UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

https://helda.helsinki.fi

Challenges in Preparing the Critical Edition of 1 Samuel

Aejmelaeus, Anneli

Albrecht, Felix; Feder, Frank

2022

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/590686

Aejmelaeus, A 2022, Challenges in Preparing the Critical Edition of 1 Samuel. in F Albrecht & F Feder (eds), Editing the Septuagint: The Unfinished Task : Papers presented at the 50th anniversary of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Denver 2018. De Septuaginta Investigationes, vol. 16, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht , Göttingen, pp. 11-25.

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository. https://helda.helsinki.fi
This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.
Please cite the original version.

Challenges in Preparing the Critical Edition of 1 Samuel

Anneli Aejmelaeus

This paper deals with the challenges by which the editor has been confronted while working on the critical edition of the First Book of Samuel (*Regnorum liber I*) as well as with the methodological approach which has enabled her to tackle the problems. Although the critical edition of 1 Samuel for the series *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum* still awaits its publication, it is already possible to reveal some of the major features of the forthcoming edition.

Working on a critical edition – in my case, the critical edition of the Septuagint translation of 1 Samuel – means doing textual criticism on that text, on each and every word and passage of it. The results of this text-critical work will be seen in the critical text, the main text of the edition, which is intended to represent the closest possible approach to the original wording of the book.

In the case of the Septuagint, there are fairly many Greek manuscripts that are used for the reconstruction of the textual history of the book.[1] All these manuscripts as well as the daughter versions and quotations by early Jewish and Christian writers, which are also used as textual witnesses, will be documented in the apparatus of the edition. The critical text cannot however be established solely on the basis of a survey of the textual witnesses, as problematic cases can rarely be solved by building a stemma of the manuscripts. The reason for this is that the manuscripts seldom represent pure copying of a model manuscript, but often several manuscripts were used when preparing a new manuscript. This was already recognized by Paul de Lagarde, who formulated one of his principles like this:[2]

> (1) Since the manuscripts of the Septuagint are all directly or indirectly the result of an eclectic process, any attempt to restore the original text must also proceed on eclectic principles; and the critic must chiefly depend upon (*a*) his [or her] acquaintance with the style of the several translators and (*b*) his [or her] faculty of referring readings to a Semitic original or, when they are not of Semitic origin, recognizing them as corruptions of the Greek archetype.

Lagarde mentions two different sets of criteria: the translation character of the translation in question and the influences from the Hebrew text. These two demand special attention when tackling the problems caused by textual contamination and corruption. Especially the relationship with the Hebrew text plays a special role in the textual criticism of the Septuagint. Behind the translation there is of course the Hebrew *Vorlage* that at times diverged from the MT, but in addition, the Greek text has been repeatedly approximated to the Hebrew in its different stages,

[1] The manuscripts available for the First Book of Samuel, with their tentative groupings, are the following (with those only partially preserved in parentheses): B A V (M) (842) (845) (846) (867); *O* = 247-376; *L* = 19-82-93-108-127; *CI* = 98-(243)-379-731; *CII* = 46-52-236-242-313-328-530; *a* = 119-527-799; *b* = 121-509; *d* = 44-68-74-106-107-120-122-125-134-(370)-610; *f* = 56-246; *s* = 64-92-130-314-381-488-489-(762); 29 55 71 158 244 245 318 (342) 460 554 707. As for the group sigla, *O* stands for the Hexaplaric, *L* for the Lucianic, *C* for Catena manuscripts.

[2] P. A. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig 1863), 3. Translation according to Henry Barclay Swete, *An introduction to the Old Testament in Greek,* Second Edition, Revised by R.R: Ottley (Cambridge: University Press, 1914), 484–6.

and this makes the textual criticism of the Septuagint different from the textual criticism of any other text.

Thus, text-critical problems cannot be solved by external criteria only, but internal criteria always play an essential role. Nevertheless, it is not an either-or situation. Which one of the existing readings is to be considered most original cannot be decided alone by the suitability of the readings in their context, either. The most important question in textual criticism is "what happened to the text?" When answering this question, we actually need to combine, on the one hand, what we know about the textual history of the text (the external criteria), and on the other, the evaluation of the kinds of variants there are and the consideration of the reasons for their emergence (the internal criteria).

During my work on the Greek 1 Samuel, I have made some observations and discoveries concerning the different factors that have been at work in the textual history of this text. This has led me to an understanding of this textual history that differs to some extent from the understanding Rahlfs had of it, and consequently, the critical text of my edition will be different from Rahlfs' edition.

I shall mention four factors or phenomena of textual history that I have discovered to be decisive in establishing the critical text in problematic cases – the translator, the *Vorlage*, Jewish revisional activity, and doublets – and then introduce just a few examples of cases demonstrating how these factors come into play in the text-critical procedure. I have chosen examples in which the forthcoming edition will differ from Rahlfs' edition.[3]

1. The Translator

The *first factor* that needs to be taken into account is naturally the translator.[4] We need to know the characteristic features of his translation style in order to be able to reconstruct his wordings.[5] Various studies have shown that this translator had a fairly strong word-for-word approach to his source text. However, literalism was for him not so much a principle as "an easy technique," as James Barr put it.[6]

Unfortunately, this translator was not quite up to his task. He had great difficulties with some Hebrew words and in many cases simply tried to guess on the basis of the context what the text means (e.g. 1 Sam 30:10, 21 below). If he did not know a certain Hebrew root, he often tried to connect it with another one that has at least some similarity (e.g. 1 Sam 14:32 וַיִּעַט 'and it rushed upon' from עיט was translated by καὶ ἐκλίθη 'and it turned,' as if from נטה). Several words that

[3] The readings found in Rahlfs' manual edition are designated by Ra.

