

Sahidic 1 Samuel - A Daughter Version of the Septuagint 1 Reigns

V&R Academic

De Septuaginta Investigationes (DSI)

Edited by

Anneli Aejmelaesus, Kristin De Troyer,
Wolfgang Kraus, Emanuel Tov

In Co-operation with

Kai Brodersen (Erfurt, Germany), Cécile Dogniez (Paris, France),
Peter Gentry (Louisville, USA), Anna Kharanauli (Tbilisi, Georgia),
Armin Lange (Wien, Austria), Alison Salvesen (Oxford, GB),
David Andrew Teeter (Cambridge, USA), Julio Trebolle (Madrid,
Spain), Florian Wilk (Göttingen, Germany)

Volume 8

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Elina Perttilä

Sahidic 1 Samuel – A Daughter Version
of the Septuagint 1 Reigns

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

With 84 Tables

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;
detailed bibliographic data available online: <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISSN 2198-1140
ISBN 978-3-647-54057-3

You can find alternative editions of this book and additional material on our Website:
www.v-r.de

© 2017, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Theaterstraße 13, D-37073 Göttingen/
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U.S.A.
www.v-r.de

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized
in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording,
or any information storage and retrieval system,
without prior written permission from the publisher.

Acknowledgements

This publication is based on my 2013 University of Helsinki dissertation. I would like to thank my supervisors, Prof. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Prof. Raija Sollamo. My cordial thanks are due to the pre-examiners, Prof. Anne Boud'hors and Prof. Melvin Peters for their comments. Prof. Boud'hors also served as opponent in the public defence of my thesis and offered many suggestions for improvement.

I also wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Christian Askeland, Dr. Frank Feder, Dr. Tuukka Kauhanen, Marketta Liljeström, Prof. Antti Marjanen, Ivan Miroshnikov, Jessi Orpana, Christian Seppänen, Dr. Alin Suciu, Dr. Ulla Tervahauta-Helin, Timo Tekoniemi, Miika Tucker, Dr. Kirsi Valkama, Hanna Vanonen and Dr. Raimund Wirth.

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Acknowledgments | 5 |
| 1. Introduction | 11 |
| 1.1. The Septuagint and its daughter versions | 11 |
| 1.2. Septuagint of 1 Samuel | 14 |
| 1.3. Manuscripts of Sahidic 1 Samuel | 17 |
| 1.4. Sahidic 1 Samuel and its research history | 25 |
| 1.5. Aims and methods of this study | 28 |
| 2. Description of the translation technique | 32 |
| 2.1. Clause connections | 32 |
| 2.1.1. Questions and methods | 32 |
| 2.1.2. Occurrences of clauses in Greek | 34 |
| 2.1.3. Coordinated clauses and their renderings | 34 |
| 2.1.3.1. <i>καί</i> -clauses | 34 |
| 2.1.3.1.a) Renderings of <i>καί</i> -clauses | 35 |
| 2.1.3.1.b) <i>καί</i> -clause rendered asyndetically | 36 |
| 2.1.3.1.c) <i>καί</i> -clause rendered with <i>αἰω</i> | 40 |
| 2.1.3.1.d) <i>καί</i> -clause rendered with <i>δε</i> | 45 |
| 2.1.3.1.e) <i>καί</i> -clause rendered with other connectives | 53 |
| 2.1.3.1.f) <i>καί</i> -clause without equivalent | 58 |
| 2.1.3.2. Asyndetic clauses and their renderings | 64 |
| 2.1.3.2.a) Asyndeton rendered with asyndeton | 64 |
| 2.1.3.2.b) Asyndeton rendered with a conjunction | 68 |
| 2.1.3.3. Interrogative clauses and their renderings | 70 |
| 2.1.3.4. Other coordinated clauses | 75 |
| 2.1.3.4.a) <i>ἀλλά</i> -clauses and their renderings | 75 |
| 2.1.3.4.b) <i>γάρ</i> -clauses and their renderings | 79 |
| 2.1.3.4.c) <i>δέ</i> - and <i>οὐδέ</i> -clauses and their renderings | 80 |
| 2.1.3.4.d) <i>ἤ</i> -clauses and their renderings | 82 |
| 2.1.3.4.e) <i>οὖν</i> -clauses and their renderings | 83 |
| 2.1.3.4.f) <i>οὕτως</i> -clauses and their renderings | 85 |
| 2.1.3.4.g) <i>πλήν</i> -clauses and their renderings | 85 |
| 2.1.4. Subordinate clauses and their renderings | 86 |
| 2.1.4.1. Relative clauses | 86 |
| 2.1.4.2. <i>ἐάν</i> -clauses | 90 |
| 2.1.4.3. <i>εἰ</i> -clauses | 93 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|-----|
| 2.1.4.4. | ἕως-clauses | 97 |
| 2.1.4.5. | καθὼς- and καθά-clauses | 98 |
| 2.1.4.6. | μήποτε-clauses | 99 |
| 2.1.4.7. | ὅπως-clauses | 100 |
| 2.1.4.8. | ὅτε- and ὅταν-clauses | 101 |
| 2.1.4.9. | ὅτι-, διότι- and καθότι-clauses | 101 |
| 2.1.4.10. | ὡς-clauses | 107 |
| 2.1.4.11. | ὥστε-clauses | 110 |
| 2.1.5. | Non-finite clauses | 111 |
| 2.1.5.1. | Participium coniunctum and its renderings | 112 |
| 2.1.5.2. | Genetivus absolutus and its rendering | 116 |
| 2.1.5.3. | Infinitive constructions and their renderings | 117 |
| 2.1.6. | Summary | 120 |
| 2.2. | Additions | 121 |
| 2.2.1. | Questions and method | 121 |
| 2.2.2. | Additions based on a grammatical difference | 124 |
| 2.2.2.1. | Completion of an incomplete clause | 124 |
| 2.2.2.2. | Relative clause | 125 |
| 2.2.2.3. | An auxiliary word in translation | 126 |
| 2.2.2.4. | Possessive article | 126 |
| 2.2.3. | Logical additions | 127 |
| 2.2.3.1. | Addition of direct or indirect object | 127 |
| 2.2.3.2. | Addition of a second verb | 129 |
| 2.2.3.3. | Addition of the subject | 130 |
| 2.2.3.4. | Introduction of a speech | 130 |
| 2.2.4. | Stylistic additions | 131 |
| 2.2.4.1. | An adverb, a prepositional phrase or an adjective | 132 |
| 2.2.4.2. | A complement to the subject or the object | 133 |
| 2.2.4.3. | Explanation | 134 |
| 2.2.4.4. | Interjection or a short comment | 135 |
| 2.2.4.5. | Other additions | 135 |
| 2.2.5. | Summary | 136 |
| 3. | Affiliations of the Sahidic manuscripts and the Greek <i>Vorlage</i> of the translator | 138 |
| 3.1. | Questions and methods | 138 |
| 3.2. | Textual analyses | 141 |
| 3.2.1. | Sa ^{MAV} 7:8–8:1, 9:21–10:2 | 141 |
| 3.2.2. | Sa ^{MI} 12:4–5,10–11 | 162 |
| 3.2.3. | Sa ^{MAU} 14:24–32 | 164 |
| 3.2.4. | Sa ^{MAB} 17:33–44 | 174 |
| 3.2.5. | Sa ^{MAFJ} 29:5–9 | 189 |
| 3.2.6. | Sa ^{MAJ} 30:21–24 | 196 |
| 3.2.7. | Sa ^{MAB} 31:1–13 | 202 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 3.3. Special cases | 218 |
| 3.3.1. Text-critical notes in the clause connections chapter | 218 |
| 3.3.2. Corrections towards the MT' | 220 |
| 3.4. Summary | 223 |
| 4. Conclusions | 226 |
| 5. Bibliography | 230 |
| 6. Appendices | 237 |
| 6.1. Collation of Sa ^I | 237 |
| 6.2. Collation of Sa ^J | 238 |
| 6.3. Collation of Sa ^U | 240 |
| 6.4. Collation of Sa ^Y | 243 |
| 6.5. Greek manuscripts and their groupings | 244 |
| Abstract | 246 |
| Index of Biblical References | 247 |

