CHAPTER NINETEEN

THE TEXTUAL AFFILIATIONS OF 4QSAM^A

The importance of Samuel scrolls from cave 4 has been recognized since the first articles by F.M. Cross, in which two columns of 4QSam^a and seven fragments of 4QSam^b have been published,[1] and in their wake many additional studies have written (see Dogniez, *Bibliography*). In these studies, the Samuel scrolls have often been described as 'Septuagintal,' and the textual analysis of these scrolls has entailed several textual theories. These theories were not limited to a description of the main textual witnesses of Samuel (MT, LXX, and the scrolls from cave 4), but they integrated the data in the description of the relationship between the textual witnesses of the Bible as a whole, and also in the reconstruction of its textual history. Because of the great importance which is assigned to the Samuel scrolls, a major study of 4QSam^a is reviewed here: E.Ch. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula, MT 1978).

The title of the book under review does not reflect its contents well. The book is not limited to a discussion of the relationship between the Samuel scrolls and Josephus, but contains a full-scale analysis of the textual affinities of 4QSam^a. This textual analysis consists of a detailed discussion of the relationship between 4QSam^a and the main stream of the LXX (chapters II, IV), LXX^{Luc} (chapter III), the MT of Chronicles (chapter V), and Josephus' biblical text (chapters VI–VIII). The message of the book derives from an analysis of a few hundred segments of text.

This analysis makes the book attractive, because these unpublished readings of 4QSam^a, often sections of two or three lines, add much to our knowledge of this scroll. At the same time, however, the fragmentary 'publication' makes the evaluation of the discussion problematical. Although there is *a priori* no reason to doubt the correctness of the

---

[1] "A New Qumran Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," *BASOR* 132 (1953) 15–26 (4QSam^a); "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran," *JBL* 74 (1955) 147–172 (4QSam^b). Henceforth: Cross, 1953, and Cross, 1955. Some readings of the Samuel scrolls have been incorporated into the textual notes to *The New American Bible (*New York / London 1970), also published separately as *Textual Notes on the New American Bible* (Paterson, N.J. , n.d.), and further in *BHS*.

author's decisions with regard to his readings, his calculation of spaces (which are often crucial to the discussion), and his joining of the fragments, one has to rely on Ulrich's judgment. At times, this situation leads to some dissatisfaction, as the author's text-critical analysis of 4QSamᵃ and the LXX is often based on palaeographical considerations which cannot be evaluated. The very existence of a certain reading in 4QSamᵃ is often assumed on the basis of a single letter and, when that letter is dubious, it would be helpful if the reader were able to consult the photographs. For example, does 4QSamᵃ in 1 Sam 2:22 read יע[שום (Cross, 1953) or עו]שִׂ֯ם (Ulrich, 73; LXX: ἐποίουν, MT: יַעֲשׂוּ֑ן)? Does 4QSamᵃ in 2 Sam 3:8 read א̇ו̇בנר or ה̇ן̇ראש? This uncertainty refers also to readings which are not analyzed in the book because they do not fit into any of the patterns discussed. For example, does the exclusion from the book of דע ◦[in 1 Sam 2:3 indicate that the author read דעות = MT (unlike Cross, 1953: דעתן), or that this instance was considered irrelevant because of the difficulty in evaluating the LXX (γνώσεως)?