[4] For a characterization of the translation, see Raimund Wirth, *Die Septuaginta der Samuelbücher: Untersucht unter Einbeziehung ihrer Rezensionen*. DSI 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016); Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel", in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992,* ed. L. Greenspoon & O. Munnich, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 41 (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1995) 109–129.

[5] For the sake of simplicity, I refer to this translator by the masculine pronoun, but of course, this might be false. We simply do not know enough about the persons who translated the various books of the Septuagint.

[6] James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in ancient biblical translations*, MSU XV (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 26, 50.

have been translated correctly in the Pentateuch were not recognized by this translator (e.g. 1 Sam 15:3, 8 חרם hiph. 'to devote to the ban'), so he was obviously not a learned person who had studied the Pentateuch in both Hebrew and Greek. Time and again he uses transliterations (e.g. 1 Sam 30:8, 15, 23 γεδδούρ for גְּדוּד 'raiding party'; 1 Sam 2:18, 28; 14:3, 18 etc. ἐφούδ for אֵפוֹד 'priestly garment'),[7] which is a clear sign of problems, but also when he uses Greek words, we need to take into consideration that he might have produced a false translation.

On the other hand, this translator did very nice work with verbal forms. Frequent use of the historical present is characteristic of him. He was also able to recognize the past iterative forms in Hebrew. In fact, I learned about the past iterative through this translator: in Hebrew, repeated actions are expressed by the alternation of the perfect consecutive and the imperfect, and this is translated by the Greek imperfect. However, this translator alternates both historical presents and (iterative or durative) imperfects with the aorist to make the discourse livelier (e.g. 1 Sam 2:14 below).[8]

2. The *Vorlage*

The *second factor* is the *Vorlage*, which was oftentimes different from the MT, even more so than generally thought. One fundamental principle in my methodology is that the Greek text must be studied in relation with the Hebrew text. In the course of my editorial work I have not been able to avoid the conclusion that the MT has been deliberately edited at a fairly late stage of the textual history, in any case later than the translation, which I would date to the second half of the 2nd century BCE.[9] In many cases it is possible to show the theological or ideological motivation behind the changes of the Hebrew text.[10] The Septuagint thus often witnesses to a more ancient form of the text of 1 Samuel.

That the *Vorlage* often differed from the MT was taken into consideration already by Paul de Lagarde, who formulated another one of his principles accordingly:[11]

[7] Please, note that the former example of transliteration is based on confusion between *daleth* and *resh*, which suggests that the false transliteration originated with the translator.

[8] For a more detailed discussion, see Raimund Wirth, "Das *Praesens Historicum* in den griechischen Samuelbüchern," in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Texts in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, ed. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law & Marketta Liljeström, CBET 72 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014) 117–132, and "Dealing with Tenses in the *Kaige* Section of Samuel," in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, ed. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017) 185–197.

[9] Certain linguistic features in the translation of 1 Samuel suggest that it was made clearly later than the translation of the Torah, which can be dated to the 3rd century BCE (see John A. L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch.* SCS 14. (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1983), 140–144). As for an *ante quem* date, the Greek text of Samuel was possibly known to the translator of Sirach, see Anneli Aejmelaeus, "When Did the Books of Samuel Become Scripture?" in *From Author to Copyist: Essays on the Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir*, ed. Cana Werman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015) 263–81 (esp. p. 268).

[10] For editorial activity on the Hebrew text, see Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Was Samuel Meant to Be a Nazirite? The First Chapter of Samuel and the Paradigm Shift in Textual Study of the Hebrew Bible," in *Textus* 28 (2019): 1–20.

[11] According to the translation of Swete, *Introduction*, 189–90. See above note 2.

> (2) Where the critic has to make a choice between two readings, he [or she] will do well to prefer (*a*) a free translation to one which is slavishly exact, and (*b*) a translation based upon another Hebrew text to one which represents the MT.

It is important to take into account that the Septuagint may represent another Hebrew text – not only because one or the other Hebrew text was corrupted, but because the MT was later on changed – and that the revisers often corrected the Greek text in cases like these.

