

CHAPTER 3

GRAMMATICAL/STYLISTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SECONDARY WITNESSES

Having determined the texts to be used in this study, the stage is now set to analyze the secondary witnesses and compare them with MT. The procedure to be followed is described above in Chapter 1, but it may be summarized briefly at this point. Simply put, the method starts with the mass of readings in the secondary witness that might possibly be considered variants and proceeds to weed out those that have no value for textual criticism, a sieve of Eratosthenes approach. The first readings to be eliminated are those which were likely forced by the nature of the differences between the source language (Hebrew) and the target language in question. Since the limitations of the target languages for rendering Hebrew are discussed at the beginning of the analysis of each version, these readings are never even listed. Those readings that are considered are listed under the category of variation that they represent.

Next, a summary of the comparison of the secondary witness with MT is given, with specific statistics for each of Tov's four categories and many sub-categories within these four. Armed with these findings, a preliminary partial translation technique is described, and significant and nonsignificant variants will be distinguished. Once the variants that are probably reflections of the translator's rendering of the Hebrew have been determined, the partial translation technique will be recalculated for each category and sub-category, *eliminating the significant variants from consideration in order to refine the translation technique.*

The rationale behind eliminating significant rather than nonsignificant variants is as follows (described in terms of LXX). The preliminary partial translation technique, that is, the one based on MT, is a comparison of the deviations in LXX from MT, which, as described above, is used initially as though it were the *Vorlage* that lay before the translators. Since it is not identical to their *Vorlage*, the deviation of LXX from MT will be greater than that between LXX and its actual *Vorlage*. The variants that are determined to be significant are those that probably reflect a difference in the *Vorlage*, and, although they do not agree with MT, they presumably agree with their *Vorlage*, and so should be not counted in the statistics as deviations from a literal translation technique. Whereas the partial translation technique based solely on MT will imply a disproportionately high degree of variation in the translation, the revised partial translation technique will imply a

disproportionately low degree of variation, since some of the variants considered significant at this stage will be eliminated later in Chapter 4. However, most of the nonsignificant variants will be identified in the present chapter, so the partial translation technique for each secondary version at the end of Chapter 3 should be reasonably close to the final translation technique as determined in Chapter 4. It may occasionally be necessary to repeat the process of recognizing significant variants and recalculating the translation technique for a particular category if the preliminary partial translation technique was skewed a large amount because of significant variants.

Septuagint

Limitations of Greek for Rendering Hebrew

Since Greek is a member of that group of languages known as the Indo-European family of languages, whereas Hebrew is a Semitic language from the larger Afro-Asiatic family,¹ it is not surprising to find that syntactic structure in the two is different. Nevertheless, Greek translators of Hebrew texts were capable of rendering almost every detail of their Hebrew *Vorlagen*, if they so chose. Different translators varied in their degree of conformity to Hebrew style, with Aquila being the most slavishly literal, even rendering אֱלֹהִים by σὺν.

The nominal system in Greek is a highly inflected one, employing five cases (nominative, genitive,² dative,³ accusative, and vocative), three genders (masculine, feminine, and neuter), and three numbers (singular, plural, and dual). By contrast, biblical Hebrew relies primarily on word order and the use of prepositions to express the nuances present in the Greek cases,⁴ and it has only two genders (masculine and feminine), but it does have three numbers. Since the association of gender with inanimate objects, abstract ideas, and so on, is largely arbitrary (as far as can be determined now),⁵ any significant correlation between the Hebrew gender of a word and the gender of its Greek counterpart

¹Also known as the Hamito-Semitic family; *Encyclopædia Britannica*, “Languages of the World,” 740.

²Includes ablative uses.

³Includes locative and instrumental uses.

⁴The morphological changes that occur in nouns in the construct state reflect phonetic and rhythmical phenomena rather than remnants of case endings. Occasional nominative, genitive, and accusative endings on nouns support a picture of an earlier form of the Hebrew language that had three distinct case endings, like its Proto-Semitic ancestor. See Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §§ 89-90; Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 127-28; Gotthelf Bersträsser, *Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen*, with an appendix, “Zur Syntax der Sprache von Ugarit,” by Carl Brockelmann (Munich: Max Hueber, 1928), 14-15.

⁵For a comparison between the use of gender in Hebrew and in other languages, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 95-110.

seems unlikely, and the data from 1 Samuel supports this supposition. On the other hand, it would have been natural for the translators to have rendered the number of the Hebrew nouns by their Greek equivalents. Not surprisingly, the translators did do so for the most part, with the exception that, since the dual was no longer used in *koine* Greek, they expressed Hebrew duals with Greek plurals.⁶

The options open to the Greek translators regarding the use of Greek cases to express various Hebrew constructions were much broader than those concerning the rendering of gender or number. Greek translators, even those concerned with being literal, had the option of rendering prepositional phrases with nouns in the appropriate case rather than rendering both the preposition and the noun.⁷ Both methods of translation could be considered literal, though the translators themselves might have thought that rendering Hebrew prepositions with Greek ones was a more faithful rendering. However, the multiplicity of available options in Greek for rendering these Hebrew constructions requires that the translation technique be examined from several different angles to determine the translators' own approach to translating them; labeling the translation as "literal" is not sufficient.

Another aspect of the nominal system in Hebrew is the (definite) article. Greek also has an article, so one-to-one correspondence was possible in translation. However, the use of the article in idiomatic Greek often varied from what would be required of a strict one-to-one rendering. For example, Greek articles could stand for relative pronouns or with infinitives, something that was not possible in Hebrew. Moreover, two barriers to a strict representation of the Hebrew article by the Greek article existed. The first was the failure of the Hebrew to use an article to identify definite nouns in the construct case; the second was the assimilation of the Hebrew article after an inseparable preposition. Whether the Greek translators would render the articles that they could see in the text or whether they would insert Greek articles for definite Hebrew nouns in which the article did not appear—or whether they would simply be inconsistent—is a matter for investigation.

Many differences also exist between the verbal systems of the Hebrew and Greek languages. The Hebrew verb can be classified by stem, inflection, person, gender, and number. Greek verbs have tense, voice, mood, person, and number. A correlation clearly exists between person and number,⁸ and it is equally clear that Greek will have to render both masculine and feminine Hebrew forms by one common form, since gender is not indicated in Greek verbs. More difficult is the relationship between stem and inflection in Hebrew and tense, voice, and mood in Greek.

⁶Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 25.

⁷For example, הַ with indirect object could be expressed in Greek simply by the dative case, and לְ with a noun could be rendered by a Greek noun in the dative (locative) case.

⁸A dual number for verbs does not exist in either Hebrew or Greek.

The combination of Greek tense and mood corresponds fairly closely in translation to Hebrew inflection. The debate over the exact meanings of the classical Hebrew perfect and imperfect have raged for years, and no universal consensus has yet been reached. However, the Greek translators often rendered the simple Hebrew perfect with a past tense (aorist, perfect, imperfect,⁹ or pluperfect) and the simple Hebrew imperfect with a present or future tense (present, future, or future perfect), and least when rendering the verb with the Greek indicative mood. The addition of the *waw* consecutive to the beginning of the Hebrew verb generally resulted in a reversal of the characterization just given in order to make the Greek rendering match the Hebrew intention. This reversal was not required by the Greek language but rather reflects the translators' understanding of the Hebrew that lay before them. When rendering conditions, possibilities, and wishes, the Greek translators had available to them moods other than the indicative, namely, the subjunctive and optative moods, and they used these moods frequently. However, when the Greek translators used subjunctive or optative moods, the correlation between Greek tense and Hebrew inflection often disappeared: since the time element of the tense no longer mattered in these moods, the translator would generally choose the tense on the basis of its *Aktionsart*, whether punctiliar (aorist), durative (present), or perfected (perfect).¹⁰ One Greek mood which does have an almost exact parallel in Hebrew is the imperative, and Hebrew imperatives were regularly rendered by Greek imperatives, though the Greek tense could vary.

Hebrew stems may be divided into three groups: simple stems (qal, niph'al), intensive stems (piel, pual, hithpael), and causative stems (hiphil, hoph'al).¹¹ These stems may also be classified according to type of action (similar to voice in Greek): active stems (qal, piel, hiphil), passive stems (niph'al, pual, hoph'al), and reflexive stems (niph'al, hithpael).¹² There is no Greek equivalent to the intensive and causative stems, though the

⁹A terminological difficulty exists in comparing Greek or Latin to Hebrew, since the Hebrew imperfect, often reflecting present or future time, functions quite differently from the Greek and Latin imperfects, which reflect past time. Though other terms are available for the Hebrew inflections—notably the suffix and prefix conjugations, referring to the perfect and the imperfect, respectively—perfect and imperfect are still the most commonly used. Furthermore, the term “conjugation” itself presents terminological difficulties, since Greek and Latin conjugations are merely morphological categories, whereas the two Hebrew conjugations reflect semantic differences. It may be best to refer to the inflections simply as the *qtl* and *yqtl* inflections, as is sometimes done. See Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 455-58.

¹⁰A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 4th ed. (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 824.

¹¹Hebrew also has various other stems (poel, pilpal, etc.) which are related to these primary stems. For a discussion of the relation of the Hebrew stems to the proto-Semitic language, see Hans Bauer, Pontus Leander, and Paul Kahle, *Historische Grammatik des hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments*, vol. 1 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1922; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962), 279-88. The names of the three groups is traditional and not always particularly helpful, especially in the case of the name “intensive.” For a discussion of the different uses of the various stems, see *ibid.*, 289-94.

¹²The niph'al was originally strictly a reflexive stem, but it came to be used also as the passive of the qal, replacing an earlier qal passive, of which only remnants remain in the Hebrew Bible (esp. the qal

LXX translators did occasionally render Greek verbs as though they were causative.¹³ A greater correlation exists between the type of action reflected in the Hebrew stem and voice of the verb. Hebrew active and passive stems are generally rendered by the Greek active and passive voices.¹⁴ The correlation between Hebrew reflexive stems and the Greek middle voice is much smaller, if not nonexistent. The reasons for this lack of correlation are many. First, the niph'al is often used with a purely passive meaning. Second, the meaning of the Greek verb used to render the Hebrew in the reflexive stem may not correspond in the middle voice to the meaning required by the Hebrew. Next, many Greek verbs, whether deponent or not, have what appears to be an active meaning expressed by the middle voice.¹⁵ When these verbs are used in the middle voice to translate Hebrew verbs, it is unlikely that a non-active Hebrew stem can be assumed. Finally, in later Greek a blending of the middle and passive voices occurred, so that middle verbs were sometimes used with passive meaning, and vice versa.¹⁶

The last verbal forms to be considered, infinitives and participles, exist in both languages, and a precise rendering in Greek of these two forms was possible. The fairly common use of the participle as equivalent to a full verb in Hebrew was rare or perhaps unknown in classical Greek. However, the use of the independent Greek participle for the verb was a permissible, if still uncommon, construction in *koine*, as demonstrated by the papyri and the New Testament.¹⁷ Undoubtedly, many of the instances of independent Greek participles used as verbs in LXX were based on a similar construction in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Nevertheless, some of the translators seem to have preferred rendering independent Hebrew participles used as verbs by Greek verbs rather than participles, particularly when such a rendering could be supported by the consonantal text. Thus, the rendering of a Hebrew participle by a Greek verb in certain instances cannot be considered indicative of a differing Hebrew *Vorlage*, though, of course, it does not rule it out.

