cappellus, 1689. Cappel's study deals with the text of the entire OT.

[19] Benjamin Kennicott, ed., *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1776-80); Giovani Bernardo de Rossi, *Variae lectiones Veteris Testamenti*, 4 vols. (n.p.: Parma, 1784-88); Frederick Field, ed., *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1875; repr., Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964).

attempting to reconstruct the earliest possible form of LXX). Neither is yet complete, but, between the two, most of the books of the OT are represented (Samuel appears in the Cambridge Septuagint).[20] Rahlfs produced a complete manual edition of LXX, but it is not limited, like the Cambridge Septuagint, to the presentation of one ms, but rather presents an eclectic text based primarily on the three important uncials B, S (Codex Sinaiticus), and A. It is thus a kind of intermediary between the Cambridge and Göttingen philosophies.[21] The Targum Jonathan (T) includes the targum to Samuel, and a critical edition has been produced by Alexander Sperber.[22] The Peshiṭta Institute in Leiden is currently preparing a critical edition of the Syriac Peshitta (P), presented as a diplomatic text, based in Samuel on ms 7a1 (Codex Ambrosianus).[23] The Benedictine Order is in the process of producing a critical edition of V, on which the manual edition of the Würtemberg Bible Society is based.[24] The final primary or secondary witness (see below, p. 7) to the text of 1 Samuel is 4QSam^{a}, a ms from the Judean desert, published in preliminary form by Frank Moore Cross.[25]

Several studies dealing with the text of 1 Samuel in particular have appeared in the last hundred years or so. The commentaries by Otto Thenius, Julius Wellhausen, and Henry Preserved Smith in the nineteenth century, and by S. R. Driver, P. Kyle McCarter,

---

[20] Alan England Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray, eds., *The Old Testament in Greek* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1906-); J. Ziegler et al., eds., *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientarum Gottingensis editum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931-).

[21] Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, Editio Minor (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979), lv. Cf. Peter Walters, *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendation*, ed. David W. Gooding (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 11. It must be pointed out, however, that Rahlfs was one of the architects of the Göttingen edition and that his manual edition was intended as a preliminary edition for use by clergy and students; Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, lv.

[22] Alexander Sperber, ed., *The Bible in Aramaic*, 4 vols. in 5 parts (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959-1973). The abbreviation "T" will be used of the targums in general and of Targum Jonathan in particular when it is clear from the context to which it is a reference. In ambiguous contexts, the abbreviation will be avoided.

[23] *The Old Testament in Syriac According to the Peshiṭta Version*, edited on behalf of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament by the Peshiṭta Institute, Leiden (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972-).

[24] The Benedictine edition is *Biblia Sacra iuxta Latina Vulgatum versionem ad codicem fidem iussu Pii XII*, ed. Cura et studio monachorum abbatiae pontificiae Sancti Hieronymi in urbe ordinis Sancti Benedicti (Rome: Typis Poliglottis Vaticanus, 1926-); it is referred to in the text as V^{R} and in the footnotes as *Biblia Sacra Romana*. The manual edition is Bonifatius Fischer et al., eds., *Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, 2d ed., 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1975); it is referred to in the text as V^{S} and in the footnotes as *Biblia Sacra Stuttgartensia*. The latter edition is more than a mere abbreviation of the larger work. The editors have examined the text of previous editions and their apparatuses, altering the text found in the larger work when deemed necessary.

[25] Frank Moore Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 132 (1953): 15-26.

and Ralph Klein in the twentieth century, deal extensively with the text.[26] Eugene Ulrich's study of the relationships among 4QSam^a, MT, LXX, and Josephus supports Cross's theory of local texts as it applies to Samuel, detailing the general convergence of the texts of 4QSam^a, LXX, and Josephus as opposed to MT. Stephen Pisano's 1982 doctoral dissertation deals with the additions and omissions in the Samuel texts of MT, LXX, and Qumran. Finally, the work of the Committee for the Textual Analysis of the Hebrew Old Testament in analyzing many significant variants in Samuel provides important data for the study of the text.[27]

In spite of the great amount of work done in the area of the text of 1 Samuel, however, it remains necessary to determine those textual variants that are truly significant for the recovery of the oldest possible Hebrew text. *Developing a methodology by which to determine which variants are significant (Chapter 1), applying this methodology to 1 Samuel 3 (Chapters 2-5), and using the information generated to reconstruct the earliest possible text of 1 Samuel 3 (Chapters 6-8) will be the goals of this study.*

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the term **"significant variant"** will refer to those variants which have some probability of representing a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the base text, MT, where the variation is not purely orthographic.[28] The choice of MT as the base text does not imply that it is superior to other witnesses; it is used as a base because it is the only complete witness in Hebrew. The term **"(textual) witness"** refers to an extant textual tradition, either complete or incomplete, whether Hebrew or some other language. It may refer to an individual ms, or it may be used to represent the presumed textual tradition lying behind a group of related mss (e.g., LXX or Lucianic mss [LXX^L]).