3. Jewish revisional activity

The *third factor* to be mentioned concerns revisions of the Greek text. It is well known that the textual history of the Septuagint includes two Christian recensions: the Hexaplaric and the Lucianic.[12] This was already known to Lagarde and Rahlfs, but what they did not know, is that there had been Jewish revisional activity on this Greek text early on.[13] In certain problematic cases Rahlfs might have suspected that there had been pre-hexaplaric revision, but he had no proof of it. In this respect, our generation is in a better position to solve textual problems in the Books of Samuel – and elsewhere. The discovery of the Naḥal Ḥever Minor Prophets scroll and Dominique Barthélemy□s interpretation of it have made it clear that the Greek text of the Septuagint was revised by Jewish scholars and that traces of this so-called *kaige* revision are found in certain sections of Samuel-Kings in *Codex Vaticanus* and the majority of other witnesses as well as in the B text of Judges – to mention just the most important for my inquiry.[14]

My discovery is that there are traces of Jewish revisional activity also in 1 Samuel.[15]

Revision that clearly conforms to the *kaige* translation philosophy was recognized by Barthélemy in the second half of 2 Samuel.[16] Similar variants are, however, also sporadically found in 1 Samuel, showing that there probably existed a *kaige* revision for 1 Samuel as well and that this has had an influence on the manuscript tradition of the Old Greek, especially on the B text (*Codex Vaticanus* and the accompanying minuscules 121-509 as well as Aeth). Several examples below illustrate the effects of this phenomenon on the textual history of 1 Samuel.

---

[12] "Recension" is a traditional term used for a new, systematically revised edition of the Septuagint text. The term "revision" is used when referring to more sporadic revision or approximation to the Hebrew text.

[13] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What Rahlfs Could not Know: 1 Sam 14,4–5 in the Old Greek," in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books*, ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn & J. Trebolle Barrera. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 246 (Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters 2012), 81–93.

[14] Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, VTSup X (Leiden: Brill, 1963). For the final edition of the revised Minor Prophets Scroll, see Emanuel Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*, Discoveries in the Judean Desert VIII (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

[15] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel" in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d'Aquila,* ed. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017) 169–184. The phenomenon was initially discussed in my article "David's Return to Ziklag: A Problem of Textual History in 1 Sam 30:1" in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004,* ed. M. Peters, SCS 54 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006), 95–104.

[16] Barthélemy accepted the definition of this section as 2 Sam 11:2 – 1 Kings 2:11 by Henry St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translation of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–78. The beginning was shown to lie more probably at 2 Sam 10:6 by Raimund Wirth, "Dealing with Tenses in the *Kaige* Section of Samuel," in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d'Aquila*, ed. A. Aejmelaeus & T. Kauhanen, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 185–197.

4. Doublets

One more *text-historical factor* remains to be presented. The *earliest* layer of corrections in 1 Samuel – earlier than the *kaige*-type corrections – resulted in numerous *doublets* that consist of the Old Greek translation of a word, a phrase or a short passage and its correction. The secondary part of the doublet, the formulation considered to be more accurate, must have been first added to the margin of a manuscript from where it slipped into the text, sometimes before the Old Greek counterpart, sometimes after it, and sometimes at a different location. These doublets mark the earliest phase of the textual history attested in the manuscripts, as they are present in practically every manuscript. These early corrections do not always show translation features that would connect with the *kaige* translation style but there always seems to have been some detail that called for correction.[17]

5. Examples

I shall begin by introducing a case with early Jewish revisional readings, an example that I have discussed on many occasions, but one that is worth repeating because it shows the connection with other exemplars of *kaige*.[18]

(1) 1 Sam 15:11 – early revisional readings

נִחַמְתִּי כִּי־הִמְלַכְתִּי אֶת־שָׁאוּל לְמֶלֶךְ
Μεταμεμέλημαι ὅτι ἔχρισα τὸν Σαοὺλ εἰς βασιλέα

μεταμεμέλημαι] μεταμέλημαι V 46*-313 55* 71 460; μεταμέλομαι *d* 554; παρακέκλημαι B A 247 93^{mg}-108^{mg} 121*(vid) Ra: cf MT; παρακεκληκαι με 376 |
om ὅτι ἔχρισα A | ἔχρισα] ἐβασίλευσα B *O L b* 244 460 Ra = MT |
θ΄ παρακέκλημαι σ΄ μετεμελήθην 243-731(s nom)

This is the message that Samuel receives concerning Saul: God has rejected Saul saying, "I regret having anointed Saul to be king." There are two different kinds of corrections in this example. In the first one, the Hebrew verb נחם *niph*. 'to regret,' has been correctly translated in the Old Greek by μεταμέλομαι but this was changed to παρακαλοῦμαι which corresponds to the meaning of the Hebrew verb in *pi*. 'to comfort,' and more precisely, to its passive in *niph*. 'to be comforted.' The change produces a concordant translation of the Hebrew verb with the same Greek verb in all its different forms, although the context demands another equivalent. The resulting text is hardly comprehensible. The same change is found in the *kaige* section of 2 Samuel (24:16) as well as in the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (Jonah 3:9 and 10). There is, however, more at stake here, and I shall come back to this example.

[17] See also my article "Where Do Doublets Come from? A Problem of the Septuagint of 1 Samuel," in *Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A.L. Lee*, ed. J.K. Aitken & T.V. Evans, Biblical Tools and Studies 22 (Leuven/Paris/Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2015) 9–19.

[18] See my articles "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta, JSJS 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 353–66 (esp. 362–4); "Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the *Kaige* Revisors," in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d'Aquila,* ed. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen, DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017), 41–53.

The second case is a simpler one. There was a difference in the Hebrew text: the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek contained the verb משׁח 'to anoint,' whereas the MT has been changed to 'to appoint to be king' (cf. the parallel 15:35). In these two cases as well as elsewhere in 1 Samuel, the main witness for the pre-hexaplaric corrections is *Codex Vaticanus*, accompanied by the other representatives of the B text (*b* [= 121-509]) and a few other manuscripts, and so these secondary readings have ended up in all editions of the Greek text, including Rahlfs, but will be corrected in the forthcoming critical edition.

