

TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF 1 SAM 1:1 - 2:4

QOHELET WEB MINISTRY

JOHN TELGREN

Introduction

The following is basically a textual commentary using standard Old Testament textual criticism techniques. This project takes into account the critical apparatus of Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS) and the Masoretic notes in the margins. For more on Old Testament textual criticism, see the bibliography.

1 Samuel Chapter One

Verse One

^a - אֶחָד (one, a certain) is lacking in Greek manuscripts and in the Pesiqta Rabbati, an 8th century homily.

It was probably dropped from the Septuagint as being redundant. The same construction, using אֶחָד to indicate definiteness occurs in Judges 13:2.

4QSam^a has the אֶחָד, so without a doubt, אֶחָד is probably the original reading

^{b-b} - הַרְמְתִים צוֹפִים varies in several manuscripts. All of them appear to spell הַרְמְתִים the same. But several either spell צוֹפִים differently, or uses a different word altogether. The Syriac has *ddwq'*, the Targums have *mtlmjdj nbjj*, and the Septuagint has *Seifa*, which could be a Greek rendering of צוֹפִים. It is possible that the Targums, which tend to be more paraphrastic, may contain a more contemporary name. The same might be true for the Syriac.

4QSam^a reads: הַרְמְתִים צוֹפִים which agrees with BHS as it stands. Therefore הַרְמְתִים צוֹפִים is likely the original reading.

^c - Origen has *Iereme/ihl* rather than something like *Ierwam* as you might expect. The Septuagint has a slight variation in spelling, rendering it as, *Ieremehl*.

4QSam^a sheds some interesting light on this. Instead of יֶרְחָם as it is in BHS, it has יֶרְמִיאל, which agrees with the reading in the Septuagint. It is possible that a homoioteleuton took place in the Paleo-Hebrew script. The אַל at the end of יֶרְמִיאל could look like the next word, בֶּן if not written clearly. But that doesn't explain how the het and the second yod was lost. Since 4QSam^a the Septuagint, and Origen all agree against BHS, the weight might seem to tip towards יֶרְמִיאל being the authentic reading. However, in 1 Chronicles 6:12 (6:27), Jeroham, not Jeremeel appears as the father of Elkanah. However, Eliab rather than Elihu appears as the father of Jorham, which still creates more problems. Due to the uncertainty of the evidence, I would choose to leave BHS as it stands.

Verse 2

^a - Several manuscripts read = “name of **the** one was Hanna” which adds an article to אַחַת. The Septuagint reads ονομα τῆ μιᾶ, and so uses the article as well. 4QSam^a does not have an article with אַחַת.

The absence of the article is probably correct since it is the shorter reading and also agrees with 4QSam^a. The article was probably added for stylistic reading to balance with the subsequent phrase, וְשֵׁם הַשְּׂנִיחַ פְּנִינָה,

Verse 4

^a - A few manuscripts along with the Pesiqta Rabbati add the preposition לְ to בְּנוֹתֶיהָ “and **to** her daughters” rather than “and her daughters” as BHS has it. BHS probably has the correct reading since it is the shorter reading. The לְ was probably added for stylistic reasons so it would be balanced with the preceding phrase, וְלְכָל־בְּנֵיהָ, “and **to** all her sons...”

4QSam^a mentions only the sons and not the daughters. The Septuagint includes the daughters. Exegetically this is of minor significance since sons could sometimes mean all of a person’s sons and daughters. 4QSam^a probably preserves a more correct reading since it is the shorter reading. The phrase about the daughters was probably added either for clarification or to further contrast the fruitfulness of Penninah and the fruitlessness of Hanna.

Verse 5

a-a - Lucian renders אַפִּים as kata:proswpon, taking the Hebrew to mean “face” rather than “nose.” The phrase, מְנַח אַחַת אַפִּים is incomprehensible. What does “one portion of two faces/noses” mean?

The apparatus of BHS says to refer to 2 Sam 12:14, which begins with the phrase, אַפֶּס כִּי. According to the apparatus, the Septuagint uses the phrase at 1 Sam 1:5, πλὴν ὅτι which corresponds to אַפֶּס כִּי. One of two things may have happened. The Septuagint translators may have mistook כִּי אַפִּים for כִּי אַפֶּס, or a Hebrew scribe may have mistook אַפֶּס for אַפִּים, missing the ם and mistaking the ס for a פ. Both the Septuagint and 4QSam^a support the latter.

