CHAPTER 1

DEVELOPMENT OF A MODEL FOR ANALYSIS OF THE WITNESSES

If one is to avoid an arbitrary or haphazard approach to textual criticism, it is necessary to have some sort of a model to follow. The problem with many attempts at textual analysis is that they are done without paying sufficient attention to matters such as translation technique, larger context, and literary characteristics of the witness. Such shortfalls are always a danger with "textual notes," whether based on philological or textual data.[1] To say this is not to deny the helpfulness of such observations in many cases but rather to remind scholars that brief, random observations must be tested with methodological soundness. The three approaches delineated in the Introduction will be discussed and evaluated in greater detail, and the insights gained from them will be used to prepare a method for evaluating the text of Samuel.

Literary Analysis before Textual Analysis

Those who believe that literary analysis[2] should be done before textual analysis fall into two broad groups: those who do so for theological reasons and those who do so for purely literary reasons. A growing number of scholars is becoming interested in examining MT and other traditions independently of the others, viewing them as traditional texts that

---

[1]Cf. James Barr, *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968; repr., with additions and corrections, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 304: "The basic assumption, that study of the relations between the Semitic languages may further the understanding of the Hebrew Bible, is incontrovertible. The trouble has not lain in comparative scholarship, but in poor judgement in its application, and in failure to see and follow out some of the general linguistic questions which are already implied in the primary use of comparative method." Although referring only to the misuse of linguistic data, a similar statement could also be made of the misuse of textual data. Cf. also P. A. H. de Boer's summary of H. S. Nyberg's approach to the text: "The recension should first be determined, then the interpretation taken in hand and the amendment postponed as long as possible…"; P. A. H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of I Samuel i-xvi: A Contribution to the Study of the Books of Samuel* (Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1938), 9.

[2]The term literary analysis as used in this context is usually not the older source criticism (though the arguments are similar for this type of literary criticism) but rather an attempt to analyze the existing form of the text and discern its meaning(s). Scholars who employ such forms of literary criticism do so in a variety of ways, including reading the Bible as pure literature, structuralism, rhetorical criticism, close reading, and deconstruction. The issue here is not whether any or all of these methods are legitimate but rather whether the search for an earlier form of the text is best served by using literary analysis from the beginning. See, for example, David Robertson, *The Old Testament and the Literary Critic*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), passim; Robert C. Culley, "Exploring New Directions," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, ed. Douglas A. Knight and Gene M. Tucker (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985; Decatur, GA: Scholars Press, 1985), 167-200.

were actually used by a worshiping community.[3] An example of this approach may be seen in several recent translations of the Bible that, in the apocryphal or deuterocanonical section, render the entire book of Esther from the Greek rather than presenting only the pluses to the Hebrew in a confused and disjointed manner, as many earlier translations did. Implicit in this editorial decision is the recognition that the Greek form of Esther in its totality has served various communities, both past (Greek speaking Jews and Christians) and present (Roman Catholics and Eastern Orthodox), as sacred text.[4] As mentioned above, the use of textual criticism to determine a text other than the oldest (i.e., one actually used by a specific community) is a legitimate modification of the more traditional goal of searching for the earliest text. Such a choice, though, is a theological, rather than a text-critical, choice.[5] For this reason, the textual critic has no basis for contesting the prior choice of a particular literary tradition before textual criticism is done.

However, some scholars, for nontheological reasons, believe that literary analysis should always precede textual analysis. In the process of examining the divergent traditions of the story of David and Goliath found in MT and LXX, D. W. Gooding demonstrates his preference for doing literary analysis before textual analysis.[6] He particularly stresses the need to examine the extant form of a text to see what it says, implying that if it makes sense as it stands, textual modifications are unnecessary. Note, for example, the following arguments.

---

[3]Sanders, *Sacred Story*, 134. Cf. Ferdinand E. Deist, "Is die Massoretiese Teks die Ou Testament?" *Skrif en kerk* 10 (1989): 9-20, especially 16-19.

[4]The inclusion of two forms of Esther, however, is based primarily on the acceptance of the two forms by various modern, rather than ancient, religious groups. If the use of different forms of a book by various ancient communities were included as a criterion for translating more than one form, variant forms of such books as Jeremiah, Proverbs, and Job would be included on the basis of the differences between the Hebrew and (Old) Greek texts, and two forms of Judges and Daniel (three forms?) would also be translated on the basis of greatly divergent Greek manuscripts, as Sanders has in fact suggested.

[5]Others would claim that the presumed "original" text is the only one that carries divine authority, so it is the one that should be sought. This, too, is a theological choice. (The textual critic should avoid the equation "original text" = "correct text"; cf. Peter D. Miscall, *1 Samuel: A Literary Reading*, Indiana Studies in Biblical Literature [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986], viii.) However, the search for earlier forms of the text need not be theologically motivated; it can also be a purely text-critical exercise, unfettered by theological presumptions of the superiority of earlier forms of the text. Because textual criticism is not a theological discipline, it cannot tell the contemporary community which ancient witness, extant or reconstructed, is best for modern translation.

[6]Gooding, "Approach to the Problems," 63: "Let us consider first the context of the book as a whole." Twenty pages later he says, "The final question is one of textual criticism," ibid., p. 83. Cf. also the approach of Dominique Barthélemy, "Trois niveaux d'analyse (a propos de David et Goliath)," in *David and Goliath*, by Barthélemy et al., 47, who begins his detailed discussion of the story by saying,

> Si nous envisageons ces trois récits [i.e., 1 Sam 16:1-13 (A); 16:14-23 (B); 17:12ff. (C)] comme des essais de légitimation des prétentions de David à la royauté, le récit A est celui qui atteint ce résultat de la manière la plus efficace. Si les auteurs des récits B et C l'avaient connu, ils auraient pu renoncer à leurs essais moins convaincants. Il est donc vraisemblable que A est le dernier-né des trois récits. On a de cela un indice complémentaire dans le fait que les autres récits ignorent cette onction de David enfant.

[Critics should not try] to claim to prove irreconcilable discrepancy, and therefore multiple authorship, by selecting a detailed feature from one context, contrasting it with a detailed feature from another context, without first carefully examining the place each feature holds and the function it performs within the thought-flow of its own particular movement. . . . To understand a narrative from a literary point of view, we must first listen to the narrative as it stands, trying to see where and how each part fits into the thought-flow of the whole. In other words we must initially give the narrative the benefit of the doubt. . . . Only after a sustained and sympathetic attempt at making sense of the narrative as it stands should we reluctantly conclude that the narrative is an irreconcilably discrepant hotch-potch.[7]

Several points may be made in response. First, it must be said that scholars like Gooding who are once again examining the final form of a biblical text to see what its message is as it stands are filling a needed and much neglected void in earlier critical scholarship, which tended to focus on earlier, hypothetical forms of the text and ignore the present form. Having said that, however, the question remains: should this examination of the final form affect text-critical judgments? Just because the final form of a text "makes sense" as it stands, does this imply that it is the original form?[8] To say that it does is to agree that any authors or redactors that might have used earlier sources must indeed have used a "scissors and paste" approach in their composition. If, in fact, the author of the final form was truly an author in some sense, it is quite possible that he or she would have smoothed over more obvious difficulties or discrepancies. Thus, an understandable final form does not imply either verbal proximity to the original form or unitary authorship.