A second problem in the evaluation of the data discussed relates to the author's approach to the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX. The main interest of this book is the relationship between 4QSamᵃ and the LXX, and for this purpose the *Vorlage* of the LXX needs to be reconstructed. After all, the text-critical analysis is based on Hebrew readings common to the scrolls and the *Vorlage* of the LXX, and does not concern their common exegesis. For this purpose, the author has reconstructed a few hundred Hebrew words in the *Vorlage* of the LXX, which are compared with 4QSamᵃ. It would have been in order if the author had outlined his view concerning retroverting in general and the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Samuel in particular. The main requisite for such a reconstruction is one's understanding of the translation technique of the unit under investigation. There is obviously a difference in this regard between the different sections of Samuel, since one of its sections contains a literal translation (2 Samuel 10—1 Kings 2:11, ascribed to *kaige*-Th), while the other sections, the OG, are neither very literal nor very free. The author has not, however, indicated whether these differences in translation character affect his approach to the reconstruction of their *Vorlagen*. Thus, are we entitled to retrovert ἐν κυρίῳ ... ἐν θεῷ μου in 1 Sam 2:1 as בה' ... באלהי (against MT בה' ... בה' = 4QSamᵃ בי]הוה ... בין[הו]ה) or should we ascribe the use of two different Greek words to the translator's wish to vary the rendering of identical words in the same context? Likewise, does ἦν λειτουργῶν in 1 Sam 2:18 reflect היה משרת (as in v. 11 MT and LXX), or only משרת, as in MT of v. 18?

Note also the difficulty in evaluating γνώσεως for MT דעות (1 Sam 2:3), mentioned above.

The reader also needs some guidance with regard to the orthography of the reconstructed *Vorlage* which is represented by Ulrich sometimes as the orthography of MT and at other times as that of 4QSam^a (e.g., שלומה on p. 45 and דויד *passim*). Likewise, how can one decide on such *minutiae* as the *Vorlage* of ἐγώ ... ἐγώ ... ἐγώ in 2 Sam 2:23-24 as אני ... אני ... אני instead of אנכי ... אנכי ... אנכי in MT and אֹני ... אֹנכי ... אֹני in 4QSam^a? Furthermore, one notes that in chapter V the lacunae in 4QSam^a are reconstructed on the basis of the MT of Chronicles, while in the other chapters such lacunae are reconstructed on the basis of the LXX of Samuel. On the whole, the lacunae in 4QSam^a are more frequently filled with words retroverted from the LXX than with parallel elements in MT. Although the close relationship between 4QSam^a and the LXX cannot be denied, it would have been better to give as few as possible reconstructions for the lacunae in 4QSam^a. Reconstructions should be limited to those instances in which one wants to show that either MT or the reconstructed *Vorlage* of the LXX fits into a certain lacuna and thus justifies the reconstruction of the whole line. Despite the positive evidence for the close relationship between 4QSam^a and the LXX, the two sources provide independent texts (see below). 4QSam^a should not be reconstructed or supplemented as if it were the Hebrew text from which the LXX was translated.

These methodological problems occasionally affect the validity of the argument. But while the retroversions from LXX^{Luc} are often problematical, those from the LXX are less so. Retroversions of elements in the *kaige*-Th section are, as a rule, reliable, and this refers also to most of the retroversions in the non-*kaige* sections mentioned by Ulrich. Furthermore, the reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the LXX of Samuel has been made easier through the finding of the Qumran scrolls themselves (see Tov, "Qumran"*, section 1 and *TCU*, 78–81). The central themes of the book are summarized as following on p. 15:

> 'The problem with which we are dealing falls basically under three headings: Qumran, proto-Lucian and Josephus. We are interested to know: (1) What new does the major Samuel scroll from Qumran tell us about the ancient form of the text from Samuel? What are its kindred text forms (e.g OG, pL, OL, C, J)? (2) What can we establish concerning the *early* stratum of L? Since a 4Q texttype in Hebrew would have been unavailable to Lucian, what can 4Q tell us about the proto-Lucian text which formed the basis of the Lucianic recension?

(3) Can it be known which type of Samuel text J used? In which language?'

The working hypothesis of this monograph is introduced on pp. 4–6: (1) The 'LXX' of Samuel is heterogeneous since the manuscripts of the 'LXX' in 2 Samuel 10—1 Kings 2:11 contain *kaige*-Th, while the remainder of the book reflects the OG. (2) LXX[Luc] in Samuel is composed of 'at least two strata'—a late stratum, designated L$_2$, dating from the time of the historical Lucian, and an earlier, proto-Lucianic, stratum.