The Septuagint reads, καὶ τῆ Αννα ἔδωκεν μερίδα μίαν ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτῆ παιδίον πλὴν ὅτι τὴν Ανναν ἠγάπα Ελκανα ὑπὲρ ταύτην καὶ κύριος ἀπέκλεισεν τὰ περὶ τὴν μήτραν αὐτῆ. “And to Anna he gave one portion because she had no children although Elkana loved Anna above these and the LORD shut up her womb.”

4QSam^a reads,
 ולחנה יתן מנה אחת כיא אין לה ילדימ אפס כיא את חנה אהב אלקנה מואת
 ויהוה סגר בעד רחמה כיא לא נתן לה יהוה ילד כצרתה

“And to Hannah he gave one portion for she had no children although Elkanah loved Hannah more than these but the LORD shut up her womb for the LORD did not give her children like her rival.”

It appears that the Septuagint is closer to 4QSam^a than to BHS. The Septuagint translators probably dropped the last phrase because it was redundant. 4QSam^a confirms that the Septuagint phrase, πλὴν ὅτι came from a Vorlage that read כִּי־אֵפֶס rather than כִּי־אֵפִים. Since 4QSam^a and the Septuagint agree together against BHS, אֵפִים should be corrected to אֵפֶס. The aleph in כִּי־אֵפֶס which appears in the 4QSam^a, but not in BHS, appears to be a matter of Hebrew orthography.

As for the phrases and words that appear in 4QSam^a and not in BHS, there doesn't appear to be a satisfactory explanation as to why they are missing from BHS. There may have been a combination of homoioteleuton beginning from the first כִּי־אֵפֶס, but then you would expect אֵפֶס to be missing as well. The only other explanation I can think of is that the extra phrases were explanatory glosses to explain why Hanna got only a single portion. The missing phrases are somewhat significant exegetically because they declare not merely that Elkanah loved Hannah, but that Elkanah loved Hannah more than her rival. Since BHS preserves the shorter reading, this is to be preferred with the correction of אֵפִים to אֵפֶס.

^b - 2 Hebrew Manuscripts add סָגַר בְּעַד after סָגַר. The phrase סָגַר בְּעַד is an idiom (BDB p.126 #1-b) meaning to shut behind or to shut upon, as in shutting a door behind someone. 4QSam^a uses the phrase, סָגַר בְּעַד. סָגַר בְּעַד may have been added to emphasize the act of shutting. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is to be preferred. Exegetically, this is insignificant.

Verse 6

^a - The Syriac versions, Targums and the Vulgate render כָּעַס as a verb rather than a noun. The difference would have been one vowel, which in an unpointed text would have been unwritten. But if it were a verb, כָּעַס would say, “he vexed,” which does not fit the context. So this should be a noun rather than a verb. BHS is correct.

Verse 7

^a - A Hebrew Manuscript drops the conjunction, וְ from the beginning of the sentence. The Septuagint and a couple of Latin manuscripts also drop the conjunction. 4QSam^a also drops the וְ. Since 4QSam^a and the Septuagint are the shorter reading and agree against BHS, the original reading probably had no וְ

^b - The Syriac has an apparent variation which I cannot read.

^c - The Greek codices read ἀναβῆναι αὐτόν. You would expect αὐτήν rather than αὐτόν, The Latin has some form of the word meaning to ascend, but beyond that, I don't know. 4QSam^a has עלתה which agrees with BHS. Therefore BHS, “her going up” is correct.

^d - Medieval Manuscripts read בית rather than בְּבֵית . The Septuagint uses eis... rather than en. Either word in the Septuagint reflects the preposition attached to בית. The Syriac and Targums attach a /... to house, and I don't know what that means. The Vulgate uses *templum*, which may reflect a possible back reading of verse 9 back to verse 7 where it reads יהוה יהוה. 4QSam^a reads בבית, agreeing with BHS. BHS is likely the original reading.