Second, while it is true that critics in the past have sometimes exaggerated differences of detail between different parts of a biblical text, it remains true that discrepancies and notable differences of presentation do provide both textual and literary critics with clues pointing to deviations from a unitary tradition, whether textual or literary. The phrases "benefit of the doubt," "sympathetic attempt," and "reluctantly conclude" seem more appropriately applied to persons standing trial than to critical evaluation of textual data.[9] While one must guard against assuming multiple authorship or textual disruption before examining the data, so must one avoid either simplistic or contrived explanations of apparently incongruous data that unfairly prejudice the case in favor of

---

[7]Gooding, "Approach to the Problems," 58.

[8]Cf., e.g., the approach of Gnuse to "retain the Massoretic text when it seems logical"; Robert Karl Gnuse, *The Dream Theophany of Samuel: Its Structure in Relation to Ancient Near Eastern Dreams and Its Theological Significance* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984), 121. See also Stoebe, *Erste Buch Samuelis*, 25-32; P. A. H. de Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, passim. De Boer also produced the textual notes for Samuel in *BHS*.

[9]Indeed, conservative critics have often used the Anglo-American legal tradition of "innocent until proven guilty" as an analogy to suggest that scholars should respect traditional views, sometimes including acceptance of MT readings, unless overwhelming evidence proves them to be untenable (e.g., Robert Dick Wilson, *A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament* [Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times Company, 1926], 19-20). However, the reason for the legal dictum is protection of the innocent, even if injustice is sometimes the result. Since no one is at risk of injury in scholarly discussions of the text, favoritism of traditional views is unwarranted. Of course, Gooding's views of the development of the text do not correspond to those of these conservative critics, but his use of language at this point is similar.

unitary authorship or faithfulness to the textual tradition.

Third, when Gooding says, "To understand a narrative from a literary point of view, we must first listen to the narrative as it stands," he makes a valid point. The exegete should examine the final form of a text. However, though the textual critic does do exegesis, to interpret is not the *goal* of his work but rather a means to an end, namely, discovering an earlier form of the text. An important difference exists between examining a text "from a literary point of view" and doing so from a textual point of view. The two must not be confused.

Stanley D. Walters also believes that literary analysis is primary, and he uses an excerpt from 1 Samuel 1 as an example. His primary contention is that the narratives of Samuel's birth as recorded in MT and LXX (specifically, ms B) are "discrete narratives, each with its own *Tendenz*."[10] He interprets the two versions of the story as they stand, and he compares them with other biblical texts with similar vocabulary or motifs. He notes that "it is a signal advantage of the comparative method that we can see features in each story that could otherwise easily have been missed."[11] The proposed interpretations are interesting, even ingenious at times. However, his understanding of the text-critical task requires scrutiny. He contends that scholars from the time of Thenius have often tried to rewrite the text rather than explain it, and the result has been the creation of various forms of the text that probably never existed. Even the discovery of the Qumran mss, revealing the existence of Hebrew texts closer to LXX than MT, has confused rather than helped the situation. In light of this situation, he says, "we must return to the commentator's primary task, that of explaining the text."[12] It is at this point that an important distinction must be made. While it may be that a commentator's primary task is to explain the text as it is (though this assertion in itself is debatable), it is certainly not the textual critic's task. Again, though the textual critic may in fact create a text that never existed in all its details, it is the nature of the text-critical task to reconstruct hypothetical texts. The amount and nature of the data will determine the chances of success in each case, but the discovery of more material (such as the Qumran mss) enhances rather than hinders the attempt.

Literary analysis is important for the text-critical task, as well as for the exegetical task. Examination of the larger literary context may well clear up apparent discrepancies or reveal certain stylistic or theological tendencies in a particular witness or within the tradition as a whole. Nevertheless, it seems clear that for the textual critic, literary analysis must accompany, not supersede or supplant, a thorough examination of all existing textual data.[13]

---

[10]S. D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna," 409.

[11]Ibid., 410.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Cf. also Miscall, who says that "text-critical study should be preceded by extended readings,

Textual Analysis before Literary Analysis

In *The Story of David and Goliath*, both Johan Lust and Emanuel Tov say that textual analysis is primary. Lust, in his response to the initial papers by the other contributors, states this point clearly. While agreeing that textual and literary analysis are both important, he says,

> A close reading of the four papers strengthened my conviction that the data and questions of textual criticism should be handled first. To a certain extent, they present facts, providing a sound basis for further more hypothetical theories. The differences between the Hebrew and the Greek texts should be noted carefully, including both pluses and minuses. . . . Once these data [Hebrew and Greek mss, Qumran, patristic evidence] are listed and checked, one should ask whether the difference between the Greek and the Hebrew texts are intentional or unintentional and whether they are due to a scribe, an editor or a translator.[14]

Tov likewise affirms the necessity of examining the textual data first:

> For the story of David and Goliath we possess two main sources, MT and the LXX, and these are by implication *textual* sources, witnessing that abstract entity which we call the biblical text. In our discussion we must attempt to approach these sources as impartially as possible. This means by implication that we should *not* speak first about the literary problems of the story nor about its textual difficulties, but we should first assess the value of the LXX because the LXX is one of the *sources* which contain the story. . . . The starting point of the discussion of the Greek version of David and Goliath should be the *translation technique* of the Greek translator. . . .[15]

Thus, both Lust and Tov stress the importance of beginning textual criticism with an examination of the text. Tov particularly stresses the importance of determining the translation technique of LXX. It is at this point that a comparison between the text-critical methodology employed in the OT and the NT will be helpful. It has already been noted that many Greek mss the NT exist that were written within the first few centuries of the original compositions.[16] In contrast, few if any Hebrew mss date from so close a time to the originals, and the vast majority come from the medieval period, more than one thousand years after composition. Perhaps more importantly, the thousands of mss of the Greek NT contain a rich variety of readings in almost every verse, and at least two, perhaps three or four, major text types can be distinguished among the mss, in addition to numerous other

---

wherever possible, of each version"; Miscall, *1 Samuel*, viii.

[14] Johan Lust, "Second Thoughts on David and Goliath," in *David and Goliath*, by Barthélemy et al., 87.

[15] Emanuel Tov, "Response by E. Tov," in *David and Goliath*, by Barthélemy et al., 92-93 (italics original). Cf. also Natalio Fernández Marcos, *Introducción a las versiones griegas de la biblia*, Textos y estudios "Cardinal Cisneros", no. 23 (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1979), 25: "El análisis de las técnicas de traducción de cada libro o de cada unidad de traducción ha de preceder a todo estudio de sintaxis."