The following example reveals one of those early doublets that occur in practically all the manuscripts. In a way, they too represent early revisional activity.

(2) 1 Sam 4:14–16 – an early doublet

וַיִּשְׁמַע עֵלִי֙ אֶת־קֹ֣ול הַצְּעָקָ֔ה וַיֹּ֖אמֶר מֶ֣ה קֹ֣ול הֶהָמֹ֣ון הַזֶּ֑ה וְהָאִ֕ישׁ מִהֵ֖ר וַיָּבֹ֥א וַיַּגֶּד לְעֵלִֽי׃
15 וְעֵלִ֕י בֶּן־תִּשְׁעִ֥ים וּשְׁמֹנֶ֖ה שָׁנָ֑ה וְעֵינָ֣יו קָ֔מָה וְלֹ֥א יָכֹ֖ול לִרְא�ֹֽות׃ 16וַיֹּ֤אמֶר הָאִישׁ֙ אֶל־עֵלִ֔י ...

14καὶ ἤκουσεν Ηλι τὴν φωνὴν τῆς βοῆς καὶ εἶπεν Τίς ἡ βοὴ τῆς φωνῆς ταύτης; καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος σπεύσας εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ Ηλι. 15καὶ Ηλι υἱὸς ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπανέστησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπεν· καὶ εἶπεν Ηλὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν τοῖς περιεστηκόσιν αὐτῷ Τίς ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἤχους τούτου; 16καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ σπεύσας προσῆλθεν πρὸς Ηλι καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ... (Rahlfs)

Reading the Greek text according to Rahlfs' edition, we can see that the parts of text underlined (either dashed or waved) form a doublet, but their formulation is not identical. If we take out the part with waved underlining, we get a text that corresponds to the MT. If we take out the part with dashed underlining, we get a text that has about the same content but differs from the MT in the order of the text and in its wording. The latter alternative obviously represents the Old Greek, which is also based on a slightly different *Vorlage*. The part with dashed underlining must have been added to the margin as a corrective to approximate the Greek text to the Hebrew proto-MT. When the text was copied, the marginal reading was inserted into the text by a scribe, who obviously understood that it belonged there.

Since the doublets are secondary elements in the Greek text – even if they are witnessed by practically all manuscripts – they will not appear in the main text of the critical edition.[19] The critical text and apparatus will thus look like this:

14 καὶ ἤκουσεν Ἠλὶ τὴν φωνὴν τῆς βοῆς. [] – 15 καὶ Ἠλὶ υἱὸς ἐνενήκοντα ἐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπανέστησαν, καὶ οὐκ ἔβλεπεν. – καὶ εἶπεν Ἠλὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσιν τοῖς περιεστηκόσιν αὐτῷ Τίς ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ ἤχου τούτου; 16 καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ σπεύσας προσῆλθεν πρὸς Ἠλὶ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ …

14 fin] + καὶ εἶπεν Τίς ἡ φωνὴ τῆς βοῆς ταύτης; καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος σπεύσας εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν τῷ ᾽Ηλί omnes La^{115} Sa Aeth Arm Ra = MT: dupl ex $_{15–16}$ ⟦ om καί^{1} – βοῆς V: homoiotel | ἡ φωνὴ τῆς βοῆς] φωνὴ τῆς ἀκοῆς 82; ἡ βοὴ τῆς φωνῆς B *O* 799 509 106-107-125-610 55 244 Ra | ταύτης] αὐτῇ

[19] In the case of doublets that include a transliteration by the translator and a correction that explains the meaning of the word in question, for the sake of readability of the text, the secondary part may appear in square brackets.

19 | σπεύσας] ἔσπευσεν καί 29 | εἰσῆλθεν La[115]] ἦλθε 106 381 | καὶ ἀπήγγειλεν] καὶ ἀνήγγειλε(ν) V 731 74; > καί 158 | om τῷ 509 | Ἠλί] Ἠλεί B A 247 *L*$^{-93}$ 98□ 46□-242□ *b f* 488□ 29 244 460 554 707⟧

This is one of the types of cases in which my critical text goes behind the archetype from which all our manuscripts derive. Another kind of case reaching beyond the manuscript witness can be observed in the following example.

(3) 1 Sam 15:28 – early corruption and reconstruction of a more original text

קָרַ֨ע יְהוָ֜ה אֶֽת־מַמְלְכוּת יִשְׂרָאֵ֛ל מֵעָלֶ֖יךָ הַיּ֑וֹם
Διέρρηξεν Κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐπὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ χειρός σου σήμερον

σου ἐπί scripsi] σου ἀπό B A *O L b d f* 55 554 Aeth Luc *Par* 4 *Reg* 2; ἀπό *CII* 64 *s* 244 460 Aug *CD* 17,7,9; > V *CI a* 381 29 71 158 245 318 707 Aug *Leg* 1,42 Isid *I Reg* 17,8 Tert *Marc* 2,24,7 Ra = MT | om Ἰσραήλ V 799

Vorlage: ממלכתך על ישראל מידך
Cf. 1 Sam 28:17 καὶ διαρρήξει Κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἐκ χειρός σου
and 1 Sam 13:13 τὴν βασιλείαν σου ἕως αἰῶνος ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ

In this case the majority of the manuscripts (among others, the B text as well as the Hexaplaric and the Lucianic texts) have the preposition ἀπό which is an inner-Greek corruption that actually makes no sense ("your kingdom *from* Israel *out of* your hand"). Rahlfs follows those manuscripts that have an omission in accordance with the MT ("the kingdom *of* Israel *from* you"). The *Vorlage* must have had something different – "your kingdom *over* Israel" – and the MT has been changed here as well as partially also in the parallel cases 13:13 and 28:17.[20]

The following is a case that puzzled me from the very beginning of my work on 1 Samuel. Its solution requires familiarity with the translator's style as well as with the manuscript groups.