1. Introduction

This study considers the Sahidic Coptic version of 1 Samuel (1 Sam) and how it may best be used in Greek textual criticism.¹ The Sahidic translation is a daughter version of the Septuagint. The Septuagint itself is the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, rendered beginning in the 3rd century BCE, probably in Alexandria. These Jewish translators rendered the Pentateuch into Greek, and, later, additional texts from the Hebrew corpus were translated and incorporated into this corpus. The translation of 1 Sam probably happened sometime in the 2nd century BCE.² The text of this original translation is referred to as the Old Greek. Since no manuscript preserves this original text, the OG must be recovered through textual criticism. Further studies on the Septuagint, including retroversions to Hebrew and comparison with other textual witnesses, should be based on the OG text. The Septuagint was later adopted by early Christians as their Scripture, whereas Jews eventually replaced it.³

1.1. The Septuagint and its daughter versions

The Septuagint has ancient daughter versions in Latin, Coptic⁴, Ethiopic, Armenian and Georgian.⁵ Additionally, there was the Syro-Hexapla (a Syriac version of the Hexapla), but only fragments of 1 Sam survive from it.⁶

-
- 1 1 Samuel is also referred to as 1 Kingdoms, like 1 Reigns (1 Regnorum), in the Septuagint. I use the name Samuel in order to avoid confusion with 1 Kings.
 - 2 For more information about the origin of the Septuagint, see Jan Joosten, “Reflections”. Concerning the dating of the 1 Sam translation, Anneli Aejmelaeus (“Corruption or Correction”, 16) dates some revisions to the MT to the 1st century BCE with no parallel in the Septuagint of 1 Sam. Thus, the LXX of 1 Sam was rendered before that time. Since the Pentateuch was rendered first, the rendering of 1 Sam happened perhaps not before the second century BCE.
 - 3 Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 143. The modern situation concerning the OT canon is complicated. The protestant reformers reverted to translations based upon the Masoretic Hebrew Bible and its canon, while the Roman and Eastern Churches continued to prefer the Septuagint and related translations. See also John J. Collins, *Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*, 2–7. For a more thorough discussion, see Lee Martin McDonald, *The Biblical Canon*, and his useful table on pp. 443–4.
 - 4 Coptic is the latest phase of Egyptian, whose written history started already in the late 4th millennium BCE. For a concise description of the setting and history of the Egyptian-Coptic language, see Grossman/Richter, *The Egyptian-Coptic language*.
 - 5 Basically, daughter versions are translations that have the Septuagint as their source text.
 - 6 Marketta Liljeström, “Looking for Fragments of the Syrohexapla”.

The two first mentioned, Latin and Coptic, are important for the textual history of the Greek text since they were translated before most extant Greek manuscripts were copied.⁷ Therefore, through these versions, we might have access to older text traditions than the text in our preserved Greek manuscripts. The Old Latin version is preserved only fragmentarily, and therefore the Coptic becomes even more important. The translation of 1 Sam into Sahidic Coptic is usually dated to the 3rd century CE.⁸

The Sahidic translation of the Septuagint of 1 Sam was made by Christians. Obviously, Christianity came to Egypt early, but our knowledge of the early stages begins only with Demetrius' rise as bishop of Alexandria in 189 CE.⁹ There are Greek fragments of the New Testament coming from Egypt, dated to the 2nd – 3rd century that indicate the presence of Christianity at that time. However, the dating of these fragments is not absolute and it is mostly impossible to get a grasp of 2nd- century Christianity with the help of the papyri, be they literary or documentary.¹⁰ If the origin of Christianity in Egypt remains obscure, so also do the first Coptic Bible translations. We do not know exactly when and where the first translations arose, nor is it clear in which order the books of the Septuagint were translated into Coptic.¹¹ At the moment, the research situation and research questions

7 For more information on the Latin version, see Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 275–89.

8 Paul E. Kahle (*Bala'izab*, 11) contends that the translation of the Sahidic OT happened “not later than the late 3rd century”. He bases this dating on manuscript evidence. Gregor Emmenegger (*Der Text des Koptischen Psalters*, 12–13) dates the Sahidic versions of the Psalter to the 3rd century, and the Bohairic ones in the 4th – 5th century. Frank Feder (*Biblia Sahidica*, 3) dates at least the beginning of the Sahidic OT translation in the 3rd century, based on the earliest fragments from the 4th (or even 3rd) century and the assumed time span between the original translation and these fragments. John Barton Payne (*Critical and comparative*, 17) has an early dating: he dates some parts of the Sahidic Bible before the end of the 2nd century, and the rest of it before Origen's Hexapla c. 245. However, the arguments of Payne concerning the lack of recensional readings in Sahidic 1 Sam and the needs of missionaries are not as convincing and accurate as preserved manuscripts when it comes to the dating of the translation.

9 Roger S. Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 4–5. The main source of information is Eusebius' Church History, and according to Bagnall, “it does not give one the impression that Eusebius knew a lot”[about the time before Constantine, 313 CE].