^e - A Hebrew manuscript adds a ו to כן. A Greek manuscript also has a kai here, but nothing to indicate the כן. The Vulgate has *et sic*, and I don't know what that means. 4QSam^a drops the כן altogether, and instead uses a ו to express this idea. Perhaps the original reading was a ו which was mistaken for a ך and so the כ was added. Since 4QSam^a has the shorter reading, and apparently agrees with the Septuagint against BHS, it is to be preferred. So כן ought to be replaced with a ך.

4QSam^a adds the phrase, ויאמר לה אלקנה אישה חנה ותאמר לו הנני אדני, to this verse. BHS is to be preferred because it is the shorter reading. Exegetically, this phrase is insignificant.

Verse 9

^a - A Greek manuscript has (μετα) τὸ φάγειν αὐτούς “after they ate” rather than (μετα) τὸ φάγειν αὐτῆς “after she ate” which would have agreed with BHS. But 4QSam^a has אחרֵי אכלם “after their eating.” A poorly written ם could have been mistaken for a ה. Exegetically, this is of little significance. I would leave BHS as it is, since this part of the narrative focuses on Hannah.

^{b-b} - This phrase, אַחֲרֵי שָׁחָה, is lacking in Origen and Lucian. It also does not appear in 4QSam^a. Since this is the shorter reading, the lack of the phrase should be preferred. Exegetically this is of little significance.

Other Greek manuscripts add καὶ κατέσθη ἐνώπιον κυρίου, which agrees with 4QSam^a, והתיצב לפני יהוה, “and she stationed herself before the LORD.” This is probably an expansion. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

^c - Medieval manuscripts render this plural. 4QSam^a also renders it plural. Since the shorter reading is the feminine singular construct ending, it is to be preferred. What probably happened is 4QSam^a thought this to be a feminine plural ending, and therefore added the mater, ך. BHS as it stands should be the preferred reading. Exegetically, this is of little significance.

^d - There is a manuscript that has בית rather than הִיכָל. There is apparently a difficulty in the Syriac, but I cannot read Syriac. 4QSam^a also has הִיכָל, agreeing with BHS. This appears to be an anachronism. You would expect the text to read בֵּית, אֶהָל, מִשְׁכָּן or something like that. But the only alternate reading attested is בית. בית was probably used either to eliminate the difficulty, or to match with the בית used in verse seven. Since 4QSam^a agrees with BHS and it is the more difficult reading, it is to be preferred.

Verse 10

^a - Multiple manuscripts use אל יהוה rather than על יהוה as in BHS. 4QSam^a uses אל יהוה. The original reading is probably אל יהוה. The change to על probably came about due to the Aramaic influence which does not use אל according to BDB page 757, left column. According to BDB page 41, אל and על are sometimes used interchangeably. So there is little difference in meaning between either reading. Since there are multiple manuscripts along with 4QSam^a that attest to אל, this is to be the preferred reading. Exegetically, this is insignificant.

Verse 11

^a - A few manuscripts read מורא, “fear” which is obviously an error because the word makes no sense in context. BHS and 4QSam^a both read מורה, “razor,” which is obviously the correct reading.

Verse 12

^a - Multiple manuscripts have אל rather than לְפָנַי. 4QSam^a has לְפָנַי. The Septuagint has ἐνώπιον which reflects an exemplar of לְפָנַי rather than אל. BHS is correct as it stands. Since לְפָנַי “before,” or more literally, “to the face/presence of” and אל “to” or “towards” are similar in meaning, this is exegetically insignificant.

Verse 13

^a - Multiple manuscripts use אל rather than על. The BHS apparatus says to refer to Gen 24:45, which has the phrase, אֶל-לְבַי. 4QSam^a uses על, which attests to the reading in BHS. Therefore, this is the correct reading. אל and על are sometimes used interchangeably in Hebrew, so there is little exegetical significance.

Verse 15

^a - A few manuscripts put a כִּי before אִישָׁה. 4QSam^a does not. There is also a reference to a Latin manuscript in the apparatus of BHS, but I can't read Latin. It also says to refer to Gen 24:45, but I'm not sure what I am supposed to see there. Since BHS is the shorter reading and agrees with 4QSam^a, it is the correct reading. This is exegetically insignificant.