[16] Kurt and Barbara Aland list forty-five NT mss that date prior to the fourth century; Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1987; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1987), 57.

early readings.[17] Medieval Hebrew mss, on the other hand, represent one text type and contain almost no variants that might reflect a competing text.[18] OT textual criticism, then, is much more dependent on witnesses that are translations than is NT textual criticism. Whereas NT textual critics can almost ignore the versional evidence, since almost every variant within a version with any claim to originality also occurs in at least one Greek ms,[19] OT textual critics cannot. In fact, versions of the OT, especially LXX, have long been used to provide textual evidence, though not always in a consistent manner. One desideratum of developing a methodology for OT textual criticism is to determine how to use versional alongside Hebrew evidence.

Though NT textual critics have employed various approaches in the past, the majority today use one of two methods: rigorous eclecticism or rational (modified) eclecticism.[20] Rigorous eclecticism, as employed, for example, by G. D. Kilpatrick and J. K. Elliott, focuses exclusively on internal evidence in evaluating variant readings. External evidence such as age, geographical setting, quantity of witnesses, and distribution among text types are considered of little or no importance in determining the correct reading. Instead, the critic examines the author's style and vocabulary to determine what he was more likely to have said. He or she also attempts to discern among the readings which one was most likely to have given rise to the others.[21] The scholar who uses rational eclecticism does consider internal evidence, but he or she also takes into

---

[17] Aland and Aland, *Text of NT*, 56-67; Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 2d ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), 211-19. Cf. also Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, corrected ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1975), xv-xx.

[18] Goshen-Gottstein, "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," 287. He identifies Kennicott's manuscripts 70, 89, 174, and 187 as having several readings that differ from the main stream of MT in 1 Samuel. The variations between the Ben Asher and the Ben Naphtali mss are minimal (only eight variations in the consonantal text); cf. Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1979), 24-25.

[19] Cf. the statement of the Alands: "It must be emphasized that the value of the early versions for establishing the original Greek text and for the history of the text has frequently been misconceived, i.e., they have been considerably overrated"; Aland and Aland, *Text of NT*, 182. They say later on the same page that the versions are useful in "confirming the identity of the regional or provincial text where they were produced," but this is mere confirmation in most cases of the text found in Greek mss. See also p. 275, "The primary authority for a critical textual decision lies with the Greek manuscript tradition, with the versions and the Fathers serving *no more than a supplementary and corroborative function . . . .*" (italics mine). Even those scholars who might see somewhat more text-critical value in the NT versions would probably still attribute far less importance to them than most OT textual critics do to LXX or even P.

[20] For a brief overview of these methods, see James A. Brooks, "The Text of the New Testament and Biblical Authority," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 34 (1992): 19-20.

[21] "Each reading must be judged on its intrinsic merits and not by weighing manuscripts, whatever we may mean by weighing"; G. D. Kilpatrick, "Literary Fashion and the Transmission of Texts in the Graeco-Roman World," chap. in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G. D. Kilpatrick*, ed. J. K. Elliott (Leuven: University Press, 1990), 63. Cf. also other chapters in the same volume: "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament" and "Eclecticism and Atticism."

consideration the external factors mentioned above. When external and internal evidence conflict, the scholar may choose to follow the lead of either the one or the other, depending on the text and the variants in question (though it is often the external evidence that predominates). This approach is that used by the Alands, Metzger, and many others.[22] It is a compromise between the exclusive use of internal evidence in rigorous eclecticism and the exclusive use of external evidence in genealogical methods.

Whereas most NT textual critics use a form of rational eclecticism, often stressing external evidence over internal evidence, many OT textual critics tend to put more stress on the internal evidence. Various reasons for this preference for internal criteria may be offered. First, OT witnesses have not been divided into distinct text types that are recognized by all scholars in the field. It would be particularly useful if all the mss of LXX were grouped by text type.[23] Second, the age and textual history of some witnesses, particularly P, are disputed, so scholars' opinions of the value of the witnesses vary. Third, since they have not been reared in the school of Westcott and Hort, OT textual critics have less tradition pulling them toward an extensive use of external criteria. One group of OT textual critics that puts more emphasis on external evidence than others is that heavily influenced by Cross's local text theory.[24] Cross's theory has influenced many other OT textual critics to a lesser extent, so that they acknowledge some of Cross's arguments, but are not convinced of all the details.[25]

---

[22]Rational eclecticism is based largely on the work of Westcott and Hort (Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek* [New York: Harper & Bros., 1882]) and the local text theory of B. H. Streeter (B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* [London: Macmillan & Co., 1924]). A summary of this approach may be found, with some variations, in Metzger, *Text of NT*, 209-11, and in Aland and Aland, *Text of NT*, 275-77. Note particularly the Alands' method of relating external and internal evidence (excerpted from a list of twelve basic rules of textual criticism) (Aland and Aland, *Text of NT*, 275):

> 2. Only the reading which best satisfies the requirements of both external and internal criteria can be original.
> 3. Criticism of the text must always begin from the evidence of the manuscript tradition and only afterward turn to a consideration of internal criteria.
> 4. Internal criteria . . . can never be the sole basis for a critical decision, especially when it stands in opposition to the external evidence.

[23]Cf. the classification of Samuel LXX mss offered by Bo Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta*, Studia Theologica Lundensia, no. 22 (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1963), 19.

[24]Frank Moore Cross, "Theory of Local Texts." Cross's theory is itself an amplification of previous work, particularly that of Dominique Barthélemy, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *Revue biblique* 60 (1953): 18-29; idem, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, no. 10 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963). See also R. W. Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 69-73; Ulrich, *Qumran Text of Samuel*, 4-9.

[25]See, for example, Talmon, "Textual Study of the Bible," 323: "[Cross's] theory, which is yet in the process of being revised and further refined by Cross and his students, appears to have attracted surprisingly little comment either from European scholars, with few exceptions, or for that matter, Israeli students of the Bible text." Cf. also Emanuel Tov, "A Modern Textual Outlook Based on the Qumran Scrolls," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1982): 11-27, who argues for a scenario more complicated

One other area in which the practice of NT textual criticism might shed some light on OT methodology is the statistical analysis of the data. Many NT scholars advocate the use of statistical analysis to delineate text types and smaller groups of related texts within text types. One of the oldest approaches is called the Claremont Profile Method, a method which uses selected passages within a given corpus to test similarity of readings among mss. The goal of this approach is to generate a group profile, that is, a list of readings characteristic to one particular group of mss (shared by at least two-thirds of them). An alternative, though similar, method appears in the work of Larry Hurtado on the so-called Caesarean text. Yet another variation of this theme is found in the dissertation of Mark Dunn.[26] The importance for OT textual criticism of these attempts to classify the witnesses should be apparent. Proposed text types, families, and groups of witnesses to the OT text are based more on random observation than on rigorous statistical analysis of the data. Such methods as these could easily be applied to witnesses in a single language (e.g., to Greek witnesses or Syriac witnesses). No method has yet been developed to apply these methods across the language barrier, but such a method is needed. The advantage of statistical studies like these is that OT textual critics would be able to use external evidence with a greater degree of certainty concerning the relationship of witnesses and their relative value in determining earlier stages of the text.[27]

In conclusion, it is crucial for the textual critic to engage in textual analysis prior to literary or theological analysis. This analysis should ideally include a clear understanding of both the textual history of each witness (external evidence) and the translation technique of each versional witness (internal evidence). After textual analysis has been done, further internal evidence may be gathered from literary and theological analyses of the sources.