10 See Bagnall, *Early Christian Books*, 7–11.

11 The Coptic language had many dialects. The literary dialects are Sahidic, Bohairic, Achmimic, Lycopolitan, Mesokemic and Fayyumic. Besides these dialects, there are some minor dialects. For more information, see Wolf-Peter Funk, “Dialects Wanting Homes: A Numerical Approach to the Early Varieties of Coptic”. For a short introduction to the New Testament manuscripts in different Coptic dialects, see Askeland, “The Coptic versions of the New Testament”. 1 Sam was translated into the Sahidic dialect of Coptic, which was the primary literary dialect beginning from the 3rd century until the rise of Bohairic in the 8th-9th centuries. From the 12th century onwards, the Sahidic version was replaced by Bohairic. For the Fayyumic version, from which one tiny fragment has survived from 1 Sam 25, it is difficult to know whether the entire 1 Sam ever existed. For more information about preserved Fayyumic literature, see Anne Boud'hors, “Manuscripts and

are taking shape, and new initiatives and questions arise. There is a consensus among scholars that mostly the dating of Coptic manuscripts has been haphazard, and datings based on paleographical arguments need reassessment.¹² The earliest witness of Sahidic 1 Samuel has been dated to the 4th century.¹³

The use of the daughter versions in the textual criticism of the Greek text has many problems that need attention.¹⁴ One must consider that *each translation also has its own textual history*.¹⁵ Variant readings stem from both the copying processes in Greek and in the daughter versions. Intentional changes also occur in the textual traditions, either as corrections according to some other text form or because of linguistic issues in the relevant languages. The textual history of the Greek text needs to be evaluated separately from the textual history of the Coptic text.¹⁶ At the same time, however, one has to consider the overall picture to avoid assumptions that do not fit into the framework. The framework, as long as Coptic is used in textual criticism of the LXX, is the Greek text and its textual history. With regard to the Greek text and its history, it is presumed in this study that our extant Greek witnesses all descend from one common hypothetical ancestor – the Old Greek, that is, the original Greek translation. Thus, the aim of studying the Greek text and its history is to trace back the history of the text and to reconstruct the OG on the basis of the extant manuscripts as well as the daughter versions.

Literature in Fayoumic Coptic”. For some reason, she does not mention the tiny fragment of 1 Sam but states that there are no preserved fragments from historical books.

- 12 For an overview of the situation in different dialects, see Feder, “Coptic Translations”. Concerning the questions urgent in dating and paleography, see Feder, “Die koptische Übersetzung des Alten und Neuen Testamentes im 4. Jahrhundert”.
- 13 Aaron Michael Butts, “P.Duk.inv. 797”, 10. This fragment has the siglum sa 77 in Karlheinz Schüssler’s *Die koptischen Bibeltex te 1: 1*, 75. Schüssler references a possible 3rd-century date. Butts himself proposes a dating to the 4th century.
- 14 J.W. Wevers (“The Use of Versions for Text Criticism: The Septuagint”, 15–20) provides three propositions concerning versions and their use in textual criticism of the source language: 1) Before a version can be used text critically the nature and limitations of the target language in contrast to those of the source language must be thoroughly understood. 2) By version one can only mean the actual translation itself, and not later corruption or revisions of it. 3) One must fully understand just how and from what points of view this translation was done by a particular translator.
- 15 For an example from the Ethiopic version, see Michael A. Knibb, “The Greek *Vorlage* of the Ethiopic text of Ezekiel”, 416–17.
- 16 The same principle is found in Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 276–8.

1.2. Septuagint of 1 Samuel

The Greek translation of 1 Sam has been described as one of the most literal in the Septuagint.¹⁷ The literalness of this translator is most apparent in some particular areas, as pointed out by Aejmelaeus. First, one notes the use of the conjunction *καί* as the rendering of the Hebrew conjunction *ו* together with the rare use of the connective *δέ*. Second, the translator has used apodotic conjunctions abundantly, against normal Greek idiom.¹⁸ Third, the use of *participium coniunctum* is very limited in 1 Sam, suggesting that the translator did not render larger units at a time. The other participial construction, *genetivus absolutus*, occurs fairly frequently in Greek 1 Sam as compared to its frequency in the Pentateuch.¹⁹ Besides *gen.abs.*, the translator's use of various verbal forms further reveals his tendencies. His use of the Greek historical present and the imperfect as well as contextual renderings show that he is not exhaustively literal. As Aejmelaeus concludes, this Greek translator proceeded by rendering one small unit at a time, but within such a unit, he could be quite free and use idiomatic Greek expressions.²⁰

The Greek translator mostly proceeded on a word-for-word basis, and this enables a retroversion into Hebrew more easily than in those books where the translator rendered larger units with freedom. In those passages in 1 Sam where variation exists between the LXX and the MT, the differences probably do not stem from the translator who usually follows his *Vorlage* literally. The Septuagint of 1 Sam was translated from a Hebrew text at times different from the MT. This view has two bases: 1) the translation technique behind the Septuagint and 2) Hebrew Samuel manuscripts found at Qumran. The fragments of three Samuel scrolls found at Qumran confirm that there are readings where the LXX and a Qumran reading agree against the reading of the MT.²¹ According to Aejmelaeus, a consensus exists among scholars that the MT of 1 Sam “contains numerous grave

17 Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen (*Infinitive*, 177–8, 186) puts 1 Sam in the group that holds an intermediate position between the most slavish and most free translations, but within this group, 1 Sam is nearer to the literal than the free extreme. Raija Sollamo (*Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions*, 286–7) has a grouping based on the renderings of the Hebrew semiprepositions, and she places 1 Sam in the third out of four groups, the fourth group consisting of the most literal and slavish translations. For more literature, see A. Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, 128, note 23.

18 Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, 128–9. Typically, Greek *καί* does not occur at the start of the *apodosis*, when the *apodosis* follows the *protasis*. When this does occur against the general tendency of the language, this is referred to as an apodotic *καί*.

19 Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, 134–5.

20 Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, 136–41.

21 Samuel fragments from Qumran are published in Cross, F.M./Parry, D.W./Saley, R.J./Ulrich, E.C., *Qumran Cave 4*. Before using fragmentary evidence from Qumran in comparison with the MT and LXX, see the critique of Tuukka Kauhanen (*The Proto-Lucianic Problem*, 165–6) concerning the reconstructions of the fragments.

errors and defects”. Additionally, the MT provides examples of deliberate editing.²² This makes the LXX a particularly helpful witness to the Hebrew text of 1 Sam.