Greek has only one infinitive whereby to render the Hebrew infinitive absolute and infinitive construct. Moreover, the common addition of the preposition לְ to the Hebrew infinitive construct is not rendered by a Greek preposition, which would be unidiomatic. It is possible that some translators may have rendered the לְ by the genitive of the article with

passive participle); cf. C. L. Seow, *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1987), 250; for a more complete discussion see Bauer, Leander, and Kahle, *Grammatik*, 285-88.

¹³Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 76-77.

¹⁴Except when the Greek verb used did not have the required form, so substituted another. See Smyth, *Grammar*, 218-19.

¹⁵A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, 811-13.

¹⁶Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 75-76; A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, 333-34. For other examples of the use of one voice with the meaning of another in Greek, see Smyth, *Grammar*, 219-24.

¹⁷A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, 944-46. Cf. also Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 74.

an infinitive of purpose. This rendering, however, is not consistent.¹⁸

This brief discussion of the similarities and differences between Hebrew and Greek is not complete, and other matters concerning the rendering of the Hebrew text by the translators of LXX are discussed in longer works and articles.¹⁹

Partial Translation Technique

Based on an analysis of the Greek language in comparison with Hebrew, the following are potentially significant variants in LXX that need further scrutiny.

Add-Oms

Since an analysis of the first three categories of variants will not include add-oms, they must first be identified. Add-oms, as mentioned above, are variants in which the reading of the base text (MT) is either longer or shorter by at least one semantic unit²⁰ than the corresponding section in the translation (in this case, LXX). In general, the list of add-oms will be almost the same as the list of quantitative variants (category four), but in each language exceptions may be made, and certain quantitative variants may not be classified as add-oms; in other words, these exceptional cases *would* be analyzed in the first three categories of variants.

It is sometimes difficult to determine whether a difference between the Hebrew and the Greek should be classified as an add-om or not. In particular, a decision must be made concerning Hebrew particles (אם) and prepositions (especially ל and אל) that are not rendered in LXX in a particular passage. Such particles and prepositions will be included in the add-om list if the Hebrew word in question is usually rendered by some equivalent Greek word. The same consideration will apply as well to the other versions analyzed. In LXX, the omission of אם, אל, or ל will not be considered add-oms, so they will be taken into account when analyzing both representation of Hebrew lexemes by Greek lexemes and quantitative representation. A full list of the add-oms of LXX is given in Appendix 2; it may be compared with the list of quantitative variants given later in this section.

¹⁸Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 58-59. Cf. the tables in Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*, *Annales academiae scientiarum fennicae*, no. 132, 1 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1965), 180-85.

¹⁹See especially Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 25-97; Thackeray, *Grammar*; Jellicoe, *LXX and Modern Study*, 314-37; and works listed in the Bibliography by Anneli Aejmelaeus, Francis I. Andersen, Albert Debrunner, Kenneth James Dover, H. S. Gehman, Martin Johannesson, Max Leopold Margolis, E. Nestle, Alfred Rahlfs, Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, Raija Sollamo, and Emanuel Tov.

²⁰A semantic unit is a phrase, word, or part of a word that represents a single concept. Of course, the most common semantic units are words, but the Hebrew pronominal suffixes and inseparable prepositions are also semantic units, as is the Greek compound πρὶν ἢ.

Consistency

The first criterion that Tov lays out for evaluating the translation technique of a version is consistency. Here, those variants in LXX that involve consistent rendering in comparison with MT are listed. The columns entitled “LXX” and “MT” describe the nature of difference between the LXX reading and MT. For example, if LXX has a full verb where MT has a participle, the respective columns will read “verb” and “participle.” If the LXX rendering reflects a lexical choice other than the main rendering (if one exists), the LXX column will read “lexeme,” and the MT column will be empty.

Since MT does have a tradition of interpretation represented by the vowel points, the complete Masoretic understanding of the consonants will be the initial basis for comparison. However, when variants come to be eliminated, those that reflect a possible alternate understanding of the consonants of MT will also be eliminated. Three common forms that would often be ambiguous without vowel points are (1) words that could be considered participles, infinitives, or various forms of the full verb; (2) nouns with inseparable prepositions, which may or may not include an article that has been assimilated; and (3) verbs with a *waw* prefix that could be either *waw* consecutive or *waw* conjunctive. Also, it should be noted that the *kethib* form of MT is used as the basis for evaluation, though *qere* forms will be discussed later.

Each variant is numbered individually for reference in later discussions. When more than one variation is associated with a particular word, each one has its own reference number.

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Septuagint</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
1	3:1	ην λειτουργων	periphrasis	participle
2		ην διαστελλουσα	periphrasis	participle
3			active	niphal
4	3:2	εκαθευδεν	verb	participle
5		οφθαλμοι	plural	singular
6		βαρυνεσθαι	lexeme	
7			infinitive	adjective
8		ηδυνατο	imperfect	imperfect
9	3:3	επισκευασθηναι	lexeme	
10			infinitive	verb
11		εκαθευδεν	verb	participle
12	3:5	αναστρεψεν	lexeme	
13	3:6	εκαλεσεν	verb	infinitive
14	3:7	γινωναι	infinitive	verb
15		θειον	lexeme	
16		αποκαλυφθηναι	infinitive	verb

17	3:8	κεκληκεν	verb	participle
18	3:9	αναστρεφε	lexeme	
19		ακουει	verb	participle
20		εκοιμηθη	lexeme	
21	3:10	ακουει	verb	participle
22	3:11	ποιω	verb	participle
23		τα ρηματα	article	not definite
24			plural	singular
25		αυτα	plural	singular
26	3:12	επι	lexeme	
27		εις	lexeme	
28		αρξομαι	verb	infinitive
29		επιτελεσω	verb	infinitive
30	3:13	ανηγγελκα	perfect	perfect w/c
31		εκδικω	verb	participle
32		αδικiais	plural	singular
33		θεον	lexeme	
34		και ουδ ουτως	word division	
35	3:14	ωμοσα	active	niphil
36		θυσαις	plural	singular
37	3:15	κοιματα	lexeme	
38			present	imperfect w/c
39		πρωι	adverb	noun
40	3:16	προς	lexeme	
41	3:17	λαληθεν	participle	verb
42			passive	piel
43		λογων	plural	singular
44		λαληθεντων	participle	verb
45			passive	piel
46			plural	singular
47	3:18	ενωπιον αυτου	lexeme	
48	3:19	επεσεν	active	hiphil
49	3:20	εγνωσαν	plural	singular
50		πιστος	adjective	participle

Now that the potential variants have been listed, it is time to examine the level of consistency reflected by various aspects of the LXX rendering. First, lexical consistency (tables 1-3) will be measured by counting the different Hebrew words used more than once

and comparing that number with the number of Greek words used more than once.²¹ Next, the number of Hebrew words (occurring more than once) rendered by the primary Greek rendering will be calculated. This statistic will measure the translator's loyalty to a particular vocabulary item when an equivalent lexical choice is available. Next, the lexical deviation factor (described in the next paragraph) will be computed. Finally, a comparison of Hebrew and Greek roots, rather than words, will be made, in an effort to see if the translators have a tendency toward etymologizing.²² Table 4 is an analysis of how the translators rendered words in a particular Hebrew word class, namely, verbs and verbals, nouns and adjectives, and pronouns. Tables 5-16 analyze the translators' tendencies in rendering various grammatical categories and syntactic relationships (i.e., for verbs: inflection, stem, person, and number; for nouns and adjectives: gender, number, use in the sentence, articles, and definiteness; for pronouns: gender, number, and use in the sentence).²³

The deviation factor is a measure of the deviation from absolute consistency, whether lexical or grammatical, by a translator. Absolute lexical consistency, for example, is defined as the use of one and only one Greek word for each distinct Hebrew word. The phenomenon of using the same Greek word for more than one Hebrew word is not considered in the calculations. The algorithm for computing the deviation factor is given in detail in Appendix 4, but its rationale is given here, described in terms of lexical consistency. If a single Hebrew word is always rendered by the same Greek word, the deviation factor for that Hebrew word is zero. If more than one Greek word is used to render a single Hebrew word, the deviation factor is a positive number. Given ten occurrences of a given Hebrew word, it is considered a greater deviation from absolute consistency for three Greek words to be employed in rendering that word than for two to be so employed (all other things being equal). Furthermore, if two Greek words are used to render a single Hebrew word, the deviation factor will be greater if each Greek word appears five times than if one appears nine times and the other only once. It is considered a greater deviation when one case out of five differs from the standard than when one out of ten does. The deviation factor is a modification of a chi-square test, adapted to account for the number of discrete renderings in the target language as well as the total number of deviations from the most

²¹The number of Greek words will always be greater than or equal to the number of Hebrew words, for if a Greek word is used to render more than one Hebrew word, it is counted more than once.

²²Tov identifies the technique of etymologizing, the rendering of all words based on a single Hebrew root (real or imagined) by words based on a single Greek root, as an aspect of consistency calling for special attention; Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 57. In table 1, the last column identifies different words that share the same root by assigning a common reference number, given in italics. Roots represented by only one word in the chapter are not explicitly indicated, though they are of course figured in the data.

²³A shortened form of the tables, containing the results of the various computations, is given below. For an expanded form of the tables, containing the data on which the computed figures are based, see Appendix 2 (the category number here corresponds to the table number in Appendix 2).

commonly used rendering. Larger deviation factors indicate more variation from absolute consistency, but it must be stressed again that the numbers themselves are not helpful until they are compared with either the corresponding deviation factor in another secondary witness or other deviation factors within the same witness. Of course, the larger the statistical base that is being analyzed, the more meaningful will be the results.

Table 1.—Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives: Lexemes

Heb words (>1x): 31	Gk words: 42	1.35 Gk words/Heb word
deviation factor: 0.38		
total Heb (>1x): 132	primary Gk: 117	88.6% of Heb words by primary rendering
Heb roots (>1x): 29	Gk roots: 42	1.45 Gk roots/Heb root

Table 2.—Adverbs, Prepositions, and Particles: Lexemes

Heb advs (>1x): 13	Gk advs: 26	2.00 Gk advs/Heb adv
total Heb (>1x): 85	primary Gk: 67	78.8% of Heb advs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 2.78		

Table 3.—Conjunctions: Lexemes

Heb conjs (>1x): 2	Gk conjs: 2	1.00 Gk conjs/Heb conj
total Heb (>1x): 66	primary Gk: 66	100% of Heb conjs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 0.00		

Table 4.—Word Classes

percentage of verbs/verbals represented by verbs/verbals:	94/95 = 98.9%
percentage of verbs represented by verbs:	71/76 = 93.4%
percentage of participles represented by participles:	4/12 = 33.3%
percentage of infinitives represented by infinitives:	4/7 = 57.1%
percentage of nouns/adjs represented by nouns/adjs:	52/55 = 94.5%
percentage of pronouns represented by pronouns:	37/38 = 97.4%

Table 5.—Verbs: Hebrew Inflection, Greek Tense and Mood

deviation factor (discrete tense/mood combinations):	6.68
deviation factor (grouped):	0.97
deviation factor (grouped, without verbals):	0.85

Table 6.—Verbs: Hebrew Stem, Greek Voice

deviation factor:	3.57
-------------------	------

Table 7.—Verbs: Person

deviation factor:	0.00
-------------------	------

Table 8.—Verbs: Number

deviation factor:	0.12
-------------------	------

Table 9.—Nouns and Adjectives: Gender

deviation factor:	21.54
-------------------	-------

Table 10.—Nouns and Adjectives: Number

deviation factor: 2.29

Table 11.—Nouns and Adjectives: Use vs. Case

deviation factor (discrete use/case combinations): 6.45

deviation factor (grouped): 0.37

Table 12.—Nouns and Adjectives: Articles

deviation factor: 11.37

deviation factor (without implied articles): 12.23

Table 13.—Nouns and Adjectives: Hebrew Definiteness, Greek Articles

deviation factor: 8.04

Table 14.—Pronouns: Gender

deviation factor: 1.44

Table 15.—Pronouns: Number

deviation factor: 0.06

Table 16.—Pronouns: Use vs. Case

deviation factor (discrete use/case combinations): 3.76

deviation factor (grouped): 0.06

Representation of Hebrew Lexemes by Greek Lexemes (Segmentation)

Translators often had a tendency to represent compound words in the source language with compound words in the target language. Thus, if a Hebrew word were composed of a preposition and a noun, for example, the Greek translator might have preferred to render the expression with a Greek preposition and noun, even though an adverb would have carried the same meaning. Here are listed all the Hebrew compounds which the Greek translators did not render all of the constituent parts. Only the consonantal text is considered, so articles indicated by pointing alone that are not represented are not listed.