Genealogical Method

Before describing the proposed model for analysis that will be used in this study, a brief discussion of another method is in order. Textual criticism of classical texts arose during the Renaissance. Since relatively few mss of most classical works are extant, it is usually possible to construct a stemma (or tree), graphically showing the relationships of each extant ms to all the others and to the archetype. Reconstruction of the archetype

---

than Cross's local text theory.

[26] Paul Robert McReynolds, "The Claremont Profile Method and the Grouping of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts," Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968, 3-8; Larry W. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*, Studies and Documents, no. 43 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1981), 10-12; Mark R. Dunn, "An Examination of the Textual Character of Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C, 04) in the Four Gospels," Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1990.

[27] For a more detailed comparison of OT and NT textual criticism, as commonly practiced, see James R. Adair, "Old and New in Textual Criticism: Similarities, Differences, and Prospects for Cooperation," *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 1 (1996).

requires three stages: constructing the stemma (*recensio*), examining the readings presumed for the archetype to see if they may all be considered original (*examinatio*), and attempting to reconstruct original readings where they no longer exist (*divinatio*).[28] The stemma is constructed by comparing extant witnesses to one another and isolating shared readings that diverge from readings of the other mss. Trivial divergences that could have been corrected easily by an intelligent scribe (e.g., misspellings or nonsensical errors in word division) are ignored. Once extant mss are grouped into the smallest possible groups, common ancestors, or hyparchetypes, are constructed by comparing the readings of all the independent witnesses to that hyparchetype. If only two mss are descended from a hyparchetype, the reading of the hyparchetype for each unit of variation must be chosen on some grounds (usually internal evidence), or, if neither seems original, a conjecture may be suggested. If three or more mss are descended from a hyparchetype, the reading shared by more than one independent ms, or by one ms and the hyparchetype in the adjacent branch of the tree, is the reading of the hyparchetype (this rule is based on the assumption that, other than trivial or purely mechanical errors, two scribes would not make the same error in any particular place). The process is continued up the tree until the archetype itself is reconstructed.[29]

It is clear that this method makes several assumptions, not all of which may be valid for the textual criticism of the OT. One assumption that should at least be questioned is that two independent copyists would not make the same non-trivial or non-mechanical error. This assumption does sound intuitively likely, but the possibility of two scribes making the same error cannot absolutely be ruled out. Moreover, the identification of trivial or purely mechanical errors is not as straightforward as it might seem. Is the presence or absence of an article or a conjunction trivial? Is a change in tense or number trivial? Also, some purely mechanical errors may in fact be of a sort that two scribes would not make independently.

A more troubling assumption is the idea that a ms was copied from only one other ms. The fact of the matter is that scribes copying OT mss frequently used more than one exemplar when creating a new ms. At other times, scribes would correct a ms, either their own or an older one, from a ms different from the original exemplar. But using more than one exemplar for a ms destroys the simple tree concept and seriously complicates the methodology for determining the relationships among the mss. Clearly the simple genealogical method that works so well with a few classical mss needs revision in order to accommodate the much more complicated textual history of OT mss.

Probably the most thorough attempt to account for the possibility of contamination in the simple tree is the work of Vinton A. Dearing. Dearing's method is rigorous,

---

[28] Maas, *Textual Criticism*, 1-19.

[29] Ibid., 2-9. See especially the diagram on p. 5.

allowing little room for subjective selection among variants.[30] His method has seven steps:
(1) decide on the states[31] to analyze; (2) decide on variations to analyze; (3) rewrite any
variations that would introduce rings into the tree; (4) find any terminal groups not in the
simple variations; (5) connect the terminal groups; (6) locate the archetype; (7) emend the
archetype, if necessary.[32] This fascinating and thorough approach is quite precise in its
methodology, covering every possible textual variation and leaving little room for human
variation in its application. Nevertheless, it is open to criticism, both on the philosophical
level and on the level of applicability to the text of the OT.

 M. P. Weitzman begins his critique of Dearing's book, *Principles and Practice of
Textual Analysis*, with a quotation from A. E. Housman, a textual critic of the early
twentieth century: "Textual criticism is not a branch of mathematics, nor indeed an exact
science at all."[33] Immediately, then, a philosophical difference emerges: is it even possible
to use methods such as Dearing proposes to do textual criticism? In fact, Dearing's method
is not nearly as exact as one might be led to suppose from some of his statements. For
example, he lists at least twenty-five rules for recognizing what he calls "directional
variants," variants that indicate which state explains the origin of the others. These rules,
however, are of varying degrees of certainty, as he himself admits, with some ("harsher
reading," "reading that smells of a gloss") quite subjective.[34] The fact that the genealogical
method works well with works extant in much smaller numbers than OT mss indicates that
it could very well be helpful in OT textual criticism as well. Thus, to deny the genealogical
approach a hearing on the grounds that textual criticism is an art rather than a science is not
justified.

 A second critique of Weitzman's, namely, that Dearing's method is too complex,
even though he provides a sample computer program for analyzing the data, may have had
some validity in 1977. However, advances in technology greatly reduce the force of this
argument. With the help of an algorithm, which Dearing provides, one can easily design a

---

[30]Dearing, *Principles and Practice*, 83: "Textual analysis, having absolute rules, is not an art."
Cf. also p. 58, "Textual analysis is a logic engine, like a computer." He also gives three advantages of the
genealogical method over the eclectic method: (1) in the genealogical method, a fact about the text (i.e., the
genealogy) is determined; (2) in most cases, the preferable variant is determined without resort to eclectic
methods; (3) it is possible to reconstruct other states of the text besides the archetype (ibid., 8). He goes
so far as to say that the textual analyst describes not what *was* (the actual transmission of mss) but what *is*
(the relationship among the extant states of the text), so he cannot be wrong (ibid., 19).

[31]For a definition of a state of the text, see above, p. 4, n. 16.

[32]Dearing, *Principles and Practice*, 21, where these steps are listed. He elaborates on each of them
in great detail on pp. 21-83.

[33]A. E. Housman, "The Application of Thought to Textual Criticism," chap. in *Selected Prose*,
ed. J. Carter (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1961), 132; quoted in M. P. Weitzman, review of
Principles and Practice of Textual Analysis, by Vinton A. Dearing, in *Vetus Testamentum* 27 (1977), 225.