^{b-b} - The Septuagint reads ἡ (or ἐν) σκληρὰ ἡμέρα. Apparently there is also an alternate reading in at least three Old Latin manuscripts, but I cannot read Latin. The apparatus of BHS, says to compare this with 30:25 or the verb רוּחַ. Not sure what that is supposed to mean. 4QSam^a reads אִשָּׁה קָשָׁת יוֹם, which corresponds with the reading the in Septuagint. Since 4QSam^a agrees with the Septuagint against BHS, it should be the preferred reading. What may have happened is יוֹם was mistaken for רוּחַ because the yod and the mem may have been poorly written. Exegetically, there is not a significant difference in meaning between “a woman of a bitter time” or “a woman of a bitter spirit.” Exegetically, there is just a little significance.

Verse 16

a-a - There are alternate readings in both Syriac and the Vulgate, neither of which I can read. 4QSam^a says, בַּת בְּלִיעֵל, which supports the reading in BHS. Therefore, BHS as it stands should be the preferred reading.

Verse 17

a - The Septuagint adds σοι “to you” after יִתֶּן. An old Latin manuscript, a Syriac manuscript, and the Vulgate also add, “to you.” This agrees with 4QSam^a which has לְךָ after יִתֶּן. Exegetically, this is of no significance. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is to be preferred.

b - Multiple manuscripts have a qere for שֵׂאל of שִׁלְתָּךְ. Apparently the scribes believed this to be a spelling error. There does not appear to be any manuscripts that attest to שֵׂאל in this verse. 4QSam^a reads שִׁלְתָּךְ. Since שֵׂאל is a qere, and there appears to be no attestation in any Hebrew manuscripts, it is best to leave BHS as it stands because it is the more difficult reading. Amending the text would be based on conjecture, though a good one.

Verse 18

a - וְהֵאכַל is missing in Syriac. This could be a homoioteleuton between the ה in לְדַרְכָּה and the ה in וּפְנִיָּה. BHS as it stands it the correct reading.

b-b - The Septuagint has συνέπεσεν for הִיוּ-לָהּ. The apparatus says to compare this to a couple of old Latin manuscripts, which I cannot read. The Septuagint reading agrees with 4QSam^a, which reads, וּפְנִיָּה לֹא נִפְלוּ עוֹד. Both say that her

face/countenance fell no longer. The text in BHS is nearly incomprehensible. Her face/countenance was to her no longer. However, sometimes **היה** can also carry the idea of falling, “to fall out” or “to fall upon,” so there is the possibility that this is what is meant. In this case, 4QSam^a and BHS would mean basically the same thing, but in different words. If this is the case, it means that the Septuagint could agree with both BHS and 4QSam^a. Taking **היה** in this sense, it is best to leave BHS as it stands since it is the more difficult reading.

4QSam^a adds after **לדרכה**, “...**ותבוא אל לשכתה והאכל עם אישה וחשתה...**” “And she went to her chamber and ate with her husband and drank...” The Septuagint agrees with this, “**καὶ εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸ κατάλυμα αὐτῆς καὶ ἔφαγεν μετὰ τοῦ ἀδρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ ἔπειν...**” This is probably an expansion to illustrate how her countenance was no longer fallen. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

Verse 19

a - The Septuagint has **τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ**. An old Latin manuscript and the Vulgate also reflect a singular suffix, showing a possible exemplar of **אל-ביתו** rather than **אל-ביתם** as in BHS. 4QSam^a has **לביתו**. Since 4QSam^a agrees with the Septuagint and the Vulgate against BHS, and since this is the shorter reading, **לביתו** is the preferred reading.

4QSam^a reads **וישתחו ליהוה** rather than **וישתחו לפני יהוה**. Since 4QSam^a is the shorter reading, it is to be preferred. This issue is exegetically insignificant.

4QSam^a adds **וילכו דרכם** before **ויבוא**. Since BHS is shorter, it is the preferred reading. This issue is exegetically insignificant.

4QSam^a adds **ותהר** “and she conceived” at the end of the verse. BHS has it in verse 20. The Septuagint agrees with 4QSam^a, and should be the preferred reading.

Verse 20

a - Several manuscripts, including some medieval ones, spell this as **לתק(ו)פת**. The root is unknown, though BDB conjectures that it may be **נקף** II. The lexical form is **תקופה** meaning “a coming around” or “circuit.” 4QSam^a spells this **לתקופות**. If the root is indeed **נקף** II, then the differences are only a matter of orthography. Due to this uncertainty, I would leave BHS as it stands.