---

[26] Otto Thenius, *Die Bücher Samuels*, 2d ed., Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, no. 4 (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1864); Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871); Henry Preserved Smith, *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899); S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1960); P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *I Samuel*, The Anchor Bible, ed. William F. Albright and David Noel Freedman, vol. 8 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1980); Ralph W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 10, gen. eds. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, Old Testament editor John D. W. Watts (Waco: Word Books, 1983).

[27] Eugene Charles Ulrich, Jr., *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, Harvard Semitic Monographs, no. 19 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978); Stephen Pisano, *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts*, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, no. 57 (Fribourg: Univeritätsverlag, 1984; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984); Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle*, vol. 1. See also Frank Moore Cross, "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," in *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*, ed. Frank Moore Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon, pp. 306-20 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975).

[28] Variants which are not significant will be termed "nonsignificant" rather than "insignificant," because of the broader connotations of the latter term. Some of the nonsignificant variants may not be insignificant in terms of understanding the meaning of the text or the historical development of the text.

In the latter case, it is equivalent to the term **"text-tradition."** A **"(textual) variant"** within a tradition is a reading that deviates from that of another witness within the same tradition. Thus, *the readings of the base text and of a divergent witness are both considered variants.* More generally, where a unit of variation exists, one may speak of a variant as either the reading of MT or that which represents a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from MT. Variants that entail differences in length between various witnesses, ranging from one lexeme to many lexemes, are often called additions/omissions or plusses/minuses. However, this terminology is not satisfactory, because it implicitly gives preference to the base text, normally MT. In this study, all such variants will be termed **"add-oms."**[29] The terms **addition/omission** and **plus/minus**, when used, will refer to deviations from the presumed archetype, not the base text. Those variants that do not differ significantly in length from the readings of other witnesses may be divided into **substitutions** and **transpositions**. All three of these types of variants are termed simple variants; complex variants are composed of any combination of simple variants.

The witnesses to the text of Samuel may be divided into three groups.[30] The **"primary text-traditions"** are those written in the original language, Hebrew (i.e., MT and Qumran mss). The **"secondary text-traditions"** are those translated directly from the Hebrew (i.e., LXX, P, T, V). **"Tertiary text-traditions"** are translations of secondary text-traditions (e.g., Old Latin [*it*], Coptic [*cop*], Armenian [*arm*], Ethiopic [*eth*], Syrohexapla [*syh*]). An attempt will be made to isolate all independent witnesses to a Hebrew text. For example, Lucianic witnesses, even when clearly secondary for determining the text of the Old Greek LXX, may be witnesses to an independent Hebrew textual tradition in places. Thus, all text-traditions which have been corrected at some point by a Hebrew text may also be considered secondary traditions at those points. Such text-traditions will be called **"partial secondary witnesses."**

Outline of This Study

The first chapter of this study will examine in more detail the various models suggested above for doing textual criticism as they apply to the text of 1 Samuel. A model for textual analysis will be developed which will then be used to analyze 1 Samuel 3 in Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, Aramaic, and Latin. Chapter 2 will discuss an abbreviated method of reconstructing archetypical secondary witnesses for use in the following chapters. Chapters 3 and 4 will analyze the various secondary witnesses from

---

[29] Adapted from Dearing, *Principles and Practice*, 25, where "add-omission" is used.

[30] For diagrams detailing the relationships among the various witnesses, see F. E. Deist, *Towards the Text of the Old Testament*, trans. W. K. Winckler (Pretoria: N.G. Kerkboekhandel Transvaal, 1978), 236; Ralph W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint after Qumran*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 71; and Talmon, "Old Testament Text," 195.

lexical/grammatical/stylistic and literary/theological points of view, respectively. Chapter 5 will briefly list other extant variants, gleaned from primary witnesses (variants in the Masoretic mss and in 4QSam^{a}), summarize the search for significant variants, and list all those that have been uncovered. The sixth chapter will discuss the methodology of retroversion from one language into another and will then attempt to retrovert, in whole or in part, the secondary and partial secondary witnesses into Hebrew. Chapter 7 will take all the Hebrew variants (both originally Hebrew and retroverted readings) that have been determined to be significant, evaluate them, and attempt to arrive at a conclusion concerning the earliest reading. Finally, Chapter 8 will present the results of the study in the form of a critical Hebrew text of 1 Samuel 3, including critical apparatuses.