The textual history of the Greek text informs the textual history of the Sahidic. One should avoid proposing theories that do not cohere with the known history of the LXX. The Septuagint has been reworked, slightly or more thoroughly, several times during its history, and this complicates its study. In addition to the LXX, further Greek OT traditions like the *καίγε*, Theodotion, and Symmachus translations also play a role in the textual history and need to be taken into account in order to most fully comprehend the history of the LXX.²³

Concerning textual history, the two terms *recension* and *revision* require clarification and careful use. These terms should always reference patterns of variants and variation which were consciously made and which can be ascribed to a common transmissional event.²⁴ Aejmelaeus speaks of motives in this connection. One has to find the direction of the changes that were made during the recensional process.²⁵ If one cannot find such a direction or common denominator, but only a few random changes, then the terms *approximation* and *reformulation* are appropriate. Approximation refers to a change towards some source language text, whereas a reformulation has no connection to a variant source text.

Indisputably, Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions are essential when the Septuagint of 1 Sam is concerned. In their very nature, these two recensions are different.²⁶ The *Hexaplaric recension* was concerned with quantitative equivalence. Those Greek passages missing from the MT are marked with an obelos. Likewise, those passages that are present in the MT but missing from the LXX are supplied and also indicated by an asterisk. This recension arose as Origen’s ‘fifth column’ which itself was based on a comparison of the Greek and Hebrew witnesses available at the time.²⁷ Additionally, this redaction produced doublets. If no Greek equivalent identifiable to the reviser existed for something in the Hebrew source, he inserted one into the

22 Aejmelaeus, “Corruption or Correction”, 6.

23 Aejmelaeus, “Corruption or Correction”, 3.

24 See also Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*, 89–94. Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 160–1: “A witness reflecting a text-type or recension by definition should show a conscious effort to change an earlier text systematically in a certain direction.”

25 Aejmelaeus, “Corruption or Correction”, 4: “Such intentional features, wherever encountered, are particularly valuable for textual criticism, as they give us a clue of what can be expected of this textual witness and which explanations are available in individual cases. In case of repeated intentional changes toward a certain direction it is justified to speak of conscious editing of the text. In such cases, it may be even possible to discern the motive behind the changes.”

26 Aejmelaeus, “Kingdom at Stake”, 358 n. 16. See also her *On the Trail*, 245–6.

27 Sebastian P. Brock, *Recensions*, 170.

Greek text. Some of the doublets result from Origen's work, while others have some (probably) earlier origin.²⁸

The *Lucianic text* contains several layers. First, there is an old base text that diverged from the rest of the Greek tradition early.²⁹ Second, it preserves a significant number of corrections according to Hebrew.³⁰ Third, some stylistic improvements concern grammar as well as lexis. Fourth, some changes aim at a text designed for public reading.³¹ The third and fourth features are those belonging to the recension proper.

The Hesychian recension has sometimes been connected especially with the Sahidic text. Jerome has described the recension as follows:

Alexandria and Egypt attribute their recension to Hesychius; from Constantinople to Syrian Antioch, the approved text is that of Lucian the Martyr, while in Palestine that of Origen as propagated by Eusebius and Pamphilus holds the field.³²

The man Hesychius remains shrouded in mystery. Sidney Jellicoe advocated identification with an Egyptian martyr-bishop who died during the Diocletian persecutions.³³ Léon Dieu, in his early study, suggests that the Sahidic text was translated from the Hesychian recension.³⁴ Dieu himself does not state which manuscripts he includes within this group, but J. Barton Payne has, after a "process of elimination", concluded that the group consists of the following manuscripts: M N(=V) 107 55 56 243 119 245 29 46 246.³⁵ Partly in accordance with Dieu, Alberto Vaccari maintains that, in the historical books, the Hesychian recension is preserved in the following mss: M V 55 56 119 158. Vaccari substantiates this argument upon the dependencies between the Hesychian recension, Coptic versions and the Egyptian fathers.³⁶

The theory of a Hesychian recension has encountered critiques from several scholars. Payne made a justified reservation by asking whether the manuscripts listed above constitute a distinct group.³⁷ Sebastian Brock forcefully rejected the idea of a recension based on the arguments provided by Vaccari. First, he questions the argumentation for a recension in historical books, as Vaccari had studied prophetic books. Second, Brock did not find

28 Brock, *Recensions*, discusses the latter doublets on pp. 158–66.

29 *Ibid.*, 306.

30 *Ibid.*, 170–1. A. Aejmelaeus ("What Rahlfs Could not Know", 89) mentions that the Lucianic recension acquired its corrections in Greek, mostly from various columns of the Hexapla.

31 Brock, *Recensions*, 298.

32 Cited here following Sidney Jellicoe, "Hesychian", 409.

33 Jellicoe, "Hesychian", 414.

34 L. Dieu, "Manuscrits Grecs", 17–60.

35 Payne (*Critical and comparative*, 349) lists M, N, dhijnvb₂, 46, 246. Payne also supposes a (707) and g (158) as belonging to this same group. Thus, it resembles Brock's MN+ with some additional mss (Brock, *Recensions*, 19).

36 Vaccari, "Hesychian Recension", 61.

37 Payne, *Critical and comparative*, 349.

“any close link between MN+ and Co[ptic] or Bo[hairic] on the one hand, or the scanty quotations of the Alexandrine fathers on the other”. If there is a need to find an affiliation for Coptic, Brock proposes Bb Eth for that purpose, but adds that in these manuscripts no recensional activity is found. He concludes: “In the textual tradition, as it comes down to us, of I Kms [= 1 Sam] there is no evidence for definite recensional activity outside the work of Origen and ‘Lucian’.”³⁸ Actually, the whole discussion concerning the Hesychian recension should be inverted; *one should begin with actual variants and manuscripts, and only if there is evidence of a recensional work, then proceed to naming.*

After Brock’s study, Aejmelaeus discerned additional recensional activity in Greek 1 Sam not connected to the name Hesychius, but rather to $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$ -Theodotion. Previously, 1 Sam has been considered as unrelated to this recension, whose influence is usually thought to begin in 2 Sam.³⁹ In 1 Sam, these approximations towards the MT appear sporadically, and typically in manuscript B. They include changes in vocabulary and omissions of plusses in the Greek text.⁴⁰ In the passages discussed by Aejmelaeus so far, the Sahidic text does not usually follow the secondary readings. However, there are some passages in which the Sahidic text agrees with early corrections according to Hebrew, and these cases are of particular interest when tracing out the textual history of the Sahidic version.⁴¹ No direct influence of a Hebrew text is perceivable since the Sahidic does not correct the mistranslations of the Greek translator. Accordingly, Sahidic acquired its readings from Greek sources that contained these corrections towards the MT.