The main focus of the book is the relationship between 4QSam^a and the LXX. On the basis of the consensus in modern scholarship the author takes into consideration the possibility that 4QSam^a relates differently towards the *kaige*-Th and the non-*kaige* sections. Two refinements in the presentation facilitate the evaluation of the evidence: the agreements are divided into pluses, minuses, and variants. Furthermore, a distinction is made between significant and less significant examples, because often the nature of the examples is more significant than their number.

Among the striking agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX one notes particularly pluses in 1 Sam 1:11 (based on considerations of space in 4QSam^a), 1 Sam 2:23, and 2 Sam 8:7-8. Of the significant minuses of 4QSam^a and the LXX, special mention should be made of 1 Sam 2:22 and 1 Sam 2:32a. Significant common variants may be exemplified by

1 Sam 1:24 4QSam^a בפר בן בקר משלש, LXX: ἐν μόσχῳ τριετίζοντι = (MT: בפרים שלשה) בפר משלש

1 Sam 2:29 4QSam^a להבריך מראש (apparently also underlying the LXX; see Ulrich), against MT להבריאכם מראשית

2 Sam 7:23 4QSam^a ואהלים = LXX καὶ σκηνώματα against MT ואלהיו.

The large number of agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX leaves no doubt regarding the close relationship between the two sources. This fact is significant not only for for the evaluation of 4QSam^a, but also for the text-critical use of the LXX in general and the book of Samuel in particular. The importance ascribed to this translation by Wellhausen, *Samuel* and Driver, *Samuel,* merely on the basis of intuition and insight, is now supported by factual evidence.

Ulrich makes one further step. There are 124 instances of the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX ≠ MT in the non-*kaige* section as against twenty such examples in the *kaige*-Th section. Although the precise details of the statistics are open to modification (see below), the relationship of the LXX to 4QSam^a differs from one section to the other. Taking into consideration that the preserved fragments of 4QSam^a in the non-*kaige* section contain twice as many verses as in the *kaige*-Th section, 4QSam^a agrees three times more with the LXX in the non-*kaige* section than in the

kaige-Th section. These data provide helpful support for the theory that the *kaige*-Th section contains a revised Greek text. Presumably the close agreement between 4QSam^a and the LXX was kept intact only in the non-*kaige* section which reflects the OG translation, but disappeared in the *kaige*-Th section because it has been revised towards MT.

Chapter III deals with the relationship between 4QSam^a and LXX^{Luc}. The discussion is limited to agreements between the two texts, belonging mainly to the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^{Luc} ≠ LXX, but also 4QSam^a = LXX^{Luc} MT ≠ LXX. The evidence is not as monumental as for the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX (chapter II), but some important agreements between 4QSam^a and LXX^{Luc} must be taken into consideration in the evaluation of these sources. The agreement between 4QSam^a נתה and LXX^{Luc} τοὺς Γεθθαίους in 1 Sam 5:9 (MT אתו = LXX αὐτήν) may serve as an example.

As for the background of this analysis, the discussion of the Lucianic problem has taken an important place ever since the pioneering work by A. Rahlfs (for details, see Tov, "Lucian"*). Ulrich's analysis should be promising because he had access to all the material of 4QSam^a, whose close connections with LXX^{Luc} has not been investigated in full.