[34]Dearing, *Principles and Practice*, 44-54. Of course, the seventh step, emending the archetype, is
highly subjective, but it lies outside of textual analysis proper (as he defines it), steps three through six.

computer program to do the work of comparing the states and generating a tree (steps three through six). The most time consuming part of the process, once the program itself is written, is data input; but considering that Dearing and Weitzman were considering using punch cards (before the advent of the affordable personal computer), today's data input is much faster. Still faster methods of data input may be achieved through the use of optical scanners, touch-sensitive screens or mouse technology, and improved data entry algorithms. However, data entry will probably remain the most difficult part of the process for the foreseeable future.

A more telling criticism, indeed, the argument that alone threatens the entire validity of Dearing's method, is the observation that the genealogical method deals with the transmission of the text as though each state were copied from one and only one exemplar, without contamination from others. Weitzman says,

> If one were dealing with a textual tradition of which each ms (except, of course, the original) had been copied from a single exemplar, without the scribe introducing any reading from a subsidiary source (e.g. by consulting a second ms, or by adopting variants which may have been recorded in the margins of his exemplar), these tasks would be simple enough. . . . But in a textual tradition wherein subsidiary sources *were* utilised to a significant extent, albeit by no more than a minority of the copyists involved in the whole process of transmission, all neat and exact methods have been found, at least until now, to break down.[35]

Dearing, of course, is aware that contamination can occur in the process of transmission, and his third step, rewriting the variations that would introduce rings, is designed to deal with this problem. Rings occur when two mss share readings not found in every intervening ms in the tree. Dearing's solution to this problem is simply to discard some of the conflicting readings by treating them as through they did not conflict. After analyzing the relationships among the variants and the mss, he breaks the ring at the point of its weakest link, where there are the fewest agreements between different states. In fact, he breaks all the links if more than one are equally the weakest. He justifies this action by saying, "Breaking the weakest instead of some other standard connection reflects the principle of parsimony. The fewest possible readings are treated as something different from what they really are."[36] He further differentiates the work of the textual critic from that of the bibliographer. Because the textual critic analyzes extant states of the text

---

[35] Weitzman, review, 226-27 (italics original). Weitzman downplays the amount of contamination in OT mss, but in fact, contamination from other branches of the genealogical tree is quite common, especially among LXX mss. In particular, hexaplaric readings, introduced into Greek mss from Hebrew mss, infect a large number of LXX mss, even those whose scribes used only one (hexaplaric) exemplar.

[36] Dearing, *Principles and Practice*, 88. On pp. 16-19, Dearing attempts to assume the mentality of a scribe copying a text and using more than one source, claiming that, from the scribe's point of view, the result is not conflation. He supports this conclusion by distinguishing between constructing a genealogy of the states of a text (the work of a textual analyst) and constructing a genealogy of the records themselves (the work of a bibliographer). He says, "In short, from the point of view of one who deals with states of a message instead of with its records, and the textual analyst is such a one, conflation does not exist at all" (p. 17).

(results) and the bibliographer with the presumed transmission of the text (causes), the textual critic defines the weakest agreement between states in terms of number of agreements, whereas the bibliographer defines the weakest agreement as that having the least "weight," or intrinsic probability.[37]

His arguments, however, fail to convince that his method yields accurate results, either in archetypical readings or in accurate trees. Weitzman constructs four hypothetical mss descended from a lost archetype, introducing a degree of contamination. After applying all of Dearing's rules to the hypothetical mss, he arrives at the correct solution in 56% of the cases and at the wrong solution in 44% of the cases.[38] These results challenge Dearing's contention that textual analysis can be done mechanically, with little or no critical judgment. In Dearing's response to Weitzman, he points out that, given the data, the tree predicted by his method explains the data just as well as the tree presupposed by Weitzman. Less convincing, however, is his contention that the failure of his method to predict the correct archetypical readings in 44% of the cases is no reflection on the usefulness of the method. He says,

> With real problems, one either knows the facts in some way, in which case no method of reconstructing them is required, or one doesn't, in which case the best one can do is reason correctly from all the evidence, on the basis of axioms that seem (and one hopes will also seem to one's fellow-critics) to be satisfactory.[39]

However, contrary to Dearing's opinion, the results of a method indicate whether the theory on which it is based is true, not vice versa. Of course, if the method yields results that are better than other methods, even though not perfect, it may still be preferred. The application of traditional methods to the hypothetical data, however, belies Dearing's claim that his method is superior. Without attempting to construct a genealogical tree, a textual critic using traditional methods of subjective selection based on internal evidence (i.e., eclecticism) would select 25 correct readings (the "x errors"), where the critic could determine on the basis of comparing the readings to one another that one was original. Of the other 25 errors, assuming a 50% chance of picking the right reading from two equally possible readings, the critic would select 12 correct readings, yielding a total of 37 correct readings out of 50, or 74%, a result considerably better than Dearing's 56%. Consequently, Dearing's method cannot be expected to be helpful in evaluating the text of the OT. Unless or until an improvement is made in the genealogical method that will deal more effectively with the problem of contamination, it must be set aside.

---

[37] Ibid., 89.

[38] Weitzman, review, 231. An alternate interpretation of Dearing's rules yields the following results: correct 44%, incorrect 36%, indeterminate 20%. The errors are of two types: "x errors" that are clearly not original (and can be determined not to be so on the basis of internal evidence) and "+ errors" that cannot easily be distinguished from the correct readings.

[39] Vinton Adams Dearing, "Textual Analysis: A Consideration of Some Questions Raised by M. P. Weitzman," *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979): 358-59.

Determining the Translation Technique

Having examined various proposed methodologies for OT textual criticism, the time has come for developing the methodology to be used in evaluating the text of 1 Samuel 3. To summarize the previous discussion, both textual analysis and literary/theological analysis are important for determining earlier forms of the text, but textual analysis should have priority. Since no genealogical approach has yet been developed that is helpful in the textual criticism of the OT, it can have no place in the present methodology. Also, no particular theory of the relationship among the various extant witnesses (e.g., Cross's local text theory) will be assumed. Tov has repeatedly insisted that the first step of textual criticism, at least as far as the versions are concerned, is the determination of the translation technique,[40] and the methodology to be tested in this study follows Tov in this regard.

Scholars often characterize a particular translation with terms such as "literal," "fairly literal," "free," and so forth. While these labels may characterize certain aspects of the translation, they are not sufficiently nuanced to be of much help to the textual critic who wants to know how the translator rendered certain types of constructions in order to use that information to determine whether a particular reading is likely to reflect a different *Vorlage*. After all, it is entirely possible that a translator could render every Hebrew word with a single word in the target language, yet be relatively indifferent about word order. Would such a translation be literal or not? The answer is that it would be literal in regard to lexical choice but not in regard to word order. The need to push beyond such general terms as "literal" and "free" is apparent.[41] In order to quantify these terms and to provide information that is more useful to the textual critic, a methodology consisting of two major phases is proposed.