1.3. Manuscripts of Sahidic 1 Samuel

Smaller or larger pieces of 24 manuscripts of Sahidic 1 Sam are extant, and only one among them is complete.⁴² This manuscript, for which I use the

38 Brock, *Recensions*, 33–4.

39 In Samuel-Kings, a recension called $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$ is widely recognized thanks to the discovery of the Nahal Hever Minor Prophets scroll and the work of Dominique Barthelémy (*Les Devanciers d’Aquila*). The books of Kingdoms are divided as follows (originally Thackeray’s division): α 1 Sam, $\beta\beta$ 2 Sam 1:1–11:1, $\beta\gamma$ 2 Sam 11:2– 1 Kgs 2:11, $\gamma\gamma$ 1 Kgs 2:12– 21:43, $\gamma\delta$ 1 Kgs 22 – 2 Kgs. Two of these sections, $\beta\gamma$ (2Sam 11:2 – 1Kgs 2:11) and $\gamma\delta$ (1Kgs 22 – 2Kgs), are representatives *par excellence* of the $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon$ recension. This recension consists of early corrections towards the proto-Masoretic Hebrew text. These corrections are found in Vaticanus (B) and the majority of mss.

40 For examples, see Aejmelaeus, “Kingdom at Stake”, 354–9, 366.

41 These are analyzed in section 3.3.2.

42 I was informed in the IACS congress in Rome (September 2012) by Joost Hagen, that there are Sahidic fragments among the fragments that have been found in the excavations in Qasr Ibrim. He is currently working on these fragments. Unfortunately, at the moment I only know that these fragments exist, and what is even more important, some of them contain text from chapter 1 Sam 17 that is of special interest (see my section 3.2.4). One additional

siglum **Sa^M**,⁴³ is one of the Hamuli-manuscripts and belongs to the collections of The Morgan Library & Museum.⁴⁴ **Sa^M** contains a colophon with the date 892/3.⁴⁵ Although this manuscript preserves almost all of its original folios,⁴⁶ the manuscript's text often leaves much to be desired.⁴⁷ James Drescher has edited the manuscript and also created an apparatus containing the different readings found in the fragments of other Sahidic manuscripts of 1 Sam that were known to him (**Sa^A** through **Sa^T**, in alphabetical order). In addition to the one complete manuscript, the following fragments of the Sahidic 1 Sam are preserved:⁴⁸

Sa^A contains more than one third of the text: 6:2–10; 6:11–10:3; 14:17–32; 17:31–44; 18:28–22:7; 22:21–23:14; 24:21–25:28; 28:16–30:1, 3–5; 30:5–24; 30:24–31:13. The ten known fragments of this manuscript are now scattered across Europe.⁴⁹ I have collated myself the fragments held in Vatican (6:11–

manuscript not listed and used in my study is sa 158 according to Schüssler's listing. This is an unedited papyrus manuscript in a poor state of preservation, and has preserved text from the following verses: 1 Sam 14:50–52; 15:1–3; 17(?); 28: 19–24; 29:8–11; 30:1. The fragments are kept in the Cambridge University Library, and K. Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:1*, 95) has a detailed list of the references. He also mentions that Sarah J. Clackson has dated this manuscript to the 5th century. Schüssler has given the siglum sa 177^{lit} to a bilingual Odes manuscript that contains the first verse from Song of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1) in Sahidic and in Greek (Schüssler, *Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:1*, 129–30).

43 In his edition, James Drescher marks this manuscript with M, while in Brooke/McLean this manuscript is marked *Cw*. I use Drescher's sigla as index letters, e. g. **Sa^M**.

44 The reference number is M567. See also Leo Depuydt, *Catalogue of Coptic Manuscripts in the Pierpont Morgan Library*. In Schüssler's listing it has the siglum sa 25 (K. Schüssler, *Die koptischen Bibeltexte 1:2*, 29–30). Schüssler states on p. 30, "Es handelt sich um eine unabhängige Übersetzung aus dem Griechischen", without giving any further arguments. This appears very strange to me since such a conclusion needs solid argumentation. There are earlier fragments of Sahidic 1 Sam that clearly have the same Sahidic base text as this complete manuscript. For more information about the Hamuli-manuscripts and their significance, see Stephen Emmel, "The Library of the Monastery of the Archangel Michael at Phantouo (al-Hamuli)".

45 ἀπογ ΔΙΘΚΛ [c. 7] 𐩮𐩣 'year of Diocletianos 609'.

46 This manuscript contains both 1 Samuel and 2 Samuel. The missing verses are 2 Sam 15:20–30 (J. Drescher, *Kingdoms*, xii).

47 I have read the actual manuscript, where the writing is badly damaged. The writing comes through the page to the other side, and occasionally the text is illegible, at least without ultraviolet light.

48 I refer to the list of Drescher in his edition (Drescher, *Kingdoms*, ix–xiii) and provide here only the very basic information on each manuscript. My cordial thanks to prof. Schüssler who provided me with a list of 1 Sam manuscripts with their reference numbers in different collections.

49 In Schüssler's list, this manuscript has the siglum sa 24. K. Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte 1:2*, 20–6) gives the exact details with reference numbers in each library. The same statement that was given with the previous manuscript (**Sa^M**) is iterated here: "Es handelt sich um eine unabhängige Übersetzung aus dem Griechischen; sa 24 und sa 25 scheinen auf dieselbe Vorlage zurückzugehen." What is the independence meant here? Obviously, these two manuscripts have a common source text according to Schüssler.

10:3) and in Vienna (17:31–44).⁵⁰ This manuscript is dated to the 10th–11th century and once resided in the White Monastery.

Sa^B is dated to the 11th–12th century, and contains such remarkable omissions that Gaston Maspero characterized it as a chronicle.⁵¹ Drescher transcribed this manuscript separately in its entirety, and the present study uses his edition.⁵² Additionally, I have collated the fragments held in the Vatican library (17:33–19:5) and Vienna collection (16:2–8, 11–18). This manuscript comes from the White Monastery, and incorporates some Fayyumic features. In addition to 1 Sam (16:2–8, 11–18; 17:33–19:5; 26:7–25; 28:3–25; 31:1–13), the manuscript contains text from Judges and 2 Samuel.

Sa^C, a parchment leaf, preserves the Song of Hannah, verses 2:1–10. The fragment, edited by J. Schleifer, resides in the British Library.⁵³

Sa^D is a bilingual Odes manuscript with a Greek and a Sahidic version of the Song of Hannah (2:1–10). This manuscript is fragmentary, and only the beginnings of the lines are preserved. Walter Till and Peter Sanz edited this manuscript which belongs to the Vienna collection.⁵⁴ I have also collated the manuscript myself.