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Hebrew Compound</u>	<u>Greek Rendering</u>
51	3:1	לפני	ενωπιον
52	3:2	לראות	βλεπειν
53	3:5	לי	με
54	3:6	לי	με
55	3:7	אליו	αυτω
56	3:8	לי	με
57		לנער	το παιδαριον
58	3:9	אלידך	σε
59	3:13	לו	αυτω
60		בם	αυτους

61	3:14	לבית	τω οικω
62	3:15	מהגיד	απαγγελοι
63	3:17	לך	σοι
64	3:18	בעינו	ενωπιον αυτου
65	3:20	ליהוה	τω κυριω
66	3:21	להראה	δηλωθηναι

Heb compounds: 43 Gk equivalents: 27 62.8% of Heb compounds rendered exactly

Word Order

As noted above, since Greek is an inflected language, its writers and speakers had much greater freedom to vary word order and still maintain the thought of the sentence. Whether the translators of LXX in fact chose to take advantage of this facet of their language, or whether instead they attempted to follow closely the word order of their exemplar, is another aspect of the literalness of the translation. The list below contains the deviations from the Hebrew word order found in LXX. As already stated, Greek postpositive conjunctions that appear as near as the language permits to the equivalent Hebrew conjunction will not be considered variations from the Hebrew word order. The number of variations is calculated by ascertaining the minimum number of shifts of position a Hebrew word (including a compound word) would have to make in order to reflect the word order found in LXX.

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Greek Variant</u>
67	3:16	3	και ειπεν
68	3:19	1	ην κυριος

Heb semantic units: 373 variations: 4 Heb word order followed 98.9% of the time

Quantitative Representation

The tendency of literal translators was to render every element of their *Vorlage*, without adding or subtracting anything unless it was required by the target language. The following list analyzes the literalness of LXX in terms of quantitative representation, in order to determine the translator's commitment to render all the elements of the *Vorlage*, and only those elements. The number of *Hebrew* semantic units represented by the variation is given, prefixed with a plus if the excess is in Greek and with a minus if the excess is in Hebrew. In the last column, each element of MT not found in LXX is listed in Hebrew, and each element of LXX not found in MT is listed in Greek. As noted above, add-oms will be included in these calculations, but quantitative differences arising from the representation of compound words have already been discussed and will not be included here. Furthermore, it should be noted that ׀ִס in verse 1 is rendered by ουκ ην, and the *he locale* in verse 19 is rendered by επι; these renderings are not considered differences in

quantitative representation, since Greek has no exact equivalents for the Hebrew expressions. ׀, the sign of the definite direct object, has no real equivalent in Greek and so cannot be rendered idiomatically (Aquila's $\sigma\upsilon\nu$ notwithstanding). Finally, articles are considered only when they appear or are implied (e.g., ׀ה in 3:1 requires that an article be assumed in ׀י) in the consonantal text (or when they would appear in the presumed Hebrew underlying an addition in LXX). In order to avoid begging the question as to which witness (if either) contains an addition to or omission from the original, the excess text is given in whichever language it appears.

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Variant</u>
69	3:1	+1	ην 1°
70		+2	του ιερεως
71	3:2	+1	και 4°
72	3:3	-1	יהוה
73		-1	שם
74	3:4	-1	אל
75		+1	Σαμουηλ
76	3:5	+1	σε
77		+1	και 4°
78	3:6	+1	και 2°
79		-1	עוד
80		+1	Σαμουηλ 2°
81		-3	ויקם שמואל
82		+1	εκ δευτερου
83		-2	בני
84		+1	σε
85		+1	και 6°
86	3:7	-1	טרם 2°
87	3:9	-3	עלי לשמואל
88		+1	και 2°
89		+1	τεκνον
90	3:10	+1	αυτον
91		-2	שמואל שמואל
92	3:11	+1	μου
93		-1	אשר
94	3:13	-2	אשר ידע
95		+2	υιων αυτου
96	3:15	+4	και ωρθρισεν το πρωι
97		-1	אל

98	3:16	-2	וִיקָרָם
99		-1	יִי 1°
100	3:17	-2	לְיָסֵלֵךְ 2°
101		+3	ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΩΣΙΝ ΣΟΥ
102	3:18	-2	לְ
103		+1	Ηλει
104	3:21	-5	בְּשֵׁלֹוּ בְּדַבַּר יְהוָה
105		+31	και επιστευθη Σαμουηλ προφητης γενεσθαι τω κυριω εις παντα Ισραηλ απ ακρων της γης και εως ακρων και Ηλει πρεσβυτης σφοδρα και οι υιοι αυτου πορευομενοι επορευοντο και πονηρα η οδος αυτων ενωπιου κυριου

Heb semantic units: 438 Gk deviations: 88 79.9% agreement

Elimination of Variants

The LXX translation of 1 Samuel is often characterized as literal or fairly literal.²⁴ A glance at the preceding tables, however, indicates that this characterization, though perhaps true in general, does not describe certain aspects of the translation technique with precision.

Whereas conjunctions are rendered with absolute consistency (i.e., exactly one Greek term per Hebrew term), verbs, nouns, and adjectives, and especially adverbs, prepositions, and particles, are not. The translators were reasonably consistent in rendering a particular class of Hebrew words (verbs/verbals, nouns/adjectives, pronouns) with the equivalent Greek class. However, the percentage of Hebrew verbals rendered by the equivalent class of verbals in Greek is low. The level of grammatical consistency is

²⁴Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, XVII-XXII; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, lix-lxii; Thackeray, *Grammar*, 13; Swete, *Introduction*, 323; Fernández Marcos, *Introducción*, 25. Cf. also Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 171-72; Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semi-Prepositions in the Septuagint*, *Annales academiæ scientiarum fennicæ, Dissertationes humanarum litterarum*, no. 19 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 286. De Boer disputes this claim: “We have already observed that the translators did not have literal rendering as motive for translation, but that the thread of the story was the cause for omissions, additions and differences,” de Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, 51. However, he seems to approach his analysis with a foregone conclusion. Note the following incredible conclusion: “Even though certain passages remain without a clear explanation of why G differs from M, and although some of the proposed explanations are nothing more than probabilities, the independence of the translated story, the agreement with Tg and S and elucidation as the main tendency leave us in *no doubt* that we *in G have to do with the same Hebrew text as the one offered by M*” (italics mine).

more complicated. The translators are absolutely consistent (deviation factor of 0.00) in rendering the person of verbs. They are very consistent (deviation factor less than 1.00) in rendering the number of verbs, the number of pronouns, the inflection of verbs, the use of nouns and adjectives, and the use of pronouns (when the Greek data is grouped appropriately). They are fairly consistent (deviation factor between 1.00 and 3.00) in rendering the number of nouns and adjectives and the gender of pronouns. They are less consistent (deviation factor between 3.00 and 6.00) in rendering verb stems. They are fairly inconsistent (deviation factor between 6.00 and 12.00) in rendering articles found with nouns and adjectives and the definiteness of nouns and adjectives. Finally, they are very inconsistent (deviation factor greater than 12.00), as expected, in rendering the gender of nouns and adjectives.

Apart from the category of consistency, the following general results may be mentioned. The translators did not feel compelled to render each component of Hebrew compounds with a Greek equivalent, choosing in 40% of the cases to translate the compound as a whole. By contrast, Hebrew word order is followed very closely, with LXX deviating only 1.1% of the time, and that in only two units. Finally, an initial look at quantitative representation suggests that the Greek translators frequently varied from the Hebrew text, either adding (fifty-seven times) or omitting (thirty-one times) elements.

It must be emphasized that these results are preliminary, based on a rigid application of the principles for determining translation technique discussed in Chapter 1, and assuming that MT is the same as the *Vorlage* of LXX. As individual variants and groups of variants are weighed, a more nuanced picture of the translation technique will emerge, and many of the above results will have to be modified.

Variants Related to Consistency

The first aspect of consistency to be examined is lexical consistency, of which twelve variants from MT have been identified in LXX. The identification of a lexical variant that might indicate a varying Hebrew *Vorlage* is based on two factors: similarity in meaning as reflected in the lexicons and Greek equivalents for the same word elsewhere in the chapter.

The first lexical variant is variant 6, where LXX reads βαρυσεσθα for MT כָּהוּת. The lexicons list two roots כָּהָה, the first meaning “to be dim, faint, blind,” and the second meaning “to rebuke.” The second root is found only in 3:13, where it is a *hapax*; the present instance comes from the first root. Of the fifteen probable renderings in LXX of either the verb כָּהָה or the adjective כָּהוּת, the only time LXX uses a root related to βαρυσω is here. (There is no single Greek root used to render I כָּהוּת that dominates, but the words related to αμυρος are used six times). βαρυσω and related words are often used to render words related to the Hebrew כָּבַד: βαρυσω twenty-eight of thirty-five total

uses of the Greek word, βαρυς twenty-five of thirty uses, βαρυγλωσσοσ one of one, βαρυωπεω one of one. The close association between כבד and βαρυνω suggests that some form of כבד appeared in the *Vorlage* of LXX. On the other hand, the use of βαρυωπεω (rendering כבד) of blinded eyes in Gen 48:10 suggests that the translators might have chosen βαρυνω as appropriate in the present case (cf. Isa 33:15; 59:1; Zech 7:11). However, there is enough graphic similarity between כבוד and כהות to allow the possibility of textual confusion in the transmission of the Hebrew text, or maybe at the point of translation. The reading of P supports the possibility that the confusion occurred during the transmission of the Hebrew text. Thus, it is likely that the *Vorlage* of LXX at this point was different from MT, so the variant is significant.

In variant 9, επισκευασθηνα (“to be made ready”) renders כבה (“had gone out”). Though the context might stretch the semantic field of επισκευαζω enough to make it roughly equivalent to כבה, the former renders the latter only here out of seven occurrences in the OT. επισκευαζω renders four other words, three of which mean “to restore” and are used in the context of restoring the temple. Ex 30:8 uses επισκευαζω to render the hiphil of עלה, referring to Aaron setting up the lamps in the evening. כבה occurs thirteen times in the qal and ten times in the piel that are rendered in LXX. Twenty-one of these occurrences are rendered by σβεννυμι, and one by αποσβεννυμι. It is likely that scribes confused an original ΔΠΟCΒΕCΘΗΝΔΙ or ΕΠΙCΒΕCΘΗΝΔΙ with ΕΠΙCΚΕΥΔCΘΗΝΔΙ,²⁵ and since no Hebrew verb with a like meaning appears to be similar enough orthographically to כבה,²⁶ variant 9 should probably be considered an inner-Greek corruption and not significant.