The first major phase of the methodology involves an analysis of the lexical and grammatical characteristics of each witness in order to understand better the translation technique. Prior to analyzing these characteristics, however, each target language must be examined to determine its limitations for rendering Hebrew.[42] If these limitations are not

---

[40]Tov, "Response," 92-93; idem, *Text-Critical Use*, 50-52; idem, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version," in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*, ed. Jeffrey H. Tigay (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), 100-102.

[41]Cf. Benjamin G. Wright, "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 312-13.

[42]Cf. J. W. Wevers, "The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint," in *La Septuaginta en la investigación contemporánea (V congreso de la IOSCS)*, ed. Natalio Fernández Marcos, Textos y estudios "Cardinal Cisneros" de la Biblia Políglota Matritense, no. 34 (Madrid: Instituto "Arias Montano" Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1985), 15: "Before a version can be used textcritically the nature and limitations of the target language in contrast to those of the source language must be thoroughly understood"; see also p. 20: "Before a translation can be properly used in the text criticism of the text of a source language, one must fully understand just how and from what points of view this translation was done by a particular translator." Models for such an analysis of the various languages may be found in the various articles found in Fernández Marcos, *La Septuaginta*, and in Bruce M. Metzger,

recognized, some differences in representation may wrongly be thought to be deviations from a literal rendering. Grammatical impossibilities (e.g., a Latin article), grammatical improbabilities (e.g., rendering the Hebrew אֵת in Greek), and stylistic characteristics of the target language (e.g., the Syriac anticipatory pronoun) must all be noted. Any rendering in the target language that meets standards for literalness that the translator may have thought to be imposed by the language itself (or at least by proper use of the language) should not be counted against the literalness of the translation, though all such differences should be noted.

Tov suggests four criteria for determining the relative literalness of a particular witness's translation technique: consistency, the representation of the constituents of compound words in the source language by individual equivalents in the target language, word order, and quantitative representation.[43] Each of these criteria will be examined in turn, and certain modifications or amplifications will be suggested. The result will be a somewhat more detailed and nuanced approach to determining the translation technique.

By consistency, Tov refers to the translators' tendency to render every occurrence of a given word in the source language by the same word in the target language. This tendency toward consistent representation of words is called stereotyping, and Tov notes that stereotyping was probably the rule rather than the exception from the beginning. However, he also says, "It has yet to be examined which types of words and elements were rendered stereotypically, in which books and under what circumstances."[44] It is one of the goals of this study to undertake just that examination for 1 Samuel 3. One type of consistent representation commonly found in the secondary witnesses in question is Hebraism. Hebraisms are renderings in the target language that are unusual or even unidiomatic, but occur because the translator has attempted to render his *Vorlage* literally. Because they preserve some structure of the source language not usually found in the target language, Hebraisms can be useful tools for reconstructing the *Vorlage*. However, it was also possible for the translators to have written Hebraisms that did not reflect a particular text before them, simply because they thought or spoke the target language in terms of structures from the source language.[45] Another type of consistent representation that

---

The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission and Limitations (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977).

[43] Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 54-60. He adds that a fifth criterion, linguistic adequacy of lexical choices, cannot be described statistically and is highly subjective, so it cannot be used profitably in the analysis of translation units.

[44] Ibid., 55.

[45] It is common for a people who learn a new language to fuse it with aspects of their own language. See the discussion of pidgin and creole languages in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1985 ed., Macropædia, s.v. "Languages of the World," 803-5. Cf. also the comment by Conybeare and Stock, that the Greek of the OT (and NT) "is so deeply affected by Semitic influence as often to be hardly Greek at all,

sometimes occurs in the versions of the OT is etymologizing, the tendency to render words derived from one Hebrew root (presumably) by words derived from a single root in the target language.

All of the examples Tov gives of consistent representation are lexical in nature. However, translators often rendered certain grammatical structures in the source language (e.g., stem, inflection, and person in Hebrew) consistently by particular grammatical structures in the target language (e.g., voice, tense, and person in Greek). Another aspect of consistency that should be measured is whether the target language regularly rendered a certain class of words in one language by a particular class in the other, for example, participles by participles. An examination of the grammatical and syntactical correspondences between MT and the secondary witnesses is another aspect of consistency that should be investigated.

In the proposed methodology, the lexical consistency of (1) verbs, nouns, and adjectives; (2) adverbs, prepositions, and particles; and (3) conjunctions will be tallied separately in a variety of ways.[46] First, the number of *different* Hebrew words occurring more than once will be compared with the number of *different* words in the target language occurring more than once. Second, the *total number* of Hebrew words occurring more than once will be compared with the *sum of the most frequently used words* that correspond to each of these Hebrew words. Third, the factor measuring deviation from complete consistency will be figured.[47] The final aspect of lexical consistency to be examined will be a measure of the level of etymologizing apparent in the translation.

The first element of grammatical consistency to be measured is the percentage of one class of Hebrew words (verbs, nouns and adjectives, pronouns) represented by the same class of words in the target language. Next, various aspects of verbs, nouns and adjectives, and pronouns will be evaluated separately and compared to their corresponding words in the target language. For verbs, the Hebrew inflection, stem, person, and number will be compared with the corresponding grammatical structures in the target language to

---

but rather Hebrew in disguise"; F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek* (Boston: Ginn & Co., 1905; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1988), 21. This statement is an exaggeration, but it does show that the Jews often spoke a form of Greek influenced by their Semitic linguistic background.

[46]Proper nouns will be excluded from the evaluation of lexical consistency and from the grammatical analyses of nouns, with two exceptions. First, the proper name יהוה, since it is equivalent in most contexts to אלהים and אדני/אדון, which are common nouns, will be included in the evaluation of lexical consistency. Second, all proper nouns will be included in the analysis of the use (i.e., grammatical function) of Hebrew nouns and adjectives in the sentence.

[47]The algorithm for arriving at the deviation factor will be explained more fully in Chapter 3, and in detail in Appendix 4. The deviation factor itself is a numerical representation of the deviation from absolute consistency, i.e., one-to-one correspondence, with a deviation factor of zero indicating absolute consistency. The deviation factor is a number that is useful primarily in comparison with the deviation factors of other elements in the same version or of similar elements in another version.

determine consistency of grammatical representation. For nouns and adjectives, Hebrew gender, number, syntactical use in the sentence, articles, and definiteness will be compared. For pronouns, the Hebrew gender, number, and syntactical use in the sentences will be compared. The level of consistency in each category will be indicated by the deviation factor.

Tov's second criterion for determining the translation technique is the representation of the constituents of words in the source language by individual equivalents in the target language, also called segmentation. Because translators were interested in being faithful to the text before them, they were often meticulous in rendering each element of a compound Hebrew word (including such things as articles, prepositions, and suffixes) with a corresponding element in the target language, even in cases where such a rendering was not idiomatic. Consistency in the segmentation will be measured by the ratio of the number of Hebrew compound words rendered exactly to the total number of compounds.[48]

The third aspect of translation technique which Tov discusses is word order. Unlike Hebrew, which relies heavily on the position of words within a sentence to determine their function, inflected languages (e.g., Greek and Latin) are capable of great freedom in word placement without altering the basic meaning of a sentence. Whether the translators took advantage of the abilities of their languages or whether they limited themselves to the order present in their Hebrew *Vorlagen* is an important measure of translation technique. Of course, variations in word order forced by the grammar of the target language (e.g., postpositive conjunctions) do not count against consistency of word order. The total number of Hebrew semantic units that are represented in MT will be compared with the number of unforced deviations from the Hebrew word order in the translation.