(4) 1 Sam 2:14 – an appropriate translation and subsequent revisions[21]
וּבָ֨א נַ֤עַר ... וְהַמַּזְלֵ֛ג שְׁלֹ֥שׁ־הַשִּׁנַּ֖יִם בְּיָדֽוֹ׃ [14]וְ֣הִכָּ֨ה בַכִּיּ֜וֹר ...

καὶ ἤρχετο τὸ παιδάριον… καὶ κρεάγρα τριόδους ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ· [14]καὶ καθῆκεν αὐτὴν εἰς τὸν λέβητα τὸν μέγαν…

καὶ καθῆκεν] pr καὶ ἐπάταξεν 509; καὶ καθίει *L*; καὶ καθῆκαν 158; κεκράτηκεν *d*$^{-68'}$(mend); καὶ ἐπάταξεν B A *f* Ra: cf MT; καὶ ἐπάταξαν 121 68´; καὶ ἐπάτασσεν *O* = MT; *et iecit* Aeth; *et mittebat* La[115]

This is part of the description of the misconduct of the sons of Eli, something that occurred repeatedly in connection with sacrificial meals, and for this reason the verbal forms are mainly those used for iterative past action: in Hebrew the perfect consecutive and imperfect; in Greek the imperfect.

[20] The MT reads at 1 Sam 13:13 אֶת־מַמְלַכְתְּךָ֣ אֶל־יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל עַד־עוֹלָֽם and at 28:17 אֶת־הַמַּמְלָכָה֙ מִיָּדֶ֔ךָ. For a more thorough argument, see my article "A Kingdom at Stake," 359–61.

[21] This example has been previously discussed in my articles "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 138, and "*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel," 170–72.

In this case, the translator has done a good job choosing a contextually fitting verb καθίημι 'to send down,' 'to let down,' (rarely also) 'to strike down.' The aorist – among the chain of imperfects – was used to express abrupt movement.

Among the alternative readings, there are different forms (aorist and imperfect) from two different verbs πατάσσω and καθίημι of which the former is the standard equivalent for נכה *hiph*. The translator certainly knew this verb and often used the standard rendering for it, but he chose to use here a verb that is more appropriate in the context.[22] The changes of the verb and of the tense that we have among the variants are clearly intentional, whereas the alternation of singular and plural and the spelling error κεκράτηκεν (καί → κε-; καθῆκεν → -κράτηκεν) were most probably unintentional.

The emergence of the different readings can only be explained, if καθῆκεν is taken as the original reading. It is represented by the majority of manuscripts, and in a sense, the Lucianic text also participates in this reading, but out of stylistic reasons, that one aorist among several imperfects was changed by the Lucianic reviser to the imperfect καθίει. It would be impossible to reconstruct the development the other way around, presupposing that καθίει was original.

There has been plenty of discussion on the position of the Lucianic text in the textual history of the Books of Samuel. It is true that the Lucianic recension is based on a good old text, but it is also clear that this text has recensional features, in particular, changes meant to improve the Greek language and style.[23]

But where did the reading ἐπάταξεν come from? It is the standard rendering of the Hebrew verb, and thus, it clearly represents an approximation to the Hebrew text, correcting a free rendering. It is typical that this reading is found in *Codex Vaticanus* B and just a few other manuscripts, the accompanying minuscules 121 and 509 showing minor variations. Other manuscripts following the B text in this reading are A and *O*: A having ἐπάταξεν and the *O* group (= 247-376) an analogous change to the imperfect as the Lucianic text). A and *O* were recognized by Rahlfs to be Hexaplaric.[24] In this case, Rahlfs did not however see any Hexaplaric influence but considered ἐπάταξεν to be part of the original translation. From my viewpoint, any form of πατάσσω is here secondary, but neither do I consider it to be Hexaplaric. Why not? The Hexaplaric recension is known for its approximations to the Hebrew text – not, however, for approximations of this kind. Origen's main interest was in the plusses and minuses between the Greek and the Hebrew texts and not in translation equivalents. It is also worth noting that the B text does not contain any of the characteristically Hexaplaric plusses.

How did it happen then that the B text and the Hexaplaric witnesses agree in a secondary reading against the great majority of witnesses? The only possible explanation is that Origen knew and

[22] In the case of נבה *hiph*. the most common rendering is naturally πατάσσω, but there are – in addition to καθίημι – several alternative renderings (πλήσσω 4:2; 5:12; τύπτω 11:11; 17:36; 27:9; 31:2; παίω 13:4; ἐκζέω 5:6; θανατόω 17:35; 20:33; ἀποκτείνω 17:46).