αναστρεφω in variants 12 and 18 is the normal translation for שוב in the passage (cf. 3:5, 6) and elsewhere in LXX, including the books of Kingdoms. In fact, apart from one other occurrence in several mss (3 Kgdms 6:12 [Rahlfs’s versification] mss AMN etc.), αναστρεφω never translates הלך, while rendering שוב some forty times. It seems that either the translator or the *Vorlage* changed the verbs in these two instances to match the other occurrences in the immediate context. Since no tendency of the translators to harmonize the LXX of this chapter has been demonstrated yet, and since αναστρεφω is an unusual translation of שוב in the book, it is quite possible that the *Vorlage* itself contained שוב rather than הלך in these verses, so these variants are significant.

Variant 15 is a variation between the Hebrew יהוה (usually rendered by κυριος)

²⁵ Klostermann suggests that the LXX reading is a corruption of επισβεσθηνα (Erich Klostermann, *Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige*, Kurzgefaßter Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testamentes sowie zu den Apokryphen, ed. Hermann Strack and Otto Böckler, vol. 3 [Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1887], 11). Cf. the readings of α’ (σβεσθηνα), σ’ (εσβεσθη), οι γ’ (κατασβεσθηνα).

²⁶ Wellhausen suggests הטיב, which he says is implied by Josephus, *Ant.* 3.8.3 (*Bücher Samuelis*, 52), but this section is not a reference to Samuel but to the Mosaic regulations concerning the lamps in the tabernacle. Cf. de Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, 62.

and the Greek θεος. Though the words are of course equivalent in the sense that they refer to the God of the Israelites, the translators of 1 Samuel are fairly consistent in their renderings of both יהוה and אל הים.²⁷ All of the other fifteen occurrences of יהוה in the chapter are rendered by κυριος. Thus, this variant should be considered significant.

Variants 20 and 37 both use a form of the verb κοιμωω to render the Hebrew verb שכב, even though forms of καθευδω are the more common rendering in the chapter (six of eight occurrences of שכב are rendered by καθευδω). However, a check of Hatch and Redpath reveals that both Greek verbs are used frequently to render שכב, and they render few other words (in the books of Kingdoms, κοιμωω renders שכב forty-nine times out of fifty occurrences of κοιμωω; the numbers for καθευδω are thirteen of fifteen). In fact, as these figures show, κοιμωω is the more common of the two main renderings outside this chapter. Thus, these variants are not significant.

Variants 26, 27, and 40 each reflect Greek prepositions that are different from what one might have expected based on the main renderings of the corresponding Hebrew prepositions. Of the thirteen occurrences of אל in the chapter, only in verse 12 is it rendered by επι or εις (one time each; the usual renderings are προς [six times] or nothing [five times]). Unlike the other renderings of אל, επι carries a somewhat different meaning, and one suspects that it might reflect a Hebrew על rather than אל.²⁸

The semantic field of εις, on the other hand, overlaps that of אל to a large extent. However, a perusal of several passages in 1 Kingdoms (Hatch and Redpath do not give the equivalents for each occurrence) indicates that εις rarely renders אל, though it is frequently used for -ב, -ל, and ה - (he locale). The readings of the other versions might suggest a reading על in their Vorlagen, but this preposition does not lie behind the LXX reading. It is possible that the preposition ב or ל lay before the LXX translators in this passage. ב could have been lost through simple haplography (בביתו became ביתו) and אל inserted by a scribe who sensed that a preposition was needed. On the other hand, the inseparable preposition ל might have been replaced with its near equivalent אל, perhaps as a result of similarity in pronunciation. Either of these two possibilities could account for the origin of על as well.

προς in verse 16 is the only instance in the chapter (of nine possibilities) where an apparent equivalent appears for את. However, the whole Greek clause is different from the Hebrew: και ειπεν Ηλει προς Σαμουηλ for ויקרא עלי את שמואל ויאמר. It is probable that אל rather than את lies behind the προς in LXX. Therefore, variants 26, 27, and 40 are all significant.

Variant 33 in verse 13 reflects an ancient scribal correction, one of the *tiqqune*

²⁷θεος in LXX reflects יהוה in MT about 12 out of 100 times in 1 Samuel. The ratio of occurrences of κυριος in LXX corresponding to אל הים in MT is even smaller.

²⁸So Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 17; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 96.

sopherim. In order to avoid reading that Eli's sons cursed God (מקללים אל הים), lest the reader join in the blasphemy by juxtaposing these two words, scribes altered the text to read מקללים להם, "they cursed themselves." LXX preserves the original reading, since θεον obviously reflects אל הים and not להם.²⁹

The final LXX variant that might reflect a different Hebrew lexeme is number 47, which reads ενωπιον αυτου for בעיניו. Though εν τω (τοις) οφθαλμοι(ς) αυτου might be considered more literal, the phrase that appears here carries the same meaning as the Hebrew of MT. In fact, the translators of 1 Samuel often did use the expression εν τοις οφθαλμοις for בעיניו (especially in *kaige* sections), but they did not do so consistently, often substituting the more idiomatic ενωπιον (e.g., 1 Kgdms 11:10; 12:17; 14:36).³⁰ Therefore, this variant cannot be considered significant.

Variant 34, και ουδ ουτως (end of 3:13 LXX) for ולכן (beginning of 3:14 MT) seems to reflect a difference in word division and a slight change in spelling: ולא כן instead of ולכן.³¹ This variant must have arisen in Hebrew rather than Greek, so it is significant.

All the other variants that reflect on the consistency of the LXX translators deal with grammatical differences. Variants 1, 2, 4, 11, 17, 19, 21, 22, and 31 all render Hebrew participles by Greek verbs (or periphrastic constructions in variants 1 and 2). In fact, of the eleven participles rendered by Greek verbs or verbals, only two (3:11, 13) are rendered by participles. When it is remembered that the LXX translators worked from a purely consonantal text, it becomes clear that all of MT's participles that could be understood, with different pointing, as full verbs (i.e., the qal active participles that function as the main verbs in their respective clauses in MT) were in fact rendered by verbs. The piel participle in 3:13 is rendered with a Greek participle. The piel and niph'al participles in 3:1 are rendered as periphrastic constructions, consisting of a form of ειμι and a participle. The only qal participle actually rendered by a participle is the one in 3:11, but the construction of the clause (the participle is part of a construct chain) mandates that the word be understood as a participle. Although the translators may have had a different reading tradition than that of the Masoretes concerning many of the participles, the consonantal text lying behind their renderings seems identical to that found in MT, so none of these variants is significant.

In variants 41, 42, 44, and 45 in 3:17, the reverse situation occurs: verbs in MT are

²⁹So *BHK* and most commentators. R. Althann, "Northwest Semitic Notes on Some Texts in 1 Samuel," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 12 (1984): 28-29, proposes on the basis of Ugaritic evidence that "lhm can be understood as a by-form of l'm, parsed as the stative participle of the root 'ym, 'to inspire awe,' preceded by the emphatic lamedh." However, his analysis is not convincing.

³⁰See the table in Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 138, and, for more discussion, *ibid.*, 123-55.

³¹Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 53. S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, 44, gives several other examples of the same phenomenon.

read as participles in LXX. Furthermore, the participles are passive, whereas the verbs in MT are both piel. Since no subject is explicitly stated (the nearest reference to God speaking is three verses earlier), the LXX translators, if they had the same consonantal text as MT, may have considered the forms pual in both instances, in spite of the infrequency of רבר in this stem. The use of the Greek article as the equivalent of רש in both cases is an idiomatic Greek rendering of the construction, a construction which has no exact parallel in Hebrew. Thus, some degree of flexibility has already been shown in each phrase. Though it is conceivable that the *Vorlage* of the translators had participles (with the prefixed ב), it seems more likely that the translators in these two cases rendered idiomatic Hebrew expressions with idiomatic Greek ones. Even if, as appears likely, the translators read the verbs as puals rather than piels, there is no indication of any variation from the consonantal MT, so the variants are not significant.

On one occasion, variant 50, the translators used an adjective, πιστος , to render a Hebrew participle. Though this is the only time in the chapter in which a Hebrew participle is rendered by something other than a verb, the participle functions in the Hebrew clause as a subjective complement (predicate adjective). The niph'al participle does function elsewhere as a predicate adjective.³² The Greek rendering is surely the meaning intended by the use of the niph'al participle, and it may be that the translators felt that the adjective carried the meaning more faithfully than would a passive participle such as πιστευομενος . Thus, the variant should not be seen as significant.

Three times in chapter 3 the translators use infinitives to render what are full verbs in MT, namely, variants 10, 14, and 16. In each case, the Hebrew verb follows רמ ; two of the verbs are imperfect (3:3, 7), and one is perfect (3:7).³³ The Greek equivalent for רמ is πριν η (see above, pp. 39-40), and though LXX has only two occurrences of this preposition, all three Greek infinitives are governed by πριν η . Since the use of the infinitive rather than some form of the full verb is required when πριν η means “before,”³⁴ these variants cannot be taken to be significant.

Variants 13, 28, and 29 have Greek verbs for Hebrew infinitives. In variant 13, LXX reads $\text{και προσεθετο κυριος και εκαλεσεν}$ for ויסף יהוה קרש . Both the infinitive and the imperfect (usually with *waw* consecutive) can follow סף in Hebrew when the meaning is “to do again,” though the infinitive is more common. Idiomatic Greek does not

³²Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 619-20.

³³Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 107c, says that the perfect should be emended to an imperfect, since the imperfect regularly follows רמ and since the perfect עד is coordinated with the imperfect הגל ; so also *BHK*, most of the commentaries. Of course, the imperfect עד requires no change in the consonantal text.

³⁴Smyth, *Grammar*, 549, 553-55. Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, 131, notes that the expression $\text{רמ(ב)} + \text{full verb}$ is usually rendered by either $\text{προ του} + \text{infinitive}$ or $\text{πριν} + \text{infinitive}$ throughout LXX.

have a similar construction, and the reading of LXX here is definitely unidiomatic. This consideration alone implies that the translators are following a Hebrew text rather than changing the Hebrew construction, especially since it is the less common Hebrew construction that is reflected in LXX. Thus, variant 13 is significant.

Variants 28 and 29 also have Greek verbs for Hebrew infinitives. The two infinitives וּבַלְהַ and וּבַלְהַ form an expression that, though idiomatic and fairly common in Hebrew, has no exact parallel in Greek.³⁵ The translators managed to create a reading in $\alpha\rho\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\sigma\omega$ that represented both infinitives idiomatically, deriving the person of these verbs from דְּבַרְתִּי . In view of the nature of the Hebrew construction, the LXX reading seems to effectively capture the flavor of the Hebrew, despite avoiding the normal grammatical parallels, so these two variants are not significant.

Variant 7 reads the infinitive $\beta\alpha\rho\upsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ for the adjective בְּהוֹרֵת . Greek idiom certainly requires the use of an infinitive after $\eta\rho\xi\alpha\nu\tau\omicron$, but Hebrew idiom would seem to require it, too. It is probable that the letters בְּהוֹרֵת were meant to stand for the infinitive בְּהוֹרֵת .³⁶ However, since Greek idiom requires an infinitive, and since such a change in Hebrew would not change the consonantal text, the variant is not significant.