Sa^{ES},⁵⁵ a papyrus manuscript, is preserved in several small fragments. It is dated to the 7th century based on paleography. Paul Kahle has assembled and edited the following verses: 2:24–30; 3:6–9; 6:14–21; 14:3, 5, 7, 10, 11; 15:13, 15, 17, 19, 20; 21:13–14; 22:1–6; 24:12, 15, 17–20. These fragments

50 The fragment in Vienna collection has been edited by Carl Wessely, *Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts*, 71–2. After Wessely's edition the fragment has been cleaned, and in its present state of preservation there is legible text in several points that Wessely had to reconstruct. The actual readings of the fragment are presented in my section 3.2.4. The Vatican fragment is part of Borgia's collection. For more information about the collection, see Paola Buzi, "Stefano Borgia's Coptic Manuscripts Collection".

51 G. Maspero, *Fragments de la version thébaine*, 159.

52 Drescher, *Kingdoms*, 183–90. Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte 1:2*, 17–19) has assigned the siglum sa 23, and offers the reference numbers in three collections.

53 The reference number is BL Or. 4717(1). This manuscript does not yet have a number in Schüssler's listing. The edition is found in J. Schleifer, *Sahidische Bibel-Fragmente*, 2–5. According to Walter Ewing Crum (*Catalogue of the Coptic manuscripts in the British Museum*, 4) and Schleifer, this leaf contains also the Odes of Moses (Deut 32:30–43) and Habakkuk (Hab 3:1–7). A detailed analysis of Hannah's Song in Sahidic, an article of mine will soon be published, with the title "Sahidic Song of Hannah".

54 Till, W./Sanz, P., *Eine griechisch-koptische Odenhandschrift*, 67–71. In the collections of ÖNB, the reference number is K 8706. The manuscript has the siglum sa 16^{lit} according to Schüssler's list (Schüssler, *Die koptischen Bibeltexte 1:2*, 89). The edition of Till/Sanz reconstructs the missing text based on the manuscript known to them, Sa^C since Sa^M was not yet edited.

55 Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:1*, 37–8) has been able to verify the possibility only mentioned by Drescher (*Kingdoms*, xi) "These fragments are very like those of S and it is not excluded that they all come from one and the same MS." In Schüssler's listing this manuscript has the siglum sa 134.

belong to the collections of the Bodleian Library, Oxford.⁵⁶ I have used Kahle's edition and collated the fragments myself. Former Sa^S, now part of Sa^E adds the following verses to the text of the manuscript: 1:18–2:9; 5:6–11; 7:15–8:3; 8:6, 8, 9; 9:12–19; 12:19–24; 13:2–5, 6,8–9; 22:6–13; 30:3–11. The fragments belong to the collections of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.⁵⁷ These fragments have not been edited, and I have used Drescher's apparatus where he cites all the variants deviating from Sa^M.

Sa^F is a parchment leaf, dated to the 5th–6th centuries. In addition to Kahle's edition,⁵⁸ I have collated this fragment myself from the manuscript. It preserves verses 29:3–9. This fragment is kept in the Bodleian Library.⁵⁹

Sa^G is a White Monastery parchment leaf, edited by Maspero.⁶⁰ This fragment preserves verses 3:8–20 and belongs to the collection of the Bibliothèque nationale, Paris.⁶¹

Sa^H is a parchment leaf of unknown origin and holding institution. Its editor, Oscar von Lemm, informs us that the leaf was offered to the Berlin Museum for purchase and that he used Prof. Schäfer's copy for the edition. This leaf contains verses 8:17–22.⁶² An early dating is proposed, based on the small page size (leaf 10 cm x 8,5 cm, one column, 20 lines, 7 cm x 5,5 cm writing area).⁶³

Sa^I is a fragment of a parchment leaf that belongs to the collections of the British Library and was edited by Schleifer.⁶⁴ A small amount of text from four verses (12:4–5, 10–11) is preserved. A dating to the 4th–5th century has been proposed.⁶⁵ I have used a photo for the collation, and present my collation as an appendix since it differs slightly from Schleifer's edition.

Sa^J is preserved in two parchment leaves, which are kept in the British Library.⁶⁶ I have collated these fragments from a photo. The leaves differ

56 Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 301–11.

57 The reference numbers are listed in Schüssler, *Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:1*, 37–8.

58 Kahle, *Bala'izah*, 312–14. Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:1*, 94) has given the siglum sa 157 to this manuscript, of which only one leaf is known.

59 Its reference number is MS.Copt. e14, d188a, b (P).

60 Maspero, *Fragments de la version thébaine*. In Schüssler's listing (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:2*, 94) this ms has the siglum sa 217^L.

61 The reference number is Copte 1291 fol. 116.

62 Drescher (*Kingdoms*, xi) seems to have a typo since he has used Lemm's edition but gives the beginning of the fragment as 8:16. Schüssler has not yet published his siglum for this leaf.

63 Lemm, *Sahidische Bibelfragmente*, 2.

64 J. Schleifer, *Bruchstücke*, 14–15. In the British Library, the reference number is BL Or. 4916(3). Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:2*, 57) has given the siglum sa 208 to this fragment.

65 Schüssler, *Die koptischen Bibeltexte 2:2*, 57.

66 The reference number is BL Or. 4916(4). Schüssler has not yet published this item in his listing.

notably with regard to their preservation. The one (containing verses 30:21–24) is in a good condition and easily legible, whereas the other (verses 29:5–9) is wrinkled and difficult to read. Schleifer has published the first-mentioned leaf but not the latter. Therefore, I present my own collation as an appendix. There are also some differences between my collation and Schleifer's in verses 30:21–24.

Sa^K has preserved two mutilated parchment leaves with only parts of some lines from verses 14:49–52; 15:1, 2, 21–26, 29, 30. These leaves are kept in Louvain and were edited by L.T. Lefort.⁶⁷

Sa^N is a large parchment fragment of a *katameros* (*Lectionary*), edited by Maspero.⁶⁸ This fragment contains text from verses 12:5–8. It is kept in Paris.⁶⁹

Sa^Q is a *scala*,⁷⁰ dated by colophon to 1296 and 1310. The text contains phrases from 1–2 Sam. This manuscript belongs to the collections of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.⁷¹

Sa^R is also a *scala*, dated 1389. This manuscript contains the same phrases as **Sa^Q**, plus one extra from 2 Sam. This manuscript is also in Paris.⁷²

Sa^S see **Sa^E** above.