Ulrich makes a distinction between agreements between 4QSam^a and LXX^{Luc} in the *kaige*-Th section and in the non-*kaige* section. In the non-*kaige* section eight items belong to the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^{Luc} ≠ LXX MT, while in the *kaige* section there are 27 such examples. Taking into consideration that there is twice as much evidence available for 4QSam^a in the non-*kaige* section as in the *kaige*-Th section, the agree-ment between 4QSam^a and LXX^{Luc} is seven times larger in the *kaige*-Th section than in the non-*kaige* section. This evidence supports the assumption of a distinction between *kaige*-Th and non-*kaige*. Further-more, the new evidence provides independent proof for another assumption which, in some way or other, has been accepted by modern scholarship: in that section in which the manuscripts of the 'LXX' reflect *kaige*-Th, the OG has not been lost, but rather is somehow reflected in the substratum of LXX^{Luc}. If the text of LXX^{Luc} agrees seven times more with 4QSam^a in the *kaige*-Th section than in the non-*kaige* section and if, furthermore, the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX has been established firmly in the non-*kaige* section (chapter II), the two conclusions can now be combined with reference to the whole book of Samuel: the agreement of 4QSam^a and the LXX in the non-*kaige* section points to the OG translation and the agreement between 4QSam^a and LXX^{Luc} in the *kaige*-Th section apparently also refers to the OG translation. Thus, throughout Samuel, 4QSam^a agrees with the OG, even though this agreement has been obscured by the vicissitudes of the transmission of the LXX. The fact that

the agreement between 4QSam^a and LXX^Luc in the *kaige*-Th section is not as extensive as between 4QSam^a and the LXX in the non-*kaige* section must be ascribed to the influence of the changes towards MT in LXX^Luc by the historical Lucian.

The following remarks should be added to this analysis:

a. When the agreements of 4QSam^a with LXX^Luc are set against those of 4QSam^a with the LXX, the examples of the former group are not convincing. The relatively small amount of agreement between 4QSam^a and LXX^Luc must probably be ascribed to the changes inserted by the historical Lucian. Whatever the reason, the agreements between 4QSam^a and LXX^Luc are not monumental. One should further take into consideration that Ulrich focused on the agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX, while the disagreements between the two have been disregarded (unlike the disagreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX discussed in chapter IV). When these disagreements are taken into account, the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^Luc is even weaker than it appears now. In principle, agreements of the pattern 4QSam^a = La, and/or Josephus could strengthen the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^Luc, since all sources involved may reflect the OG, but at the present stage of research, such procedure should be considered a *petitio principii.*

b. It has been suggested by Cross, "Biblical Text" that the substratum of LXX^Luc contains an inner Greek revision towards a Hebrew text like 4QSam^a. Ulrich supports this assumption by the eight examples of the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^Luc ≠ LXX MT in the non-*kaige* section. However, these few examples may also indicate that the OG basis of LXX^Luc in the non-*kaige* section differed slightly from the LXX in that section, which presumably also contains the OG, or rather, *an* OG translation. Alternatively, the LXX has been revised in these instances (and elsewhere?) towards MT. In any event, the evidence does not prove that proto-Lucian contained a revision.

c. The twenty examples of the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX ≠ MT in the *kaige*-Th section apparently belonged to the OG substratum of the Greek translation (pp. 92–93). These items can be combined with the 27 examples of the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^Luc ≠ LXX MT in the same section because these, too, reflect the OG. On the basis of these assumptions there are thus 47 agreements between 4QSam^a and the OG in the *kaige* section. This is an important datum, because these 47 examples can be compared with the 124 items of agreement belonging to the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX ≠ MT in the non-*kaige* section (see above). Taking into account that the preserved verses of 4QSam^a in the non-*kaige* section are twice as numerous as in the *kaige*-Th section, one notes that the

agreement between 4QSam^a and the OG refers to 94 items (2 x 47) in the *kaige* section, and to 124 items in the non-*kaige* section. Therefore the agreement of 4QSam^a and the OG translation is more or less equal in both sections of Samuel, a fact which corroborates the very assumptions which have been mentioned above. This calculation has not been made by Ulrich, probably because he considers the substratum of LXX^{Luc} as reflecting a proto-Lucianic *revision* rather than the OG.