In the case of variant 39, a Greek adverb, $\pi\rho\omega\iota$, is used to render the Hebrew noun and article הַבְּקָר . Although none of the other fifty-four Hebrew nouns in the chapter is rendered by an adverb, הַבְּקָר here functions as an adverbial of time, and as such, $\pi\rho\omega\iota$ is an appropriate translation. In fact, $\pi\rho\omega\iota$ is the regular equivalent for בְּקָר in LXX, so this variant is not significant.

The next three variants deal with the rendering of the inflection of Hebrew verbs in a manner contrary to the most common representation. First, variant 8 uses the Greek imperfect (a past tense) to render the Hebrew imperfect (usually rendered by the present or the future tense). The context clearly shows that an event in the past is being described, so one would usually expect a past tense. However, the Hebrew imperfect does not correspond completely with the Greek present or future tenses. In the case at hand, the

³⁵Though וּבַלְהַ is classified as an infinitive construct by BDB and Holladay, it seems more likely that it should be seen with Kautzsch and Klostermann as an infinitive absolute, as וּבַלְהַ is. Cf. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 113h; Klostermann, *Bücher Samuelis*, loc. cit; Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1906; reprint, 1951) [hereafter BDB], s.v. “ וּבַלְהַ ”; William L. Holladay, *A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1971), s.v. “ וּבַלְהַ .”

³⁶BDB, s.v. “ וּבַלְהַ ”; Holladay, *Lexicon*, s.v. “ וּבַלְהַ .” Wellhausen says that since no preposition וּבַלְהַ is present, an infinitive would be ungrammatical (*Bücher Samuelis*, 52), but Smith disputes this contention (H. P. Smith, *Books of Samuel*, 27). Cf. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 114m). Driver says that the infinitive is more in accord with biblical usage (S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, 42). Cf. Walter Baumgartner and J. J. Stamm, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, 3d ed., 5 vols. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967-) [hereafter KB³], s.v. “ וּבַלְהַ .”

imperfect is used to indicate the continuous nature of Eli's blindness,³⁷ so variant 8 is not significant.

Variant 30 has a Greek perfect rendering a Hebrew perfect with a *waw* consecutive. The Hebrew implies that the message to Eli concerning judgment on his house has not yet been given to him, whereas the Greek says that it has (cf. 1 Sam 2:27-36).³⁸ This difference of perspective is reflected in other secondary witnesses as well, so the variant is significant.

In variant 38, the present κοιμαται is used to render the imperfect with *waw* consecutive וְשָׁכַב (ו). Normally, the Greek translators use a past tense to render the Hebrew imperfect with *waw* consecutive, but the present here could be explained as a historical present. Although the imperfect with *waw* consecutive is rendered thirty-four times by the aorist and only once by the present in chapter 3, the presence of 151 instances of the historical present in 1 Samuel³⁹ suggests that the ratio in the present chapter is disproportionate, and the variant is probably not significant.

Variants 3, 35, and 48 represent deviations from the usual rendering of Hebrew stems by means of Greek voice. In the first two instances, a niph'al is represented by a Greek verb in the active voice. The use of the active voice in variant 35 is easily explained by the fact that the verb וְשָׁכַב regularly appears in the niph'al when it has an active meaning.⁴⁰ The active voice would be the one that most accurately represented the meaning of the Hebrew, and this is the one the Greek translators chose.

Variant 3 is not quite so simple. As noted above, the participle διασπελλουσα is part of a periphrastic construction that renders a Hebrew participle. The meaning of the verb διασπελλω is "to separate, distinguish, determine," and "to command, give orders."⁴¹ פָּרַץ qal has meanings such as "break through, break out, break into, break up," but it also occasionally means "to spread, become known." The niph'al is cited in BDB as "spread abroad," but the definition given by Holladay is "to be ordered,

³⁷Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, § 107b. The Greek translators also emphasized the continuous nature of his blindness by using the imperfect rather than the aorist.

³⁸Cf. Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *Die Samuelbücher*, 2d ed., Das Alte Testament Deutsch, ed. Volkmar Hertrich and Artur Weiser, vol. 10 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), 29. Hertzberg interprets the *waw* as a *waw* conjunctive rather than a *waw* consecutive, but the reason for using this construction rather than the usual *waw* consecutive with an imperfect to indicate past narrative action is unclear, so it seems better to understand MT as a *waw* consecutive perfect construction; on this point cf. John Mauchline, *1 and 2 Samuel*, New Century Bible, ed. Ronald E. Clements and Matthew Black (London: Oliphants, 1971), 58. The translators of P certainly understood the construction as referring to a future time.

³⁹Thackeray, *Grammar*, xx. Cf. also A. T. Robertson, *Grammar*, 866-69.

⁴⁰The niph'al in this verb carries reflexive rather than active meaning. Cf. Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 391.

⁴¹Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968) [hereafter LS], s.v. "δια-σπέλλω."

orderly.”⁴² The exact meaning of the Hebrew word is obscure, with commentators divided between the definitions given above (contrast McCarter and Klein).⁴³ The textual question at this point, however, is whether the LXX reading reflects a Hebrew text different from MT. *BHK* suggests that LXX reflects a reading פִּרְיָ, to be pointed פִּרְיָ or פִּרְיָ (though it prefers either the reading of MT or the qal passive participle to the reading of LXX),⁴⁴ but *BHS* does not have any textual comment on the word. It is possible that the *nun* of the niphil is the result of dittography and that the occurrence of this verb in the niphil stem in postbiblical Hebrew developed from this passage.⁴⁵ The niphil stem is not frequent enough in the chapter to state conclusively that LXX normally rendered it with a passive verb, at least when it had a passive meaning, though the other three occurrences in the chapter are rendered with passives. However, the methodology only allows the elimination of variants that are probably not significant, so this borderline case will be considered significant at this point.

In the case of variant 48, a hiphil is rendered by a verb in the active voice that does not normally have a causative meaning. Greek does not have a causative voice, though it does possess words whose root meanings are causative (cf. 3:12 ἐπεγερῶ; 3:13 ἀνηγγέλκα; 3:15 ἀπαγγείλα; 3:17 προσθειῆ). πίπτω does not usually have a causative meaning. However, it is not uncommon for words in the active voice to have causative meanings in LXX that they do not normally have in nonbiblical Greek.⁴⁶ Therefore, this variant should not be considered significant.

The last two variants among the verbs concern instances in which the Greek verb is plural but the Hebrew verb is singular. Though table 8 on verbal number suggests that the overwhelming majority of Hebrew singulars are rendered by Greek singulars, both variants 46 and 49 involve the word כָּל. (Since the noun in variant 43 also figures in the discussion of variant 46, it will be considered here as well.) Greek does not utilize collective nouns to the extent that Hebrew does, and this fact is demonstrated in variant 49, where the Hebrew verb is singular to agree with the singular form of יִשְׂרָאֵל, whereas the Greek verb is plural to agree with the plural idea of Ἰσραήλ. An awareness of the translators’ shift from singular to plural in this verse helps explain the shift in variants 43

⁴²BDB, s.v. “פִּרְיָ” (BDB says, though, that the text of this passage is dubious); Holladay, *Lexicon*, s.v. “פִּרְיָ.” Holladay follows the suggestion of G. R. Driver, who says on the basis of Assyrian evidence that two different roots פִּרְיָ exist in the OT. Cf. Godfrey Rolles Driver, “Some Hebrew Roots and Their Meanings,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 23 (1922): 71-73; idem, “Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament: III,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 32 (1931): 365.

⁴³Smith says the word seems to have “no good meaning” (H. P. Smith, *Books of Samuel*, 27).

⁴⁴Cf. also Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 51; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 95.

⁴⁵McCarter, *I Samuel*, 97; cf. Wilhelm Caspari, *Die Samuelbücher*, Kommentar zum Alten Testament, ed. Ernst Sellin, vol. 7 (Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl, 1926), 53.

⁴⁶Conybeare and Stock, *Grammar*, 76-77.

and 46. The construction כל הדבר in verse 17 can mean either “the whole matter” or “every word” (i.e., “everything”); the translators apparently understood the phrase to mean “the whole matter,” to which the translation παντων των λογων (“all the words”) is roughly equivalent.⁴⁷ Since the participle (in Greek) had to agree with the noun, it was also changed from singular to plural. Thus, the presence of כל and παν in these two verses provides an extenuating circumstance in each case that explains the translators’ retreat from their usual method of rendering verbal and nominal number, and the variants are not significant.

Five other cases of difference in number in nouns and pronouns appear in the chapter, variants 5, 24, 25, 32, and 36, all of which have a plural in the Greek that corresponds to a singular in MT. In variant 5, the plural οφθαλμοι corresponds with the *qere* reading in MT, עיניו, and it also agrees with the number of the verb וחקלו, so the Greek almost certainly reflects a plural *Vorlage*. However, it would be a mistake to assume that the translator was rendering עיניו rather than עינו, since the latter reflects an orthography current until about the fifth century B.C.E.⁴⁸ In other words, the translation in LXX could well reflect the reading עינו, so variant 5 is not significant.⁴⁹

In the cases of variants 24, 32, and 36, table 10 indicates that Hebrew singulars are usually represented by Greek singulars, but there are enough instances of singulars being represented by plurals to question the propriety of calling such variants significant without supporting evidence. In variants 24 and 32, such evidence may be present. In both cases the LXX sentence structure is different from that of MT. In verse 11, MT reads אנכי ישראל עשה דבר בישראל, whereas LXX reads εγω ποιω τα ρηματα μου εν Ισραηλ; the following clause is also different in that LXX lacks anything to render the relative particle. Furthermore, it is possible that the plural ending or the pronominal suffix were omitted through haplography and graphic confusion: דברי ישראל or דברים בישראל became דבר בישראל. The fact that αυτα (variant 25) is also plural and that it is the only instance in the chapter in which a singular pronoun in MT is rendered by a plural pronoun in LXX also supports the possibility that the noun in variant 24 was plural in the *Vorlage* of LXX. In variant 32, a difference in structure also exists: εν αδικιας υμων αυτου for בעון אשר ידע. This difference in structure is probably related to the *tiqqun sopherim* in the same verse. The disturbance in the text in verse 13, like that in verse 11, increases the

⁴⁷Cf. Smyth, *Grammar*, 296. “Every word” would require (εκ) παντος λογου.

⁴⁸Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, “Another Look at 4QSam^b,” *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989): 23-27. For a more extensive discussion of orthography, see below, pp. 212-16.

⁴⁹Whether the LXX translators would have known of earlier orthographic practices is ultimately unanswerable, though it seems arrogant to deny the possibility that individual ancient translators would have been aware of different spelling conventions. Even if one suspects that the LXX *Vorlage* read עיניו, the fact that עיניו and עינו are probably simply orthographic variations rules out the possibility that the LXX reading is significant as defined in this study.

likelihood that the text underlying LXX was different from that of MT. Thus, variants 24, 25, and 32 should all be considered significant at this point.

The text around variant 36, on the other hand, shows no signs of textual disturbance, and since the table indicates that it is not uncommon for singulars to be rendered by plurals, this variant cannot be taken as significant.