[23] More examples can be found in my article "Textual History of the Septuagint and the Principles of Critical Editing" in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions: Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot*, ed. by A. Piquer Otero & P. Torijano Morales, Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 1 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2016), 160–79 (esp. 167–71).

[24] Rahlfs in fact includes A in the group siglum *O*.

used a manuscript that represented the B text.[25] Thus, the B text must have been in existence around 200 CE. It is my theory that the B text is the *first Christian edition* of the Biblical text from Alexandria – an edition characterized by its adoption of early Jewish corrections.[26]

Origen obviously knew different manuscripts of the Septuagint, and comparing them, he, of course, preferred readings that were closer to the Hebrew text, believing to recover in this way the genuine Septuagint. Readings that Origen picked up from different manuscripts for his fifth column were by definition pre-Hexaplaric, and he naturally did not mark them in any way.

If we now compare our first example 1 Sam 15:11 with this one, we can see that the Hexaplaric recension is following the B text in both cases there too: (1) in the first case, the corrective παρακέκλημαι is found in A 247 and also in 376 in an erroneous form, and (2) in the second case, the corrective ἐβασίλευσα is found in the *O* group whereas A has an omission. Outside of these two groups, the B text and the Hexaplaric text, the distribution of these readings is not very wide.

It is also interesting to see how the Lucianic text behaves in these cases. (1) In the first case, the Lucianic text witnesses the original reading μεταμεμέλημαι. (2) In the second case, however, the approximation to the Hebrew ἐβασίλευσα is also found in the Lucianic text. The pre-Hexaplaric corrections must have been known to the Lucianic reviser, but he did not very often decide for these literal, sometimes even Hebraistic renderings. Of the three cases we have seen, the Lucianic text once had the original Old Greek, once a stylistic improvement, and once the early approximation to the Hebrew text. The following two examples will reveal how the Lucianic text sometimes prefers the original longer reading, sometimes decides against such a reading – probably in the interest of the readability of the text.

(5) 1 Sam 1:13 – omission of a genuine Septuagint reading resulting from omission in the MT
וְקוֹלָהּ לֹא יִשָּׁמֵעַ
καὶ φωνὴ αὐτῆς οὐκ ἠκούετο· καὶ εἰσήκουσεν αὐτῆς Κύριος.

καί 2° – Κύριος] > B A *O b f* 55 245 707[txt] Aeth Sa Compl Ra = MT |

Vorlage: וישמע אליה יהוה
Cf. Gen 30:22 וַיִּשְׁמַע אֵלֶיהָ אֱלֹהִים καὶ ἐπήκουσεν αὐτῆς ὁ θεός

Hannah was praying silently at the sanctuary in Shilo. “Her voice was not heard, but” – according to the Greek text – “the Lord heard her.” This sentence was obviously inspired by the story of Rachel, who was also suffering from childlessness. The borrowing must however have happened

[25] This was maintained already by Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek,* 2nd edition (Cambridge: University Press, 1914 [original publication 1900]), 487. Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien I – III*, 2. Auflage, Vermehrt um einen unveröffentlichten Aufsatz und eine Bibliographie mit einem Nachruf von Walter Bauer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965 [original publication *I* 1904; *II* 1907; *III* 1911]), 101, suggests that B was “cum grano salis die Vorlage des Origenes.”

[26] The B text does not seem to have had a direct contact with the Hebrew, from which follows that the *kaige*-type readings were most probably excerpted from an actual *kaige* manuscript. Moreover, the B text used by Origen had to be a Christian text, otherwise he would not have used it to “heal” the text of the Church. For a more detailed discussion, see my articles “*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel,” 182–84; “Textual History of the Septuagint and the Principles of Critical Editing,” 172–75; and “Hexaplaric Recension and Hexaplaric Readings in 1 Samuel,” in *On Hexaplaric and Lucianic Readings and Recensions*, ed. Dionisio Candido, Joshua Alfaro, and Kristin De Troyer, DSI (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming).

in Hebrew, because the formulation in Greek is different from Gen 30:22. The longer text must have been present in the *Vorlage* – probably representing the original wording of the Hebrew text. It was removed from the MT by an editor who made several changes in the birth-story of Samuel, obviously with the aim to make Hannah's vow appear illegitimate.[27] Comparison of the Greek text with the shorter Hebrew text led to the omission of the sentence from those Greek manuscripts that witness the early Jewish corrections – that is, the B text followed by a few other manuscripts – and this reading was picked up by Origen for the Hexapla, because it was in harmony with his Hebrew text. Again, omitting parts of the traditional text was not a feature of the Hexaplaric recension, but a typical feature of the *kaige* revision. The longer text no doubt belongs to the critical text.