At this stage in the book the close agreement between 4QSam^a and the OG has been substantiated (in Ulrich's words '... that the Greek version was originally translated from a Hebrew text much closer to 4QSam^a than to M' [p. 119]). The next chapter (IV) is devoted to evidence contradicting this theory. This evidence, belonging to the pattern 4QSam^a ≠ LXX, is subdivided into four categories: 4QSam^a = MT + LXX; 4QSam^a ≠ MT ≠ LXX; 4QSam^a ≠ MT LXX; 4QSam^a = MT ≠ LXX. Expressing the relationship between different sources by way of statistics is even more difficult in this chapter than elsewhere. For some of the examples refer to complete sections differing in two or three witnesses such as 1 Sam 2:13-16, while other examples refer to isolated disagreements. There are four items of the pattern 4QSam^a = MT + LXX, but these examples actually belong to the pattern 4QSam^a ≠ LXX ≠ MT. Furthermore, there are four examples of composite differences of the type 4QSam^a ≠ LXX ≠ MT as well as 19 simple disagreements of this type. There are also 23 items of the type 4QSam^a ≠ MT LXX and 18 items of the type 4QSam^a = MT ≠ LXX. Altogether, this chapter contains 68 examples of disagreement between 4QSam^a and the LXX, of which several are composite. To this number we may add the 8 items of disagreement between 4QSam^a and LXX^{Luc} in the *kaige* section.

However, most of these 76 disagreements are toned down by the author, who describes them as secondary (error, omission, doublet), and hence irrelevant. Thus, of the 76 items of the pattern 4QSam^a ≠ LXX, the author accepts only 24 as valid. Ulrich then contrasts these 24 disagreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX with the 183 items of agreement between 4QSam^a and the OG (the combined evidence of chapters II and III referring to both the LXX and LXX^{Luc}), concluding that the differences between 4QSam^a and the LXX can be disregarded. There are differences, but the agreement between 4QSam^a and the LXX is many times more convincing, concludes Ulrich.

Chapter V deals with 'the agreement of 4QSam^a with Chronicles' against the MT of Samuel. Some examples of this pattern have been

noticed earlier by Cross, "Biblical Text," and Lemke.[2] The best examples belong to the pattern 4QSam^a = Chronicles ≠ MT LXX, especially in long pluses in 2 Sam 10:6-7 and 24:16. Ulrich also provides a long list of minor agreements between 4QSam^a , Chronicles and the LXX of Samuel against the MT of Samuel. However the latter examples can also be explained on the basis of the known pattern 4QSam^a = LXX. The author concludes that 4QSam^a and the MT of Chronicles reflect the same Palestinian text which is distinct from the MT of Samuel. Accordingly, one should not automatically ascribe the differences between the MT of Samuel and Chronicles to the Chronicler's editorial activities, but apparently the Chronicler often used a Hebrew text that differed from the MT of Samuel. This analysis illustrates just one aspect of the relationship between 4QSam^a and the Chronicler, viz. their agreements, disregarding disagreements between the two. These disagreements cannot be evaluated easily because they may have originated not only from differences between 4QSam^a and the Chronicler's *Vorlage*, but also from the Chronicler's manipulations.

The author has shown that 4QSam^a is joined not only by the LXX and LXX^{Luc}, but also by the MT of Chronicles, and that their combined readings often disagree with the MT of Samuel. This group is now joined by a witness of different nature, viz. Josephus' biblical text. The most significant examples of the pattern 4QSam^a = Jos. consist of a few exclusive agreements between these two sources. E. g., the plus in 1 Sam 1:22 ונת[תי]הו נזיר עד עולם (about Samuel, cf. Ant. V, 347). Likewise, before the beginning of the story in 1 Sam 11:1, both 4QSam^a and Ant. VI, 68–69 add a large section (see Ulrich and subsequently F.M. Cross [3]).

Except for the exclusive agreements of 4QSam^a and Josephus, Ulrich mentions long lists of other agreements (Jos. = 4QSam^a LXX ≠ MT; Jos. = 4QSam^a LXX^{Luc} ≠ MT LXX; Jos. = 4QSam^a Chronicles ≠ MT LXX; Jos. = 4QSam^a MT LXX^{Luc} La ≠ LXX).