The final variant to be considered under the category of consistency is variant 23, in which $\tau\alpha \rho\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ stands for רַב־רַב , a noun with an article for an indefinite Hebrew noun. A look at the two tables concerning articles and definiteness indicates that the translators were consistent about rendering Hebrew articles, both present and implied in pointing in MT, with Greek articles. However, Hebrew substantives that are definite by virtue of being in construct with a definite substantive (including determination by a pronominal suffix) are not consistently rendered by Greek words with articles. Furthermore, Hebrew nouns without articles are not rendered consistently, though indefinite nouns are usually translated by Greek nouns without articles. However, the lack of overall consistency in rendering both articles and definiteness (note the high deviation factors) casts doubt on the reliability of Greek articles as to the reading of the *Vorlage*. In addition, the add-om $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ in LXX, if it accurately reflects the Hebrew *Vorlage*, would eliminate the possibility of a Hebrew article, since a noun cannot have both an article and a pronominal suffix.⁵⁰ Therefore, variant 23 is not significant.

Now that the significant variants dealing with consistency have been determined, the partial translation technique in several categories needs to be recalculated, in order to obtain a more realistic appraisal of the translators' approach to their task. The first step in the reevaluation process is to eliminate all references to the data contained in the significant variants. For example, since variant 3, rendering a niph'al stem with a verb in the active voice, is considered a significant variant, it is deemed probable at this stage of the investigation that the *Vorlage* of LXX did not have a niph'al at this point. Not enough groundwork has yet been laid to allow one to retrovert the LXX reading into Hebrew, so at this stage the references to the niph'al and the active voice are simply eliminated from the data. If it is found later that the variant is in fact not significant, the references will be added again to the data. Variant 33 is not represented in the statistical data because the Hebrew לְהַבִּיחַ is a compound that appears only once with a single equivalent, and Hebrew words must appear twice to be counted for lexical consistency. Similarly, variant 34 is not represented in the data because no category for word division exists. The elimination from the statistical data of significant variants like these two that are not already represented will not affect the calculation of the translation technique.

The elimination from the statistics of the significant variants does not end the

⁵⁰For a discussion of definiteness in Hebrew nouns, see Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, §§ 125-27.

recalculation of the translation technique. Other factors besides variant *Vorlage* have also skewed the results so that the translators appear usually somewhat less literal, but sometimes more literal, in their approach than they really were. The other factors in question will be dealt with in the order of the tables. After all these other factors have been noted, the summaries at the bottoms of all the tables that have changed will be listed.

First, in representing the Hebrew verbal stem (cf. table 6), the translators were constrained by the Greek language in some of their choices, specifically, those verbs whose active voices were not used (deponents) or were used with a different meaning.⁵¹ There are no truly deponent verbs in chapter 3,⁵² but there are several that correspond to qal or piel verbs whose use in middle or passive voice is required in order to preserve the correct verbal idea: πορεύω (three times), σοφίζω, κοιμάω (twice), φοβέω, μεγαλυνώ. In addition, LS indicates that αρχω is found more commonly in the middle than in the active, and Bauer notes that in the *koine* of the NT and early Christian writers, the meaning “to begin” is found only in the middle; the active means “to rule.”⁵³ It is probable, then, that the translators considered it necessary to use the middle αρχομαι in order to convey the proper meaning. Furthermore, as noted above, though λαληθεν and λαληθεντων do not require a change in the consonantal text, it is likely that the translators looked at רבך in both places as puals rather than piels.

The second table that needs to have some of its data adjusted is table 11, comparing the use of nouns and adjectives in Hebrew with case in Greek. Hebrew grammars often describe Hebrew as though it were an Indo-European language, using terms, such as genitive, that do not correspond exactly to genitives in languages such as Greek or Latin. It seems preferable to describe the function of Hebrew substantives in terms that are appropriate to the language and then attempt to compare it with a language from a different family of languages. The initial analysis evidenced in table 11 shows quite a bit of disparity, as might have been expected, but it is possible to manipulate the data somewhat in order to arrive at a clearer picture of the translators’ understanding of both Hebrew and Greek. First, the dative that corresponds to a Hebrew direct object is in fact a dative of direct object, following a verb of serving,⁵⁴ so it may be combined with the accusative when the deviation factor is figured, since the dative is required by the language. Second, since the relationship between Hebrew prepositions and objects is manifold, the data from all the Greek oblique cases should be combined, and the result is exact correspondence. Finally, Hebrew participles that function as verbs really have no counterpart in the Greek substantival system, even though they may be represented by Greek participles with

⁵¹ Cf. Smyth, *Grammar*, 218-24

⁵² καθημα in B, v. 2, is deponent, but καθευδε has been read instead; see above, pp. 38-39.

⁵³ LS, s.v. “APXΩ”; BAG, s.v. “ἀρχω.”

⁵⁴ Smyth, *Grammar*, 339.

substantival attributes, so they should be eliminated from consideration. The same considerations also apply to table 16, which deals with the use and case of pronouns. In addition, the row labeled “adj” should be grouped with the objects of the prepositions, since all three of the pronouns functioning as adjectives (demonstratives) are in apposition to a noun that is an object of a preposition.

Table 14 deals with the gender of pronouns, and it might seem surprising at first glance that the deviation factor is so low (1.44) in comparison with that of the table 9, gender of nouns and adjectives (21.54). However, when one realizes that most of the pronouns (thirty-four of thirty-eight) in the chapter refer to people and that their gender is not a mere grammatical category, the low deviation factor becomes understandable. An alternate deviation factor, with pronouns referring to people excluded, will be calculated for comparison.

The changes to the tables that result from the elimination of the significant variants and from the modifications to the data discussed above yield the following results:

<u>Table</u>	<u>Changes</u>
1	Gk words: 40 1.29 Gk words/Heb word deviation factor: 0.31 total Heb (>1x): 129 primary Gk: 116 90.5% by primary rendering Gk roots: 40 1.38 Gk roots/Heb root
2	Gk advs: 23 1.77 Gk advs/Heb adv total Heb (>1x): 82 81.7% of Heb advs by primary rendering deviation factor: 1.27
4	percentage of verbs/verbals represented by verbs/verbals: 93/94 = 98.9% percentage of infinitives represented by infinitives: 4/6 = 66.7%
5	deviation factor (discrete tense/mood combinations): 6.70 deviation factor (grouped): 0.85 deviation factor (grouped, without verbals): 0.83
6	deviation factor: 3.55
10	deviation factor: 1.33
14	deviation factor (excluding references to people): 5.00
15	deviation factor: 0.00

These results permit a better informed appraisal of the translators’ approach to the text than was possible before the raw data was examined more closely (see above, pp. 85-86). The conclusions concerning lexical data and word classes appear sound after a reappraisal of the data. Several modifications must be made, though, to the characterization of grammatical consistency stated earlier. The translators were absolutely consistent in rendering not only the person of verbs, but also the number of pronouns. They are very

consistent in rendering the inflection of verbs (grouped), verbal number, grammatical use of nouns and adjectives, and grammatical use of pronouns. They are only a little less consistent in their rendering of the number of nouns and adjectives. They are still fairly inconsistent in their rendering of articles and definiteness, as well as in their rendering of verbal stem. They are still very inconsistent in their rendering of the gender of nouns and adjectives. The rendering of pronominal gender requires special comment. It might have been supposed that the deviation factor would have soared to levels near that of the gender of nouns and adjectives once references to the gender of people were removed, but instead it increased only to 5.00. The reason for this unexpectedly low deviation factor is that only four of the pronouns in the chapter (out of thirty-eight) refer to objects other than people, and the highest deviation factor possible for four items (they are all masculine in Hebrew) put into three categories (masculine, feminine, neuter in Greek) is 8.00, when the items are split 0, 2, 2 and the 0 refers to the category that corresponds most closely to that of the source language, the one that was expected (in this case masculine gender).⁵⁵ The split in the present case is 0, 3, 1, because there are no masculine pronouns in Greek, three feminine pronouns, and one neuter pronoun. The rendering of the gender of pronouns referring to objects other than people, then, is inconsistent (in the chapter it is consistently something other than what might be expected, but too few examples occur to state conclusively that the rendering of pronominal gender is very inconsistent, though such is probably the case over a larger amount of data). The corollary to this observation is that when the pronouns do refer to people, the rendering in LXX is absolutely consistent, at least in this chapter.

Variants in the Representation of Hebrew Lexemes by Greek Lexemes (Segmentation)

The fact that only 62.8% of the Hebrew compound words found in MT are rendered exactly in LXX leads one to suspect immediately that none of the variants is significant. Even if one of the variants appeared to have some claim to represent a different *Vorlage*, reasons other than simply the failure of the Greek to represent every Hebrew element in the compound would have to be present for the variant to be considered significant.

Most of the variations in segmentation deal with instances in which the Greek translators failed to render the prepositions ל or לִּשׁ in compounds. Since the omission of any Greek preposition is one of the two main ways the translators chose to render לִּשׁ (omission four times, πρὸς six times, others two times), and since omission was the main way they rendered ל (eleven of thirteen times), the variations in segmentation that result

⁵⁵The zero as part of the data is a special case that is used only when the category in the target language that corresponds most closely to that in the source language is empty, as it is here. See Appendix 4 for details on the calculations.

three positions. Associated with this apparent shift of וַיִּצְמַר is the omission of any word in LXX corresponding to וַיִּקְרָא (variant 98, below) and the rendering of וַיִּצְמַר with πρὸς (variant 40, above). It is almost certain that the LXX translators had a text different from MT at this point, so the variant is significant.

Variant 68 has καὶ ἦν κυριος for וַיְהִי וַיְהִי. It is easy to see how a Hebrew scribe could have confused the word order in either direction between וַיְהִי וַיְהִי and וַיְהִי וַיְהִי. Since either order is idiomatic Hebrew, this variant is also significant.⁶⁰

When these two significant variants are eliminated from the statistical data because they are no longer considered variations from the *Vorlage*, the data related to word order is modified. There are now 369 Hebrew semantic units, 0 variations, and the Hebrew word order is followed 100.0% of the time.

Variants in Quantitative Representation

A glance at the summary at the bottom of the table dealing with quantitative representation indicates that the Greek translators were not overly concerned with representing every possible aspect of the Hebrew text without addition or omission. A more careful perusal does reveal some trends, though. LXX has fifty-seven semantic units which have no apparent counterpart in MT, and MT has thirty-one semantic units which have none in LXX. If the long addition in LXX in verse 21 (variant 105) is omitted from consideration, however, the excess in MT outweighs the excess in LXX thirty-one to twenty-six. (Variant 105 is assumed to be significant at this point, but it will be examined in detail later.) If the figures are recalculated, omitting the thirty-one words of the long addition in verse 21, the result is an 87.0% agreement between MT and LXX. This figure is a more accurate representation of the translators' concern to maintain a one-to-one correspondence between their *Vorlage* and LXX, though it will have to be modified again after an in-depth examination of the data.

The first case to be examined, variant 97, has an excess in MT, and it is concerned with the omission of וְאֵלֶּיךָ which is followed by a noun functioning as an indirect object. Since an omission is one of the two main ways in which וְאֵלֶּיךָ is rendered, this variant cannot be considered significant.

Variant 69 concerns the addition of a form of εἶμι to a participle in LXX, resulting in a periphrastic construction. As noted above (see discussion on variant 1), the LXX translators often rendered Hebrew participles with Greek verbs, including periphrastic verbs, so this variant cannot be considered significant.