(6) 1 Sam 15:29 – a partial omission of a Septuagint reading according to a shorter Hebrew text

לֹא יְשַׁקֵּר וְלֹא יִנָּחֵם כִּי לֹא אָדָם הוּא לְהִנָּחֵם

καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψει (4QSam^{a} ישוב) οὐδὲ μετανοήσει,
ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν τοῦ μετανοῆσαι·
αὐτὸς ἀπειλήσει καὶ οὐκ ἐμμενεῖ;[28]

αὐτὸς – ἐμμενεῖ] pr αὐτός 554: dittogr; αὐτός B A *O b*$^{-121mg}$ *d*$^{-44}$ Ra; *ipse minatur et non permanet* Aug *CD* 17,7; *quia ipse iratus est* Aeth; *irascetur* Sa; om αὐτός V 245 707; > *L* 44 La^{M} = MT

Vorlage? ההוא אמר ולא יקימנה
Cf. Num 23:19 הַהוּא אָמַר וְלֹא יַעֲשֶׂה וְדִבֶּר וְלֹא יְקִימֶנָּה
αὐτὸς εἶπας οὐχὶ ποιήσει; λαλήσει καὶ οὐχὶ ἐμμενεῖ;

This example reveals a categorical statement that God does not regret or change his mind like human beings do. In a negative statement, the verb μετανοέω seems to pose no problem. But there is a problem with the following sentence, beginning with αὐτός. In fact, in Rahlfs' edition, the verse ends with the word αὐτός. As usual, Rahlfs follows in this reading *Codex Vaticanus* B which is accompanied by 121-509 (= *b*; except for 121^{mg} that has the longer text) as well as A and *O* and the *d* group (with the exception of 44). This group of manuscripts – mainly familiar from the previous examples – makes a partial omission, leaving the pronoun αὐτός in its place – as proof of the omission! The Lucianic text (with manuscript 44 coinciding) leaves out the whole sentence including αὐτός.[29] It is possible that the Lucianic reviser made the omission, because he found the sentence hardly comprehensible to those listening to the reading in his Christian community.

No doubt, the longer text is original in the Septuagint – and thus part of the critical text. It is present in the majority of the Greek witnesses and is supported by several daughter versions

[27] This thesis is discussed in my article "Was Samuel Meant to Be a Nazirite? The First Chapter of Samuel and the Paradigm Shift in Textual Study of the Hebrew Bible," *Textus* 28 (2019): 1–20.

[28] For a more thorough discussion, see my article "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*," 362–4. See also "Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the *Kaige* Revisors," 41–53.

[29] Manuscript 44 probably follows the shorter text of the *d* group but leaves out the otiose pronoun, thus coinciding with the Lucianic reading.

(even if Sa and Aeth give a false interpretation of it). For some reason, it is not represented in the MT, although it must have been in the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint. The formulation is somewhat puzzling. No one would add a sentence like this, but omitting it is understandable. Essential for its interpretation is that it is a question, which underlines the unchangeableness of God's decisions, in this case the decision to reject Saul: "Should he threaten and not keep it?"[30]

The fact that αὐτός was left in its place in the group of manuscripts that witness the *kaige*-type corrections shows indisputably that the longer text is primary. Comparing the longer Greek text with the shorter Hebrew text, it was perhaps not so easy to see which words should be omitted. Whether the error originated with the *kaige* reviser, or with the scribe behind the B text who decided to adopt the shorter reading while copying the text, is impossible to know for sure – however, I find the latter more plausible.

Since I mentioned that the translator was not quite up to his task, I have to present a case where he made an error and this error was corrected by those early Jewish revisors.

(7) 1 Sam 30:21 – an erroneous translation and its correction
וַיָּבֹא דָּוִד אֶל־מָאתַיִם הָאֲנָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר־פִּגְּרוּ| מֵלֶכֶת| אַחֲרֵי דָּוִד

Καὶ παραγίνεται Δαυὶδ πρὸς τοὺς διακοσίους ἄνδρας τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας τοῦ πορευθῆναι ὀπίσω Δαυίδ

ὑπολειφθέντας] ἀπολειφθέντας *L*$^{-93}$; ἐκλυθέντας B A *O b* Sa Ra = MT |
πορευθῆναι] πορεύεσθαι B A *a b* 64′ 342 460

When chasing after the Amalekites, David had divided his troops and left 200 men behind. When he comes back to them, the Hebrew text refers to these men as those "who were too exhausted to go after David." The translator made a contextual guess: "who were left behind to go after David," giving the impression that they were to follow David later. The Hebrew verb used here, פגר pi. 'to be exhausted,' is a rare word, occurring only here and earlier in v. 10 of the same chapter. The translator obviously did not know the word and made a different contextual guess in each case.

At the first occurrence in v. 10, the translator rendered מֵעֲבֹר אֶת־נַחַל הַבְּשׂוֹר אֲשֶׁר פִּגְּרוּ as οἵτινες ἐκάθισαν πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου τοῦ Βοσόρ. Instead of "too weary to cross the brook," the Greek text says, "remained on the other side of the brook," which does not change the story too much, but is in fact a false rendering. For v. 10, no correction has been transmitted,[31] but in v. 21 we find ἐκλυθέντας (from ἐκλύω pass. 'to become weary') in a group of manuscripts already familiar to us: B and A and the groups *O* and *b*. It seems that this alteration caused another change in the following infinitive, at least in B A *b*: the verb "to become weary" seems to function better with the infinitive in the present πορεύεσθαι, but not all manuscripts follow the same pattern, due to

[30] If not understood as a question, it must be connected with the human being: "He threatens and does not keep."