Ulrich also mentions other examples for the same sources, but this time when disagreeing with Josephus. Of particular interest is a group of disagreements between 4QSam^a and Josephus, when the latter is based on a Greek rather than Hebrew source. For example, in Josephus' quotation of 2 Sam 10:6, he speaks about 'Σύρος, the King of the Mesopotamians.' This text must have been based on a Greek reading like LXX^{Luc} (τòν Σύρον), which has been misunderstood as the name of a person rather than a country (MT ארם).

---

[2] W.E Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," *HThR* 58 (1965) 349–363. The conclusions of neither Cross nor Lemke are mentioned by Ulrich.

[3] For details, see *TCHB*, 342–344.

Summarizing both sections of this chapter, Ulrich concedes that Josephus must have used a Greek text of Samuel which was 'strikingly close to 4QSamᵃ, but ... that text was in the Greek language, closely connected with OG\protoLucian and clearly distant from both M and the *kaige* and hexaplaric recensions' (p. 191).

Since Ulrich's conclusions on Josephus' biblical text have implications for other topics, the last chapter (VIII), deals with 'Josephus and his *Vorlage*..' The author suggests that Josephus used a Greek rather than a Hebrew text as the basis for his paraphrase of the history of the biblical period. This assertion is based on an analysis of statements in Ant. I, 5 and Ap. I, 54; I, 1. On the empirical level this assumption is based on detailed analysis of Josephus' paraphrase of 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 11 in Ant. VII, 78–89. The Greek texts are presented in parallel columns, while the degree of closeness between Josephus and the Greek texts (LXX and LXX^Luc) of Samuel and Chronicles is rated from 1-4 (rate 4 refers to the clearest evidence of Josephus' reliance upon an existing Greek text). The two most telling examples are 2 Sam 6:8 פרץ עזא - διακοπὴ Ὀζα = Ant. VII, 82 Ὀζᾶ διακοπή; 2 Sam 6:19 אחד ואשישה אחת ואשפר לחם אחת חלת - κολλυρίδα ἄρτου καὶ ἐσχαρίτην καὶ λάγανον ἀπὸ τηγάνου = Ant. VII, 86 κολλυρίδα ἄρτου και ἐσχαρίτην καὶ λάγανον τηγανιστόν. The Greek renderings are very rare in the LXX, and, likewise, the words themselves are very rare (or *hapax legomena*) within the Greek language, so that Josephus must have relied on the wording of this passage in the LXX.

Ulrich also examines evidence which is contrary to his main contention in this chapter, viz. evidence showing that Josephus' biblical text is based on a Semitic *Vorlage*. Few positive arguments in favor of this assumption can be sustained, so that we are left with the conclusion that Josephus used a Greek text .

Chapter VII ('Quantitative analysis of 2 Samuel 6') provides a pilot study of one chapter, analyzing Josephus' biblical text in a running passage rather than isolated verses. The following conclusions are reached:

a. Of the three Hebrew texts, 4QSamᵃ is the best one, followed by Chronicles. The MT of Samuel is a 'poorly preserved text' (p. 197).

b. The Greek translation of this chapter, though included in the OG section, presents evidence of revisional activity ('a later translator or the *kaige* recension'). The evidence for this assertion is not convincing, since the phenomena analyzed in this section were probably caused by the vicissitudes of the textual transmission. Furthermore, the theory suggested here is not a necessary link in Ulrich's chain of arguments.

c. 4QSam^a agrees in eleven instances with the MT of Samuel against the MT of Chronicles, but it also agrees in thirteen instances with Chronicles against the MT of Samuel, and in eight instances it presents independent evidence.

d. Ulrich discards the possibility that 4QSam^a has been corrected on the basis of Chronicles. The two texts are closely related, but they also reflect independent developments occurring after the split of the two texts from their common ancestor. In any event, the small differences in details between the readings of the pattern 4QSam^a = Chronicles ≠ Samuel (MT) preclude the assumption that 4QSam^a was corrected on the basis of Chronicles. This possibility seems unlikely also because of the frequently occurring pattern 4QSam^a = Chronicles = LXX Samuel ≠ MT Samuel.