Verse 21

a - The Septuagint and 3 Latin Manuscripts add several words here. The Septuagint adds, καὶ πάσας τὰς δεκάτας τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ. This agrees with 4QSam^a which reads, וְאֵת כָּל מַעֲשְׂרוֹת אֲרָצוֹ, "...and all the tithes of his land." Since BHS preserves the shorter reading, it is to be preferred.

4QSam^a renders נְדָרָיו as a plural noun, נְדָרִי. Since the context prefers the singular form in that it uses וְנִבַּח, and since BHS has the shorter reading, the reading in BHS is to be preferred.

Verse 22

a - עַד is lacking in a few manuscripts, but compare to 2 Sam 10:5 which also uses an עַד in the sentence. The Qumran manuscripts add אֲשֶׁר. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

b-b - Qumran manuscripts add several words here. 4QSam^a reads, וְנִתְחַתְּיָהּ נָזִיר עַד עוֹלָם כּוֹל יְמֵי חַיָּיו, "And I give him (as a) Nazirite forever all the days of his life." There appears to be no evidence of a homoioteleuton or homioarchton, so this is probably an expansion. Since BHS preserves the shorter reading, it is to be preferred.

4QSam^a renders יִגְמַל as a Qal perfect 1st person singular verb גַּמְלֵתִי ("I wean"), rather than a Niphal Imperfect 3rd person masculine singular ("He will be weaned"). The Septuagint has ἀπογαλακτίσω, which agrees with 4QSam^a. So גַּמְלֵתִי is the preferred reading. Exegetically, this is insignificant.

Verse 23

a - Qumran manuscripts add הֵיוּצָא מִפִּיךָ, which seems to say something like, "the going out from your mouth." 4QSam^a reads the same way and drops דְּבָרָיו, "his word." The apparatus of BHS says to compare this to the Septuagint, Latin and Syriac manuscripts. I can only read the Septuagint which says, ἀλλὰ στήσαι κύριος τὸ ἐξελθὸν ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου, "but may the Lord establish the going out of your mouth." Even though the reading is attested in both Qumran and the Septuagint, BHS has the shorter reading and should therefore be preferred.

Verse 24

a - Qumran says שִׁילָה. The Septuagint says Σηλωμ. It is not certain why the Septuagint now adds a μ to Σηλωμ. The apparatus says to compare this to a Latin manuscript, which I cannot read. This may merely be a matter of spelling. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

b-b - Qumran reads, בקר משלש ולחם, “cattle from three and bread.” The Septuagint points to this reading, ἐν μόσχῳ τριετίζοντι καὶ ἄρτοι. The apparatus says to compare this to 2 Latin manuscripts and Syriac. Since BHS is the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

c - The Septuagint says, καὶ εἰσηλθεν, “and she went up.” Compare to a Latin manuscript. BHS says, “and she brought him up.” The Septuagint also adds, καὶ τὸ παιδάριον μετ’ αὐτῶν, “and their son.” So this may not be a textual issue, but a translation issue. BHS has the preferred reading.

d - The BHS reading, נָעַר, is difficult. As a verb, it could mean, “he growled,” or “he shook,” or “he cried.” Apparently, most English translations have taken this to be a noun rather than a verb. So the phrase would be, “the lad was a child.” The Septuagint reads, μετ’ αὐτῶν, “with them” (or, μετ’ αὐτῆς, “with her”). It is not certain where the Septuagint reading came from. It would be better to leave BHS as it is since it is the shorter reading. But I would render נָעַר as a noun.

The apparatus says there are multiple extra words in Qumran,
וּיקְרִיבוּ אוֹתוֹ לְפָנֵי יְהוָה וַיִּשְׁחַט אָבִיו אֶת הַזֶּבֶחַ אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה מִיָּמִים יְמִימָה לַיהוָה
וּיקְרִיבוּ אֶת שְׂמוֹאל:

“And they brought him before the LORD and his father slaughtered the sacrifice which he made yearly to the LORD and he brought Samuel near.” There is no obvious evidence homoioteleuton or anything like that. It is possible that the extra words are an explanatory gloss. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it would be best to leave BHS as it is. Exegetically, this is of little significance.