The fourth criterion for determining translation technique, quantitative representation, refers to the tendency of some translators to render every element of their *Vorlage* without omitting superfluous or redundant elements and without adding clarifying words. The target language might put certain restrictions on the translator, so that a one-to-one correspondence is impossible; however, grammatically imposed strictures (e.g., absence of an article in Latin) will not be counted against consistency. To measure consistency in quantitative representation, it is not sufficient to compare the total number of semantic units in MT and in the version, since one addition and one omission in the version would yield a number identical to that of MT. Instead, the total number of differences

---

[48] Wright notes that the representation of the constituents of a word by elements in the target language "is actually a sub-category of quantitative representation [the fourth criterion, below] because it involves a type of one-to-one representation albeit a very specific type"; Wright, "Quantitative Representation," 316. Cf. also Barr's discussion of segmentation and his examples of extremes from the version of Aquila; James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens, no. 15 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979), 26-29.

between MT and the version will be calculated and then compared with the total number of Hebrew semantic units to produce a ratio.

One other note about the grammatical analysis is necessary at this point. It will become apparent when comparing MT with each version that certain add-oms occur.[49] The question of whether to incorporate add-oms in the statistics is important, for a considerable number of add-oms could significantly alter the picture of the translation technique. It is clear that add-oms should play a part in determining the translation technique. On the other hand, it is difficult to compare something to nothing, and calculations of consistency that tried to take add-oms into account might well produce less than meaningful results. Therefore, add-oms will be omitted from the computation of statistics in the first three areas (consistency, segmentation, and word order). However, they will be counted in the measure of quantitative representation.

Once the initial statistics for each of the categories in a particular version being investigated have been figured, the process of refining those statistics begins. The first statistics will give only a rough idea of the translation technique, because certain trends in the translation not apparent at the beginning of the investigation will become evident. Each new discovery will lead to a modification of the previously calculated partial translation technique, until finally all the grammatical data will be accounted for. Then, using the partial translation technique as determined to that point, variants in the version that do not reflect a different *Vorlage*, either because they are nonreproducible in the target language or because they are theoretically reproducible but are not consistently rendered, will be eliminated.[50] All other variants that are not purely orthographic will be considered significant, because they have some probability of reflecting a *Vorlage* different from MT.

The second major phase in the proposed model involves determining the literary

---

[49] For a definition of add-om, see above, p. 7.

[50] The variants which are eliminated correspond for the most part to the non-variants that Tov discusses in *Text-Critical Use*, 217-28. Tov's pseudo-variants, discussed on pp. 228-40, require special comment. He defines pseudo-variants as readings that "presumably were not found in the translator's *Vorlage*, but existed only in his *mind*" (p. 228, italics his). The problem with this definition (as he notes, pp. 228-29; cf. pp. 140-41) is that distinguishing real variants from pseudo-variants is usually subjective. After all, if the translator could mistake one word for another, so could a Hebrew scribe, and there is no way of convincingly demonstrating at what point the mistake occurred, whether in the transmission of the Hebrew or of the versional text. Cf., e.g., P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *Textual Criticism: Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 26-57, passim. An exception to this contention is the case of demonstrably inner-version (e.g., inner-Greek) variants, which, of course, could only occur in the transmission of the versional text (cf. Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 237-40). It is undoubtedly true that the translators sometimes read their Hebrew *Vorlagen* incorrectly, thus creating variants that never existed in a Hebrew ms. However, it seems methodologically preferable, except in the case of inner-version corruptions, to treat what might be pseudo-variants in exactly the same way as other variants. The decision to eliminate them on the grounds that they probably never occurred in Hebrew is best left to the final stage of the process of textual criticism of the Hebrew text, namely, choosing the best reading from the various Hebrew and retroverted readings (see below, chap. 7).

and theological characteristics of the witness. This process will require an examination of the larger context to determine theological tendencies and other changes probably related to literary, cultural, or historical circumstances. If a witness is determined to have a specific tendency (e.g., a tendency to harmonize parallel passages), variants that exhibit this tendency cannot be considered likely indicators of a different *Vorlage*. An examination of various literary and theological studies of Samuel will be particularly helpful in this analysis. Numerous recent commentaries and articles deal with the larger literary shape of 1 Samuel in a particular tradition (especially MT and LXX), and others, though not dealing specifically with 1 Samuel, use a literary approach that might fruitfully be applied to the text. Literary approaches to be investigated include close reading, rhetorical criticism, structuralism, narrative analysis, deconstruction, and analysis of comparative structures. Literary analyses that borrow from several different approaches will also be consulted. An examination of the theological themes identified in 1 Samuel will be studied for the light they might be able to shed on the state of the text. Finally, any historical or archaeological data that might be relevant to the meaning of the text will be analyzed. The purpose of investigating these different approaches is to determine whether further characteristics of the translators, such as cultural or theological biases, should be indicated in a full description of the translation technique of each of the versions. Once as many characteristics of this nature have been identified as seem probable, the partial translation technique will be adjusted again, and the result will be the final translation technique. On the basis of the new information gathered in the second phase of study, other variants will be eliminated which probably do not reflect a different *Vorlage*.

After the process of eliminating variants has been completed, all the remaining variants may be considered significant. Since Hebrew variants that are not purely orthographic are significant by definition (see above, p. 6), all the variants found in those Masoretic mss that possibly preserve pre-Masoretic readings[51] and all the variants found in

---

[51] As identified by Goshen-Gottstein; see above, p. 16, n. 18. Though all such variants will be listed, Goshen-Gottstein's warnings concerning the use of variants from medieval mss must be stressed. In his article "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts," he makes the following statements: "Among all the MSS and fragments known so far there is not even one the deviations of which can be significantly connected with any non-Massoretic tradition. We possess no medieval manuscript which, on the strength of its readings, may be termed 'valuable' or be worthy of our attention more than any other" (p. 277); "For those books of the Bible which have already been checked the results gained for Isaiah are paralleled, and there is no reason to assume that further investigations of MSS and fragments from other books are going to enable us to uphold the notion of a 'valuable' medieval MS" (pp. 282-83); "The possibility of infiltration of extra-Massoretical variants into the Massoretical 'central current' is so negligible that for all practical purposes it may be disregarded" (p. 286). Nevertheless, "the analysis of readings such as in the Book of Kings may at least justify the mentioning of the possibility that different results may be obtained for different books (or parts) of the Bible and that, accordingly, we may have to reckon with different 'breadths' of the 'central current' and different strengths of the 'trickle' from the side" (p. 287). (It is at this point that he lists the four mss that "stand out" from the rest in Samuel.) For example, he finds only seven variants in medieval mss of Isaiah that "might be possibly more than the result of harmonization" or other scribal habits, and only one of these "makes one really prick up one's ears." It will be in the light of these cautions that

4QSam^a, the only other primary witness to the text of 1 Samuel 3, may simply be listed. Once all the significant variants have been determined, the process of retroversion and evaluation of variants may begin. Before beginning the analysis of the secondary witnesses, however, the text of the secondary witnesses themselves must be established, and one other preliminary matter requires some discussion, namely, the script of the *Vorlagen* of the various Samuel translations.