The greater part of the author's conclusions on pp. 257–259 is devoted to an analysis of proto-Lucian. However, in the book itself this issue is not covered at length, and when it is discussed it forms part of the overall discussion of 4QSam^a's relationship to the Greek version of Samuel. The main conclusions are:

a. 4QSam^a agrees significantly with the LXX of Samuel against MT.

b. Barthe lemy's theory with regard to the revision of the LXX of 2 Sam 10:1—1 Kgs 2:11 by *kaige*-Th is supported by the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX ≠ MT which occurs much more frequently in the OG section of Samuel than in the *kaige*-Th section, where the original agreements with 4QSam^a had been removed by *kaige*-Th.

c. The agreements of the type 4QSam^a = LXX^{Luc} ≠ LXX MT are not as monumental as with regard to the LXX.

d. The different ratio of agreement between 4QSam^a and LXX^{Luc} (in the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^{Luc} ≠ LXX MT) in the different sections (seven times more in the *kaige*-Th section than in the non-*kaige* section) leads to the same distinction between *kaige*-Th and non-*kaige* as referred to in conclusion b. Furthermore, the proto-Lucianic stratum of LXX^{Luc} agrees with 4QSam^a in the *kaige*-Th section, because in that section proto-Lucian reflects the OG.

e. Eight examples belonging to the pattern 4QSam^a = LXX^{Luc} ≠ LXX MT in the non-*kaige* section support the assumption that the substratum of LXX^{Luc} contained a proto-Lucianic revision towards a Hebrew text like 4QSam^a.

f. In view of the 183 agreements between 4QSam^a and the OG (LXX and LXX^{Luc}), the disagreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX (76, reduced by Ulrich to 24) may be disregarded.

g. Significant data belong to the pattern 4QSam^a = Chronicles ≠ LXX MT (both of Samuel). Late influence of Chronicles on 4QSam^a is excluded.

h. Josephus' biblical text is based on a Greek rather than a Hebrew text. This text is close to the text of 4QSam^a and Chronicles, and the LXX, LXX^{Luc}, and Old Latin versions of Samuel, and differs from the MT of that book.

i. The MT of Samuel is often corrupt, and differs from the 'Palestinian' Hebrew text of 4QSam^a and Chronicles. This Palestinian text formed the basis of the translations of the LXX, LXX^{Luc}, and La, as well as for Josephus' paraphrase.

Some reactions:

a. The relationship between the sources is determined on the basis of statistics, but a refined methodology would have been in order. Thus, Ulrich's statistics do not distinguish between significant and insignificant agreements, nor between simple agreements, such as the addition or admission of a small element, and composite agreements involving complete verses.

b. In the evaluation of the agreement between 4QSam^a and the LXX, their disagreements should be taken into consideration as well.

c. Readings of 4QSam^a and the LXX which reflect a presumably original text, as opposed to a presumed corruption in MT should be disregarded, or be given special status (e.g., corrupt readings in 1 Sam 1:24, 24; 2:22; 2 Sam 13:21, 22:39; 24:17). At the same time, common corruptions of 4QSam^a and the LXX should be included in the analysis (such as the doublet in 1 Sam 2:23-24 and the readings in 1 Sam 10:27—11:1 and in 2 Sam 7:23).

d. Agreements between 4QSam^a and the LXX (as opposed to corrupt readings in MT) should be excluded from the statistics if they are joined by one or more ancient versions, as is true for several of the items discussed.

e. When these remarks are taken into consideration, the agreement between 4QSam^a and the LXX is smaller than suggested by Ulrich, and the amount of disagreement is larger than indicated. At the same time, the number of unique and independent readings of 4QSam^a is larger than suggested by Ulrich.

In spite of these criticisms, 4QSam^a's frequent agreement with the LXX and Josephus' biblical text has been demonstrated beyond doubt.