Sa^T is an ostrakon that resides in the collection of the British Museum. It contains text from verses 16:4–5.⁷³

Sa^U⁷⁴ is probably the oldest fragment of Sahidic 1 Sam, dated to the 4th century.⁷⁵ The leaf belongs to the collections of the Duke University Library with the reference number P.Duk.inv. 797.⁷⁶ In Schüssler's listing the manuscript has the siglum sa 77. The amount of text is remarkable, verses 14:24–

67 L.T. Lefort, *Les manuscrits coptes de l'université de Louvain*, 49–52. Schüssler has not yet published a siglum for this manuscript.

68 Maspero, *Fragments de la version thébaine*, 155–6.

69 The reference number is B.N. Copte 129¹⁹. Drescher (*Kingdoms*, xii) mentions that he was unable to find the fragment in Paris. Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltex* 2:2, 69–75) has given this ms siglum sa 212^L.

70 A *scala* is a list of Coptic words and their Arabic counterparts. For more information, see the article of Werner Vycichl, "Sullam".

71 The reference number is B.N. Copte 43. Schüssler has not yet published this *scala* in his lists, but he mentions it as a citation in his preliminary listing. The same also applies to the following manuscript, **Sa^R**.

72 The reference number is B.N. Copte 44.

73 Egypt Exploration Fund Ostraca, No 196. This is number 1 in W.E. Crum, *Coptic Ostraca*. In Schüssler's listing this item has the siglum sa O 053.

74 This is the first fragment in my list that was not known to Drescher and, therefore, was not used in his edition. The same is true for the **Sa^{U-Z}**. The sigla continue from Drescher's last witness, T, in alphabetical order.

75 F. Feder ("Koptische Übersetzung", 69) lists the manuscripts that he dates to the 4th century, and this is one of them.

76 Formerly, P.Rob.inv. C. 1.

46. I have collated this papyrus manuscript from a photo and include my own collation as an appendix. In a few passages, my deciphering differs from that of Aaron Michael Butts's edition.⁷⁷

Sa^V was published by Gerald Browne and Lucia Papini and dated to the 6th century by its editors.⁷⁸ Two parchment leaves preserve verses 7:8–8:1 and 9:21–10:2. The manuscript belongs to the collection of the Istituto papirologico G. Vitelli, Florence.⁷⁹ I have collated the fragment in a photo, and the edition is accurate.

Sa^W refers to the parchment fragment P.Strasbourg copte 546 which contains verses 2:35–36, 3:6(?), 4:3 and 4:9. It belongs to the collections of BNU (Bibliothèque nationale et universitaire de Strasbourg) and was edited by Anne Boud'hors. The editor proposes a dating to the 5th–6th-centuries.⁸⁰

Sa^X is the siglum for the fragment P. Strasbourg copte 319, containing verses 27:8–9 and 28:3b–5. The fragment belongs to the collections of BNU and was edited by Boud'hors.⁸¹

Sa^Y belongs to the collections of Cambridge's Corpus Christi College and it is not yet published.⁸² It contains text from 1 Sam 15:12 and I have collated it from a photograph. My collation is found as an appendix.

Sa^Z is kept in Manchester within the John Rylands Library. It offers text from verse 1 Sam 3:6 and I have used a photograph since these fragments are not published. These tiny fragments have not featured in the current study because of their small size and broken nature. With some reconstructive work, perhaps they might yield a small amount of text.

Bohairic fragments of some parts of 1 Sam are also known: 2:1–10; 16:1–13; 17:17–54; 18:6–9; 23:26–28; 24:1–23. I use the siglum **Bo^A** for these fragments published by Paul de Lagarde.⁸³ An unpublished Psalms and Odes manuscript *Barberiniani Orientali 2* contains four versions of the Song of Hannah (verses 2:1–10) in four parallel columns, the Bohairic, Arabic,

77 Butts, "P.Duk.inv. 797".

78 Browne, G.M./Papini, L., "Frammenti in copto dei Libri dei Re". Drescher did not know about this fragment.

79 The reference number is PSI Inv.16 C. Schüssler (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte* 2:2, 57) has given the siglum sa 208 to this manuscript.

80 A. Boud'hors, *Catalogue des fragments coptes*, 21–3. Schüssler has given the siglum sa 206 to this ms (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte* 2:2, 54–5). This was not known to Drescher.

81 Boud'hors, *Catalogue des fragments coptes*, 24–5. In Schüssler's listing, this ms has the siglum sa 210 (*Die koptischen Bibeltexte* 2:2, 59). Drescher did not know about this fragment. Boud'hors has not given a dating to this manuscript in her edition, but in personal correspondence she proposed a dating to the 6th century.

82 The reference number is CCC Ms 541 no. 38.

83 P. de Lagarde, "Bruchstücke der koptischen Übersetzung", 63–72.

Ethiopic and Syriac.⁸⁴ The siglum **Bo^B** refers to this fragment. One *tiny fragment in Fayyumic* survives, Oxford, Ms.Copt.e.162(P), containing text from 25:31–34.

I have taken into account those manuscripts that are direct witnesses to the Coptic biblical text. Therefore, citations in the Coptic literature are excluded. This is because of the complications that come with these indirect witnesses: before using a citation as a witness for the biblical text, one has to know the textual character of the citation. It can be a word-for-word citation from some biblical manuscript or quoted from memory, a reformulated citation, an allusion or anything between these ends.⁸⁵

Below, the list outlines the preservation of 1 Sam in the Sahidic manuscripts discussed here. The complete manuscript *Sa^M* is present in every verse, and the list thus presents the additional manuscripts in those verses where *Sa^M* is not the sole witness.

| Ch. | Verses | Mss | Ch. | Verses | Mss |
|-----|--------|-------|-----|--------|-------|
| 1 | 18–28 | S | 6 | 2–13 | A |
| 2 | 1 | C D S | 6 | 14–21 | A E |
| 2 | 2 | C S | 7 | 1–7 | A |
| 2 | 3–4 | C D S | 7 | 8–14 | A V |
| 2 | 5–7 | C S | 7 | 15–17 | A S V |
| 2 | 8 | C D S | 8 | 1 | A S V |
| 2 | 9 | C D S | 8 | 2–3 | A S |
| 2 | 10 | C D | 8 | 4–5 | A |
| 2 | 13 | Q R | 8 | 6 | A S |
| 2 | 18–19 | Q R | 8 | 7 | A |
| 2 | 24–30 | E | 8 | 8–9 | A S |
| 2 | 35–36 | W | 8 | 10–16 | A |
| 3 | 6 | E W Z | 8 | 17–22 | A H |
| 3 | 7 | E | 9 | 1–11 | A |
| 3 | 8–9 | E G | 9 | 12–19 | A S |
| 3 | 10–20 | G | 9 | 20 | A |
| 4 | 3 | W | 9 | 21–27 | A V |
| 4 | 9 | W | 10 | 1–2 | A V |
| 4 | 13 | Q R | 10 | 3 | A |
| 5 | 4 | Q R | 12 | 4 | I |
| 5 | 6–11 | S | 12 | 5 | I N |

84 In other parts of this manuscripts, there is also an Armenian column. For an introduction to this manuscript, see D.V. Proverbio, “BARB.OR. 2 (Psalterium Pentaglottum)”. A detailed analysis of mine of the Bohairic Hannah’s Song in this and other manuscripts will be published soon with the title “Bohairic Column in Barberiniani Orientali and other Bohairic manuscripts”.