<div align="center">The Script of the *Vorlagen*</div>

Although it is often assumed that the *Vorlagen* of the secondary versions of Samuel were written in the later square script, this assumption needs further discussion and demonstration, particularly in the case of LXX. Rabbinic tradition says that Ezra and the other returnees from Babylonia introduced the square ("Assyrian") script into Palestine in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. (*b. Sanh.* 21b-22a; *j. Meg.* 1.9, etc.), whereupon it replaced the Old Hebrew script then in use. However, evidence from Qumran, coupled with evidence already known (script of the Samaritan Pentateuch, numismatic evidence from the Hasmonean and Herodian periods, revival of the older script during the time of Bar Kokhba), necessitates a new look at the issue. Shemaryahu Talmon concludes on the basis of all the data, especially the existence of several scrolls from Qumran written in the Old Hebrew script, that "the ancient Hebrew script retained a lease on life until after the destruction of the Second Temple and the cessation of Jewish political sovereignty."[52]

Qumran data demonstrates that the Old Hebrew script was sometimes used for transmitting biblical material in the late Second Temple period. Most of the mss in Old Hebrew script are from the Pentateuch; however, one Old Hebrew ms of Job does exist (4QpaleoJob^c).[53] It is probable that Samuel was composed, and subsequently transmitted, in the Old Hebrew script.[54] However, S. R. Driver concludes that the *Vorlagen* used by the translators of most of the books in LXX (presumably including Samuel) were written in an earlier form of the square script.[55] In order to demonstrate that the *Vorlage* of LXX

---

variants from medieval mss will be listed.

[52] Shemaryahu Talmon, "The Ancient Hebrew Alphabet and Biblical Text Criticism," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor*, ed. A. Coquot, S. Légasse, and M. Tardieu, Alter Orient und Altes Testament, no. 215 (Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon & Bercker, 1985; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), 391. See his discussion of examples of the alternation of י and צ in the Old Hebrew script, ibid., 393-401, and of the alternation of א and ח, idem, "The Ancient Hebrew Alphabet and Biblical Text Criticism," in *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Études bibliques offertes a l'occasion de son 60e anniversaire*, ed. Pierre Cassetti, Othmar Keel, and Adrian Schenker, Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, no. 38 (Fribourg: Éditions Universitaires, 1981; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 504-22.

[53] Tov also mentions 4QpaleoJoshpara, containing parts of Joshua 21; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1992), 105, n. 79.

[54] Cf. ibid., 220.

[55] S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, lxiv. Cf. the similar conclusion of Johann

Samuel was written in Old Hebrew, it would not be sufficient to point to evidence of confusion that can occur only in Old Hebrew, since this confusion could have occurred during the process of transmission of the Hebrew text that led to the *Vorlage*. Instead, it would be necessary to show that errors resulting from graphic similarity which only exist in the square script (e.g., י and ו, ב and כ, כ and מ) do not appear with any great frequency in the translation. (Furthermore, the confusion of י and ו, that could only have occurred in square script, must be ignored if *matres lectionis* are involved.) However, such graphic confusion based on the square script does seem to play a major role in Samuel (cf. 3:2, 6, 11), so the *Vorlage* used by the translators of LXX (as well as those used by the other translators) does appear to have been written in square script.

The ingenious, but discredited, transcription theory of Franz Wutz may be mentioned briefly at this point. In several studies produced early in the current century, Wutz propounded the theory that the translators of LXX worked from texts in which the Hebrew had been transcribed in Greek characters, checking the actual Hebrew text only occasionally.[56] Though he won several influential early supporters, most notably Rudolf Kittel and Paul Kahle, support quickly faded, and Wutz himself seems to have abandoned the view in later years. Johann Fischer, who supported the transcription theory at least in part, pointed out one of the flaws in Wutz's theory, namely, that the frequency of such graphic errors as ד for ר, which do not resemble one another in Greek, tend to contradict any reliance on mss written with Greek characters.[57]

One last matter of a methodological nature needs to be mentioned in connection with work on the script of the *Vorlage* of the translations, a matter that applies equally to attempts to trace the early history of the Hebrew text itself. Many studies, including those of Wutz and Johann Fischer, have based much of their analysis on the evidence provided by the transmission of proper names, on the grounds that since the names are transcribed rather than translated, they should provide a stable interface between Hebrew and the target

---

Fischer for the Pentateuch: "Wie ersichtlich, steht das A[lphabet] der LXX-V[orlage] zwischen neuaramäischer Schrift und Quadratschrift und man wird es als neuaramäisches Alphabet mit starker Neigung zur Quadratschrift bezeichnen dürfen"; Johann Fischer, *Das Alphabet der LXX-Vorlage im Pentateuch: Eine textkritische Studie*, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen, vol. 10, no. 2 (Münster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1924), 93. However, cf. Driver's comment, "The confusion of י and ו, and מ and כ (which cannot be explained from the old character) is in the Pent. so uncommon that it may be due to accidental causes: the books in which it is frequent can only have been translated after the change of character had been effected; the Pent., as tradition states, may have been translated earlier"; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, lxiv, n. 3.

[56]Franz Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus*, pt. 1, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament, n.s., no. 9, Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen, no. 2 (Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1925), 5: "Da wir weiterhin beweisen können, dass nur in ganz wenigen Fällen ein hebräischer Konsonantentext eingesehen wurde, so sind selbst die hebräischen Verlesungen nicht direkt mit der Septuaginta in Zusammenhang zu bringen, sondern mit ihrer Transkriptionsvorlage."

[57]Johann Fischer, *Alphabet der LXX-Vorlage*, 95.

language. However, the evidence suggests that the opposite is rather the case. Names, particularly lists of names like those found in Joshua, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, are subject to deviation on a grand scale. The problem in using proper names to determine script of the *Vorlage* is that, unless they refer to well-known individuals, they are meaningless collections of letters, subject to uncontrolled variation, unlike other words, whose variation is controlled to some extent by the context of the sentence. Thus, common nouns, verbs, and adjectives are better suited for studies on script than are proper names.[58]

Having determined that the square script apparently lay behind all of the secondary versions of 1 Samuel, the archetypical secondary witnesses may now be reconstructed. This is the task of the second chapter of this study.

---

[58]Cf. S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, lxiv, n. 3.