The next group of cases to be examined are those that, if secondary, could be

⁶⁰Of course, the confusion could have arisen at the moment of translation, without the benefit of a different *Vorlage*, but for methodological reasons, and since the variant is clearly not an inner-Greek corruption, the decisions as to when exactly the variant arose, as well as which order is original, belong to a later stage in the process of evaluating the various extant readings. See above, p. 25, n. 50.

classified as explanatory expansions;⁶¹ variants 70, 72, 76, 79, 82, 87, 89, 90, 92, 99, 102, and 103 fall into this category. Together, they represent a deviation of sixteen semantic units between MT and LXX. The fact that each version has eight excess semantic units as compared with the other demonstrates that the tendency toward expansion was not limited to the translators of LXX, for it shows eight possible Hebrew expansions in MT. An examination of these variants might reveal that one or two are primary, and their omissions secondary, but the evaluation process belongs to a later stage in the process of reconstructing the text. The important point here is that the LXX translators do not show any tendency toward expanding their text with explanatory elements, so it is likely that most or all of the explanatory expansions in LXX are derived from the Hebrew *Vorlage*, so all these variants should be considered significant.

On five occasions, LXX has a καί which does not correspond to a Hebrew conjunction (variants 71, 77, 78, 85, and 88). It is important to note that all five additions of conjunctions are in LXX; no additional conjunctions (aside from conjunctions included as part of a larger phrase) appear in MT. On the other hand, the LXX translators show a concern for consistency with conjunctions (see table 3), and this factor, too, must be taken into account. Three of the variants (77, 85, and 88) concern the phrase ἀναστρέφε καὶ καθευθε. It was noted above (pp. 41-42) that the Hebrew phrase in MT displays a common form of Hebrew asyndeton with an auxiliary-like verb and that the translators might have felt that an additional καί in each instance would have been a better balance for the following phrase. Thus, it is doubtful that these conjunctions reflect conjunctions in the Hebrew *Vorlage*, so these variants are not significant.

Variant 71 has an additional καί at the beginning of the final clause of verse 2. Since MT usually begins clauses in a narrative with a conjunction, it is somewhat surprising not to find one here. The additional καί in LXX could either be a reflection of a different *Vorlage* or an assimilation to usual Hebrew style. The addition or omission of conjunctions is a frequent variant even among Masoretic mss, and it is impossible to determine at this point whether the conjunction lay in the *Vorlage* or in the translator's mind, but it seems best to consider the variant significant.⁶²

The final example of an additional καί is variant 78, which reads καὶ προσεθετο κυριος καὶ εκαλεσεν for אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה קָרָא. This variant is related to variant 12 above, and, as noted there, the construction in LXX contains a Hebraism that a literal rendering of MT would not have, namely, προσεθετο καὶ εκαλεσεν for a single verbal idea. The

⁶¹ See Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle*, 1:*72, in the discussion of factor 7: "Dans certains cas, la forme particulière d'un texte est le résultat d'une exégèse spéciale que l'on en donnait. . . . Ou il arrivait aussi qu'ils voulaient un texte qui exprimât plus clairement un sens qui n'en ressortait qu'imparfaitement." Cf. also the discussion on p. XIX concerning *explicitation* and *amplification*.

⁶² So Alfons Schulz, *Die Bücher Samuel*, Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament, ed. Johannes Nikel, vol. 8 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1919), 57-58.

omission of ם on the front of קרם could be explained as graphic confusion with the adjacent ם, perhaps abbreviated as ם. Variant 78, then, is a significant variant.

Another group of variants that share a common feature is variants 75, 80, and 91, each dealing with the number of times Samuel’s name was repeated when God called him. MT in verses 4, 6, 8, and 10 reads שמואל; שמואל; שמואל; and שמואל שמואל, respectively. Of these, the first is an indirect object (following ם), and the last is clearly vocative. The other two could conceivably be interpreted as either accusatives or vocatives, but the lack of ם before שמואל in both cases implies that they are vocatives.⁶³ LXX reads Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ; Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ; and Σαμουηλ in verses 4, 6, and 8, and it omits any reference to Samuel in the corresponding clause in verse 10. The references in verses 4 and 6 are vocatives, but that in verse 8 is probably accusative. Of the four instances cited, MT and LXX agree in only one, verse 8 (and even there they probably differ in their understanding of the syntactic relationship of “Samuel” to the rest of the verse). The fact that neither version is consistently shorter or longer than the other and that neither is identical in all three instances suggests that the variants did not arise from the translators but from their *Vorlage*. Thus, variants 75, 80, and 91 should all be considered significant.

The omission of ם in variant 74 should be considered in conjunction with variant 75. While it is true that the omission of ם is usually not significant (see above on variant 97), the similarity between ם and שמואל, coupled with the fact that variant 75 involves an omission, suggests the possibility that the ם in MT could be a remnant of an earlier שמואל. Thus, variant 74 should be considered significant.⁶⁴

The next variants to be considered are two pairs of apparent substitutional variants: 83 and 84, and 100 and 101. MT in verse 6 reads לם קרם בני, and LXX reads ου κεκληκα σε, so it seems that בני and σε are substitutional equivalents for one another.⁶⁵ It

⁶³Wellhausen says that שמואל in 3:6 must be vocative, since it lacks a preceding ם; Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 52; cf. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, § 117a. However, there are exceptions to the rule that a definite direct object should be preceded by ם; see Waltke and O’Connor, *Introduction*, 180. Takamitsu Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1985; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1985), 146-58, also notes exceptions, but in his analysis of 1 Samuel 1-8, he finds no examples of accusative proper names without ם (cf. p. 150). KJV, ASV, NIV, and NRSV read a vocative in 3:6 and an accusative in 3:8. NAB, GNB, and REB apparently read accusatives in both verses, but the accusatives could have been used because they are stylistically preferable in English. Klostermann, Dhorme, Budde, McCarter, and Klein all accept the LXX reading in 3:6, but in 3:8, Dhorme and Budde read accusative, while the other three read vocative; Klostermann, *Bücher Samuelis*, 11; Dhorme, *Livres de Samuel*, 43; Karl Budde, *Die Bücher Samuel*, Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, ed. Karl Marti, vol. 8 (Tübingen and Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1902), 27; McCarter, *I Samuel*, 94; R. W. Klein, *I Samuel*, 29.

⁶⁴Cf. Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 16; cf. also Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 52; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, 42.

⁶⁵Cf. Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle*, 1:73-74. After a discussion of conflated readings (factor 13), he says, “En d’autres occasions, le texte subissait une correction, mais on omettait d’ôter du texte la forme primitive qu’on venait de remplacer par la forme corrigée.” Cf. also p. XX.

is possible that the variants arose from the graphic similarity of כ and כ, perhaps from an original קר ארת׳, but the direction of the variant (if in fact it did arise in this way) is unclear. Nevertheless, the likelihood of graphic similarity suggests a Hebrew rather than Greek origin of the variant, so variants 83 and 84 are significant.

In the last clause of 3:17, MT reads מכל הדבר אשר דבר אל יך, whereas LXX reads εκ παντων των λογων των λαληθεντων εν τοις ωσιν σου. The variation between יך אל and εν τοις ωσιν σου probably did not arise because of graphic similarity but because the phrase reflected in LXX is cumbersome. It is, however, the type of expression characteristic of Hebrew rather than Greek (cf. 1 Sam 15:14; 25:24; 2 Sam 7:22; 18:12; 22:7, etc.). The tendency of the translators would probably be in the direction of better Greek idiom than a more Hebraic expression if they were the ones who introduced the variant. It is probable, then, that the root of the variant found in LXX lies in the *Vorlage*, and variants 100 and 101 should be considered significant.⁶⁶

The next variants to be considered are variants 94 and 95. Though the two variants correspond in position, they are not substitutional variants like the previous cases, since they are not semantically equivalent. It seems that a textual disruption exists here, for it is difficult to see how one reading could have arisen from the other in either Hebrew or Greek, though both make sense. It is possible that υτωσ αυτου was transposed from υτοι αυτου later in the same verse, but the same transposition could have occurred in Hebrew. In the absence of other data, and in light of the textual disruption, these variants should be considered significant.

Variants 81, 96, and 98 have in common that they all represent a compound (two-fold) verbal phrase in one version where the other version has a simple (one-fold) verbal phrase. In the first two of these variants, the shorter text is probably the result of parablepsis, but the omission could have occurred as easily in one language as in the other. There is no indication that the translators would have omitted the phrase intentionally, but it is certainly possible that וקם שמואל in variant 81 was omitted accidentally in the process of translation.⁶⁷ However, variant 96 demonstrates that Hebrew scribes were not immune from such mistakes, so it is impossible to tell whether the presumed omission in variant 81 occurred in the process of transmission (Hebrew or Greek) or translation. Therefore, it should probably be considered significant, and variant 96 should certainly be considered significant.

Variant 98 is somewhat different from the other two, inasmuch as it is associated with further textual disruption (see above, variants 40 and 68). The shorter reading in verse 16 is not the result of parablepsis. Instead, MT here looks like the result of the conflation of two variant readings, ו׳אמר and ו׳קר. If this is indeed the case, the

⁶⁶Cf. Schulz, *Bücher Samuel*, 65.

⁶⁷Contra Budde, *Bücher Samuel*, 27.

shorter LXX version represents an earlier form of the text, one clearly based on a Hebrew *Vorlage*, since the conflation occurred in Hebrew rather than Greek. Variant 98, then, is significant.

Variants 73, 86, and 93 all represent Hebrew texts that are one word longer than LXX. In variant 73, MT reads אֲשֶׁר שָׁם, and LXX reads ου. Though one might have expected a rendering like that found in Gen 2:11 (εκει ου), the translators here were content to render both Hebrew words with a single Greek word. The usual relative adverb in classical Greek would have been οπου, but the genitive of the relative pronoun was also used to indicate the adverbial idea of place,⁶⁸ so this variant is not significant.

Variant 86 deals with the failure to render the second אֲשֶׁר in verse 7. This variant has already been discussed somewhat in the previous chapter (p. 46), where it was noted that whereas Hebrew prepositions usually govern only one word, Greek prepositions frequently govern more than one object. It is not unknown, however, for Hebrew prepositions to govern two or more words (cf. p. 46, n. 36). Furthermore, though it is no problem to have a Greek preposition govern multiple nouns, it is also perfectly idiomatic to repeat prepositions. The question to ask is whether the translators show a tendency to modify an acceptable Greek reading that closely reflects the Hebrew text to one that is perhaps somewhat closer to classical style, but further removed from Hebrew idiom. The answer seems to be that the translators show no such tendency. What might be seen as modifications in the renderings of אֲשֶׁר שָׁם (3:3) and כַּפְעַם בַּפְעַם (3:10) would be unidiomatic if translated word for word and so do not apply to the present case. The numerous Hebraisms preserved in LXX (e.g., και προσεθετο κυριος και εκαλεσεν [3:6], ταδε ποιησαι σοι ο θεος και ταδε προσθειη [3:17], εν τοις ωσιν σου [3:17]) show that the translators were not primarily interested in good Greek idiom, though they sought an understandable text. The fact that the hexaplaric mss Acx also fail to render the second אֲשֶׁר supports the idea that the second אֲשֶׁר was not present in all Hebrew texts even in the third Christian century, and it seems probable that the ms from which the translators of Samuel worked omitted it as well. Variant 86 should be considered significant.