Verse 25

4QSam^a - After הפַּר reads as follows, “And Hanna the mother of the Lad came near to Eli.” Since BHS has the shorter reading it is to be preferred. Exegetically, this is of little significance.

Verse 26

4QSam^a drops the אֲדָנָי after נִפְשֶׁךָ. The Septuagint also drops it. Since this is the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

Verse 27

a - The Syriac and Vulgate connect with 26. Compare to a Latin manuscript which adds a word I cannot read.

4QSam^a begins with עַל rather than אֵל. This is of no significance since the two words are often used interchangeably. It would be best to leave BHS as it is.

1 Samuel Chapter 2

Chapter 1, Verse 28 and Chapter 2, verse 1

a-a - 2 Variant readings for הָיָה, חָיָה and חָי. חָי should be taken as verb, so this is probably a matter of orthography. The Septuagint reflects a verb reading, ζῆ αὐτός, "...he himself lives..." Compare with some Latin manuscripts, Syriac, and Targums. חָיָה is probably an error and should be amended to חָיָה.

b-b - The phrase, "and he bowed himself down before the LORD and Hannah prayed" is missing from the Septuagint. Compare to a Latin manuscript. 4QSam^a after לִיהוָה שָׂאָל says this, "and she left him there and bowed him down there to the LORD." Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is preferred.

c - A few manuscripts, including a medieval one, Lucian, Syriac, and the Vulgate render this plural. This is probably an error where the ך was mistaken for a 3rd masculine plural ending rather than a suffix. The singular verb fits the context. Therefore, the reading in BHS is the preferred one.

d - Qumran reads וַחֲשָׁתָה, "and she bowed down." This is probably an expansion. Since BHS has the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

e - Multiple manuscripts, several of which are medieval ones, read, "in my God." The Septuagint supports this reading. Also compare to Latin, Syriac and the Vulgate. One Syriac manuscript has nothing here. Since multiple manuscripts attest to אֱלֹהַי, and since this reading is supported by 4QSam^a and the Septuagint, "my God" is the preferred reading. In addition, it makes a better parallelism.

Verse 2

a-a - Qumran puts a yod before this word. This makes no sense. Refer to Codex Alexandrinus which begins with ὅτι "because." Also refer to the old Latin. It appears from Alexandrinus that there may have been a כִּי in its exemplar. 4QSam^a begins verse 2 with כִּי־א. What may have happened is the ך at the end of verse one and the א at the beginning of the following word were mistaken for the aleph and kaf in כִּי־א. Therefore the כִּי־א was inadvertently dropped. Since 4QSam^a, Qumran, and Alexandrinus all attest to כִּי, and because it looks like it may have been inadvertently dropped, it is the preferred reading.

b-b - Codex Alexandrinus transposes this to the end. The phrase is lacking in a Latin manuscript. There doesn't appear to be a satisfactory explanation, so BHS remains the preferred reading.

c - The Septuagint reads “righteous” rather than “rock.” 4QSam^a has “and there is no rock like our God ... and there is none righteous like our God...” So it has both. A homoioteleuton may have taken place between the two כאלוהינו. If this is the case, then the phrase, “there is no rock like our God” was not written as “there is none righteous like our God”, it was merely left out as a result of homoioteleuton.

4QSam^a reads, “For none is holy like the LORD, and none is righteous like our God, and none is holy but you, and there is no rock like our God.” There is a possible homoioteleuton here between two of the ואין, which accounts for the loss of the phrase, “and none is righteous like our God.” This phrase should be restored to the text as the preferred reading because there is a good explanation as to why it was dropped.

As for the next phrase, “there is none holy but you,” there does not seem to be a good reason why the word, “holy” was dropped. The addition of it seems to have a good rhythm, balancing out the first phrase. So there is more cause to think it was added, rather than it was taken away. So, since BHS has the shorter reading, it should remain, “there is none but you.”