[31] Nevertheless, the readings of the Three have been transmitted for 1 Sam 30:10: α′ οἳ ἠτόνησαν σ′ ἠδυνάτησαν θ′ ἀπενάρκησαν 243-731(s nom).

the eclectic nature of most of the manuscripts. Rahlfs' edition follows the revised text in the participle but not in the infinitive.

The critical text is ὑπολειφθέντας, and ἐκλυθέντας reflects early *kaige*-type approximation to the Hebrew text. The readings of the Three that have been transmitted for these cases confirm that the correction is pre-Hexaplaric.[32]

6. Conclusion

With these few examples from the text of 1 Samuel I have tried to give a glance at the kinds of text-historical problems that an editor of the critical text of a book like the Book of Samuel needs to deal with. I have concentrated on cases that exemplify the new text-historical insights and the methodology used to unravel problem cases that are largely related to the idiosyncrasies of the translator, to early revisional history, and/or to differences of the *Vorlage* in comparison to the later proto-MT.

Bibliography

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel", in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992,* ed. L. Greenspoon & O. Munnich. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 41 (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1995) 109–129. Also published in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translator: Collected Essays*. Revised and Expanded Edition. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis & Theology 50 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007) 123–141.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "David's Return to Ziklag: A Problem of Textual History in 1 Sam 30:1" in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004,* ed. M. Peters. SCS 54 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2006) 95–104.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek – Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta. JSJS 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 353–66.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "What Rahlfs Could not Know: 1 Sam 14,4–5 in the Old Greek," in *After Qumran: Old and Modern Editions of the Biblical Texts – The Historical Books*, ed. H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn & J. Trebolle Barrera. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 246 (Leuven – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters 2012) 81–93.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, "When Did the Books of Samuel Become Scripture?" in *From Author to Copyist: Essays on the Composition, Redaction, and Transmission of the Hebrew Bible in Honor of Zipi Talshir*, ed. Cana Werman (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015) 263–81.

[32] The readings of the Three for 1 Sam 30:21 are slightly different from those for the parallel verse: α' οἳ ἐπτωματίσθησαν σ' ἀτονήσαντας θ' ἀποναρκήσαντας 243-731(s nom).

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “Where Do Doublets Come from? A Problem of the Septuagint of 1 Samuel,” in *Biblical Greek in Context: Essays in Honour of John A.L. Lee*, ed. J.K. Aitken & T.V. Evans. Biblical Tools and Studies 22 (Leuven/Paris/Bristol, CT: Peeters, 2015) 9–19.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “Textual History of the Septuagint and the Principles of Critical Editing” in *The Text of the Hebrew Bible and Its Editions: Studies in Celebration of the Fifth Centennial of the Complutensian Polyglot*, ed. by A. Piquer Otero & P. Torijano Morales. Supplements to the Textual History of the Bible 1 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2016) 160–79.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “Does God Regret? A Theological Problem that Concerned the *Kaige* Revisors,” in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila,* ed. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen. DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017) 41–53.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “*Kaige* Readings in a Non-*Kaige* Section in 1 Samuel” in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila,* ed. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen. DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017) 169–184.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “Was Samuel Meant to Be a Nazirite? The First Chapter of Samuel and the Paradigm Shift in Textual Study of the Hebrew Bible,” in *Textus* 28 (2019): 1–20.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli, “Hexaplaric Recension and Hexaplaric Readings in 1 Samuel,” in *On Hexaplaric and Lucianic Readings and Recensions*, ed. Dionisio Candido, Joshua Alfaro, and Kristin De Troyer. DSI (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, forthcoming).

Barr, James, *The Typology of Literalism in ancient biblical translations*. MSU XV (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).

Barthélemy, Dominique, *Les devanciers d’Aquila*. VTSup X (Leiden: Brill, 1963).

Lagarde, P. A. de, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverbien* (Leipzig 1863).

Lee, John A. L., *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch.* SCS 14 (Chico, Ca.: Scholars Press, 1983).

Rahlfs, Alfred, *Septuaginta-Studien I – III*. 2. Auflage. Vermehrt um einen unveröffentlichten Aufsatz und eine Bibliographie mit einem Nachruf von Walter Bauer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965 [original publication *I* 1904; *II* 1907; *III* 1911]).

Swete, Henry Barclay, *An introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.* Second Edition, Revised by R. R. Ottley (Cambridge: University Press, 1914 [original publication 1900]).

Thackeray, Henry St. J., “The Greek Translation of the Four Books of Kings,” *JTS* 8 (1907): 262–78.

Tov, Emanuel, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8ḤevXIIgr)*. Discoveries in the Judean Desert VIII (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990).

Wirth, Raimund, *Die Septuaginta der Samuelbücher: Untersucht unter Einbeziehung ihrer Rezensionen*. DSI 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016).

Wirth, Raimund, “Das *Praesens Historicum* in den griechischen Samuelbüchern,” in *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes: Studies in the Biblical Texts in Honour of Anneli Aejmelaeus*, ed. Kristin De Troyer, T. Michael Law & Marketta Liljeström. CBET 72 (Leuven: Peeters, 2014) 117–132.

Wirth, Raimund, “Dealing with Tenses in the *Kaige* Section of Samuel,” in *The Legacy of Barthélemy: 50 Years after Les Devanciers d’Aquila*, ed. A. Aejmelaeus and T. Kauhanen. DSI 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017) 185–197.