85 The problems with Coptic citations are basically the same as in the case of patristic evidence in other languages, see Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel*, 26–8.

| Ch. | Verses | Mss | Ch. | Verses | Mss |
|-----|--------|-------|-----|------------|---------|
| 12 | 6–8 | N | 19 | 6–24 | A |
| 12 | 10–11 | I | 20 | 1–18 | A |
| 12 | 19–24 | S | 20 | 19 | A Q R |
| 13 | 2–4 | S | 20 | 20–43 | A |
| 13 | 6 | S | 21 | 1–12 | A |
| 13 | 8 | S | 21 | 13 | A Q R |
| 14 | 3 | E | 21 | 14–15 (16) | A |
| 14 | 5 | E | 22 | 1–4 | A |
| 14 | 7 | E | 22 | 5 | A Q R |
| 14 | 10–11 | E | 22 | 6–7 | A S |
| 14 | 14 | Q R | 22 | 8–13 | S |
| 14 | 17–23 | A | 22 | 21–23 | A |
| 14 | 24–32 | A U | 23 | 1–14 | A |
| 14 | 33–46 | U | 24 | 21–23 | A |
| 14 | 49–50 | K | 25 | 1–16 | A |
| 14 | 51–52 | K | 25 | 17 | A Q R |
| 15 | 1–2 | K | 25 | 18–28 | A |
| 15 | 12 | Y | 26 | 4 | Q R |
| 15 | 13 | E | 26 | 7 | B Q R |
| 15 | 15 | E | 26 | 8–19 | B |
| 15 | 17 | E | 26 | 20 | B Q R |
| 15 | 19–20 | E | 26 | 21–25 | B |
| 15 | 21–26 | K | 27 | 8 | Q R X |
| 15 | 29–30 | K | 27 | 9 | X |
| 16 | 2–3 | B | 28 | 2 | Q R |
| 16 | 4–5 | B T | 28 | 3 | B Q R X |
| 16 | 6–8 | B | 28 | 4–5 | B X |
| 16 | 11 | B | 28 | 6–15 | B |
| 16 | 12 | B Q R | 28 | 16–25 | A B |
| 16 | 13–18 | B | 29 | 1–2 | A |
| 17 | 5–7 | Q R | 29 | 3–4 | A F |
| 17 | 18 | Q R | 29 | 5–9 | A F J |
| 17 | 31–32 | A | 29 | 10–11 | A |
| 17 | 33–44 | A B | 30 | 1–2 | A |
| 17 | 45–48 | B | 30 | 2–11 | A S |
| 17 | 49 | B Q R | 30 | 12 | A Q R |
| 17 | 50 | B | 30 | 13–20 | A |
| 17 | 51 | B Q R | 30 | 21 | A J |
| 17 | 52–54 | B | 30 | 25–31 | A |
| 18 | 6–27 | B | 31 | 1–2 | A B |
| 18 | 28–29 | A B | 31 | 3 | A B Q R |
| 19 | 1–5 | A B | 31 | 4–13 | A B |

1.4. Sahidic 1 Samuel and its research history

Only a few studies have examined the nature of Sahidic 1 Sam and its *Vorlage*. In these studies, the questions have primarily addressed the Greek source text behind the Sahidic text. Likewise, these studies have considered the affiliation of the *Vorlage* of Sahidic 1 Sam to the extant Greek manuscripts. Dieu published the article “Le texte copte sahidique des livres de Samuel” in 1946.⁸⁶ For this article, he had compared Rahlfs’ Greek text and the text of the Sahidic manuscript Sa^M in verses 17:11–19:1, a passage in which the Septuagint is considerably shorter than the MT. He concluded that the *Vorlage* of the Sahidic translator lacked Hexaplaric and Lucianic additions. This is, according to Dieu, the best way to explain the omission of verses 17:55–18:6 and the absence of many Lucianic variants. Later on, however, a scribe probably compared the Coptic text with the Greek text of his time and added some details here and there.⁸⁷

Payne wrote his dissertation *Critical and comparative study of the Sahidic Coptic texts of the First book of Samuel* at Princeton in 1949. His study remains unpublished aside from a short derivative article from 1953.⁸⁸ In his work, Payne begins with manuscripts Sa^M and Sa^A, and finds almost 1500 variations between these manuscripts. After excluding the variations that he considered unreliable for textual criticism, 670 variations, in his opinion, could be attributed to the Greek texts. These variations he classified as follows: A) 383 instances where Sa^M is closer to the unanimous testimony of the Greek evidence,⁸⁹ B) 150 instances where Sa^A is closer to this Greek evidence,⁹⁰ C) 137 instances where one is closer to one group within the Greek and the other is closer to another Greek group.⁹¹ As objective as the numbers might appear, Payne’s conclusions are not convincing because his argumentation lacks a sound methodology. Mostly, his work consists of lists in which he provides different kinds of examples without evaluating their importance.⁹²

The most problematic issue in Payne’s work is the simplistic way in which he uses the text-critical principle *lectio difficilior*.⁹³ This principle

86 Previously, Dieu had already written a more general article “Les Manuscrits Grecs des Livres de Samuel” on the Sahidic 1 Sam.

87 L. Dieu, “Le texte copte sahidique”, 452.

88 J.B. Payne, “The Sahidic Coptic Text of I Samuel”. Thanks to Prof. Sebastian Brock’s personal archive, I have been able to use a microfilm copy of Payne’s dissertation.

89 Payne, *Critical and comparative*, 82–90.

90 Payne, *Critical and comparative*, 90–6.

91 Payne, *Critical and comparative*, 265–6.

92 The assessment of Payne above is not unique, as the same problem also occurs elsewhere. See the critical comment of Kauhanen concerning a comparable Princeton thesis on the Latin version of 1 Sam, Kauhanen, *The Proto-Lucianic Problem*, 131–2.

93 According to this rule, in the case of variants the priority should be given to the more difficult reading since texts are prone to simplification in the process of transmission.