Verse 3

a - A few manuscripts lack the second “proudly.” The Septuagint also drops it, and apparently a Latin manuscript does as well as the Syriac. It is easy to see that a case of haplography has taken place here. 4QSam^a agrees with BHS. So the preferred reading is in BHS as it stands.

b - There is a manuscript that places עשק before עתק. Also refer to the Syriac, Psalms 119:134, which uses the word עשק (oppression), and to a few Latin manuscripts and the Vulgate. I’m not sure what any of those say. The addition of the word עשק would make the whole phrase in this verse say, “(do not) let arrogant oppression/extortion come from your mouth...” 4QSam^a does not have עשק added. It is probably an expansion. Therefore, since BHS has the shorter reading, it is the preferred one.

c - Qumran has דעת, the singular form rather than the plural form, דעות. The apparatus says to refer to the Septuagint, which reads, γνώσεων, a feminine plural genitive. 4QSam^a also has the plural form, דעות. This could be a matter of orthography. Since BHS is supported by 4QSam^a, the Masoretic Tradition, and the Septuagint, BHS has the preferred reading.

d - Multiple manuscripts have a qere for וְלוֹ of וְלוֹ. The qere seems preferable, because the text as it stands would say, “and wantonness/deeds are not measured,” which does not fit the context at all. With the qere, the text reads, “and by him are measured wantonness/deeds.” The Septuagint doesn’t give much help because it says, θεὸς ἐτοιμάζων ἐπιτηδεύματα αὐτοῦ, “a God who

prepares his pursuits.” It is possible that they mistook וַיִּלֵּא for וַיִּאֵל and misunderstood the precise meaning of נִחְכְּנוּ, translating it as meaning “to prepare” rather than “to measure, regulate, or estimate.”

The qere is preferable because וַיִּלֵּא simply does not make sense in the context. It probably came about as the result of a misspelling very early.

e - The Septuagint codices add αὐτοῦ at the end of the verse. Several Latin manuscripts add something as well, but I can't read them. The Syriac adds something that may have come out of a qere. The αὐτοῦ was probably added to smooth out the translation of the text. Evidently, the Septuagint translators had some difficulty with this verse too, since they translated it to mean that God prepares his own pursuits, rather than God measuring the deeds of others. Obviously, αὐτοῦ (עַל־לַיְךָ in Hebrew) is not how the text was written. BHS has the correct reading.

Verse 4

a - Qumran reads חָתָה (to snatch up) rather than הִתְיַמָּה (shattered, dismayed). The Septuagint has, ἠσθένησεν “it was weak.” The apparatus says also to refer to a Latin manuscript, which I cannot read, and to 2 Sam 22:35, which uses נָחַת, (to go down, descend). Evidently, the editors felt that this word might be derived from נָחַת. It certainly fits the context, but it is a conjecture that is not supported by any textual evidence. The word, הִתְיַמָּה is an adjective, so a more literal translation in the Septuagint would have been, ἀσθενής. Since ἠσθένησεν is a verb, it might lean toward חָתָה which is also a verb. However, חָתָה does not mean weak. But it is possible that the translators of the Septuagint mistook חָתָה for חָתַת.

4QSam^a also has חָתָה. In one sense, this fits better because חָתָה makes the first phrase a verbal phrase, and the next phrase is also a verbal phrase. With הִתְיַמָּה in the first phrase, it is an adjectival phrase, and the second phrase is a verbal phrase. It also fits better in thought. 4QSam^a would say, “The bow of mighty ones is snatched up, and the enfeebled ones gird on strength.” There appears to be a better balance than BHS which literally reads, “The bow of the mighty broken ones, and the enfeebled ones gird on strength.”

Since Qumran, 4QSam^a, and possibly the Septuagint agrees against BHS, they would be the preferred reading.

Bibliography

- Alt, A., et. al. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart : Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.
- Brenton, Lancelot C.L. *Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986.
- Brotzman, Ellis. *Old Testament Textual Criticism: A Practical Introduction*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994.
- Fincke, Andrew. *The Samuel Scroll from Qumran: 4QSam^a Restored and Compared to the Septuagint and 4QSam^c*. Boston: Brill, 2001.
- Herber, Edward D. *Reconstructing Biblical Dead Sea Scrolls : A New Method Applied to the Reconstruction of 4QSam^a*. New York:Brill, 1997.
- Scott, William R. *A simplified guide to BHS: Critical Apparatus, Masora, Accents, Unusual letters & Other markings*. North Richland Hills, TX: Bibal Press, 1995.
- Wurthwein, Ernst. *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1981.