In verse 11 (variant 93), MT reads אֲשֶׁר כָּל, while LXX simply has παντος. Of the other four occurrences of אֲשֶׁר in the chapter, the translators rendered it with a relative pronoun twice and an article (substituting for a relative pronoun) twice. A perusal of other occurrences in the books of Samuel indicates that the relative or its equivalent was the common rendering of אֲשֶׁר, and it seems unlikely that the translators of LXX would have failed to render it had it been in their *Vorlage*. The omission of the conjunction in T supports the assumption that Hebrew mss existed which omitted the word. Therefore, the variant is significant.

⁶⁸Smyth, *Grammar*, 562; LS, s.v. “Ὅς, ἧ, ὅ.” Cf. the rendering of אֲשֶׁר בְּ in Judg 5:27 LXXA,B.

Only two variants dealing with quantitative representation remain, variants 104 and 105 in verse 21. Though one phrase is missing from LXX (בשלו בדבר יהוה), variant 104), by far the shorter text is MT, which lacks thirty-one semantic units found in LXX (variant 105). Much of the content seems to be a duplication of phrases from verse 20 and even phrases from verse 21 itself. It is probable that part of the difficulty in MT arose from parablepsis: the last word in verse 21 in MT is יהוה, and the last word in LXX is κρυου. However, simple parablepsis does not account for LXX's omission of בשלו בדבר יהוה, and the redundancy of the verse suggests an earlier disturbance of the text.⁶⁹ Much of verse 21 may even be seen as an alternate version of verse 20, though the content is not identical. At this point it is sufficient to point out the strong probability that the disturbance arose in Hebrew rather than in Greek (cf. especially the Hebraism προρευομενοι ε προρευοντο), so both variants are significant.⁷⁰

When the variants that probably represent a different Hebrew *Vorlage* are eliminated from the quantitative representation data, only 7 of the original 88 deviations remain. Of the 438 Hebrew semantic units in the original calculations, 28 are eliminated from consideration at this time, that is, all those significant variants in which the excess was in MT. The result is a 98.3% rate of agreement between MT and LXX, a figure much higher than the preliminary partial translation technique indicated. This figure indicates that the translators of LXX were careful to represent all the words that lay before them in their *Vorlage*, without adding any, with a few exceptions. It is true that some of variants eliminated as significant may never have existed in Hebrew mss but were rather unintentional mistakes made in the process of translation. However, *unintentional* variants say nothing about the *intention* of the translators, which is the basis of translation technique.⁷¹

Peshitta

Limitations of Syriac for Rendering Hebrew

Unlike Greek, Syriac is a Semitic language closely allied with Hebrew; both are representatives of the Northwest branch of the language group. The Northwest (or simply West) Semitic languages, at least the later representatives of the group, are usually divided

⁶⁹The exact meaning of בשלו בדבר יהוה in the context of the verse is unclear; cf. Walter Dietrich, *David, Saul und die Propheten: Das Verhältnis von Religion und Politik nach den prophetischen Überlieferungen vom frühesten Königtum in Israel*, Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 122 (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1987), 119-20.

⁷⁰Cf. Barthélemy, ed., *Critique textuelle*, 1: 151-52, and the commentaries.

⁷¹Of course, the carelessness of the translators is also a factor in translation technique, but in a project as important as the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into the common language must have been for them, it may probably be assumed that the translators made an effort to minimize careless errors.

into two main subgroups: the Canaanite (including Hebrew, Moabite, and Phoenician) and the Aramaic.⁷² Aramaic itself may be divided into various subgroups on the basis of time and geography.⁷³ Since Syriac is a Semitic language, the Syriac representation of a Hebrew text could be very close indeed to the *Vorlage*, in both syntax and vocabulary. Nevertheless, significant differences do exist between the two languages, and these must be noted.

The nominal system of Syriac shares with Hebrew two genders (masculine and feminine). Because both are Semitic languages, they share many common roots, and it is not surprising that a large number of words sharing common roots also share the gender inherited from a common ancestor. Not all words from common roots have the same gender, however, and Syriac possesses many roots foreign to Biblical Hebrew. Like Greek, Syriac only has two numbers (singular and plural); the dual has fallen into disuse, except for the numbers two and two hundred.⁷⁴ Thus, Hebrew duals are generally rendered by Syriac plurals.

Another difference exists in the number of states available, with two in Hebrew (absolute and construct) and three in Syriac (absolute, construct, and emphatic). The existence of the emphatic state in Syriac highlights another difference, namely, that Syriac lacks an article.⁷⁵ In Syriac, the absolute state rarely occurs, except in certain constructions.⁷⁶ Its place is regularly assumed by the emphatic, which is the lexical form in most lexicons. It cannot be assumed, then, that the use of the emphatic state in the Syriac implies any sort of definiteness in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. The construct case is also

⁷²*The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia* [hereafter *ISBE*], 1988 ed., s.v. "Semites," by Mario Liverani, trans. William Sanford LaSor, 388; for a concise chart of the Semitic languages, see M. J. Mulder et al., eds., *The World of the Bible*, trans. Sierd Woudstra, vol. 1 of *Bible Handbook*, ed. A. S. van der Woude (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1986), 77. For a way of grouping the Semitic languages into two branches rather than three, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 5.

⁷³Joseph A. Fitzmyer distinguishes five historical phases of the language: Old Aramaic (925 B.C.E. to 700 B.C.E.), Official Aramaic (*Reichsaramäisch*) (700 B.C.E. to 200 B.C.E.), Middle Aramaic (200 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.), Late Aramaic (200 C.E. to 700 C.E.), and Modern Aramaic (still spoken today in isolated locales). Syriac is a representative of the Eastern branch of Late Aramaic. The particular dialect of Syriac present in the Peshitta is Jacobite, a western form of Syriac, as opposed to Nestorian, an eastern form. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Phases of the Aramaic Language," chap. in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays*, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, no. 25 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1979), 60-63.

⁷⁴Carl Brockelmann, *Syrische Grammatik*, 6th ed., *Porta Linguarum Orientalium*, ed. Richard Hartmann, no. 5 (Leipzig: Otto Harrasowitz, 1951), 51n.

⁷⁵The characteristic ܠܝ ending of the emphatic state in Aramaic (including Syriac) may be the remains of a postpositive article. See Brockelmann, *Grammatik*, 51; Fitzmyer, "Phases," 66, 69.

⁷⁶Robinson lists four types of cases: predicate nominatives, nouns in distributive phrases, nouns after ܠܐ (= "all, every"), and nouns after numerals. The use of the absolute case is not universal in the last three types of cases. See Theodore H. Robinson, *Paradigms and Exercises in Syriac Grammar*, 4th ed., ed. L. H. Brockington (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 21. Brockelmann adds proper nouns to the list of uses of the absolute, as well as a few rarer instances of its use; *Grammatik*, 104-5.

used less in Syriac than in Hebrew, its place being taken by the relative particle ܐ followed by a noun in the emphatic case.⁷⁷ Because of these differences between Hebrew and Syriac idiom in regard to the use of states, the textual critic must use caution in analyzing the implications of differences between P and MT.

With regard to the verbal system, both Hebrew and Syriac verbs can be classified by stem (or conjugation), inflection, person, gender, and number. Some differences do exist, however, in the use of stem and inflection. Hebrew's seven stems in three groups are rendered by Syriac's six stems in three groups: simple stems (peal, ethpeal), intensive stems (pael, ethpael), and extensive (or causative) stems (aphel, ettaphal). There are no distinct reflexive stems in Syriac.⁷⁸ Despite the differences, a great degree of correlation is possible: for example, between qal and peal, niph'al and ethpael, or hiph'il and aphel. However, Syriac may employ a verb in one stem to render a Hebrew verb that regularly occurs in another.⁷⁹

The greatest distinction in the use of inflection between Hebrew and Syriac is the lack of any construct in Syriac corresponding to the Hebrew *waw* consecutive construction. Thus, the correspondence that normally exists between a Hebrew and Syriac inflection will generally be reversed when the *waw* consecutive is used in Hebrew. Another difference between the use of inflections in Hebrew and Syriac is that in the latter, the inflections have come to be used more or less as tenses (perfect for past, imperfect for future), perhaps under the influence of Greek. In addition, the participle is used with a personal pronoun as a present tense, and three compound tenses have developed, all of which use forms of the copula ܐܘܪܘܢ.⁸⁰

One stylistic characteristic of the Syriac language must be noted, namely, the extensive use of the anticipatory pronoun. A verb that has a noun (either a common or a proper noun, but not a pronoun) for a direct object will often have a third person pronominal suffix attached to the verb that "anticipates" the direct object, agreeing with it in number and gender. Similarly, nouns that could possibly appear in the construct case frequently have an anticipatory pronominal suffix attached to them and are followed by the relative particle and the word that it governs (i.e., what is often called the genitive).⁸¹

⁷⁷Brockelmann, *Grammatik*, 105-6.

⁷⁸T. H. Robinson, *Grammar*, 51-53.

⁷⁹For example, ܐܘܪܘܢ in P (peal) often corresponds to ܦܝܠ (piel) in MT.

⁸⁰T. H. Robinson, *Grammar*, 53, 59-60.

⁸¹Brockelmann, *Grammatik*, 115, 106.

Partial Translation Technique

Add-Oms

Since Syriac is a Semitic language, one might suppose that structures in the Hebrew text that translators of LXX found difficult to represent idiomatically would be easier to render in Syriac, and an analysis of the data supports this supposition. The translators of P often render אִשׁ or לְ with equivalent Syriac terms, and they almost always have an equivalent for לְאִשׁ. However, Syriac idiom does show itself to be different from Hebrew in the frequent replacement of the Hebrew construct chain with a noun in the emphatic state followed by the relative particle ܐ and the next word. Such constructions in Syriac will not be considered add-oms, since they are in fact the usual (though not exclusive) rendering of the Hebrew. Another aspect of Syriac idiom that has no equivalent in Hebrew is the use of anticipatory pronominal suffixes before a direct object. These anticipatory pronominal suffixes will not be considered add-oms, either. See Appendix 2 for a full list of P's add-oms.

Consistency

The following variants in P differ from MT in some way related to consistency.

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Peshitta</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
1	3:1	ܐܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ	cont past	participle
2		ܕܡܢ 1°	preposition	DDO
3	3:2	ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ	plural	singular
4		ܕܥܘܠܡܐ	verb	participle
5		ܕܥܘܠܡܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ	plural	singular
6		ܕܥܘܠܡܐ	participle	adjective
7		ܐܪܡܢܐ ܕܥܘܠܡܐ	cont past	imperfect
8	3:3	ܐܪܡܢܐ 1°	lexeme	
9		ܕܥܘܠܡܐ	verb	participle
10	3:5	ܐܪܡܢܐ	lexeme	
11	3:6	ܐܪܡܢܐ	lexeme	
12	3:7	ܐܪܡܢܐ	lexeme	
13	3:8	ܐܪܡܢܐ	verb	participle
14	3:9	ܐܪܡܢܐ	imperative	perfect w/c
15	3:12	ܐܪܡܢܐ 1°	lexeme	
16		ܐܪܡܢܐ	lexeme	
17		ܐܪܡܢܐ 2°	lexeme	
18		ܐܪܡܢܐ	noun	infinitive
19		ܐܪܡܢܐ	noun	infinitive

20	3:13	ל2°	lexeme	
21		למ	cont past	perfect
22		למ	lexeme	
23		למ	periphrasis	participle
24		למ	subject	direct object
25	3:14	למ	plural	singular
26		למ	plural	singular
27	3:15	למ	singular	plural
28		למ	verb	infinitive
29	3:17	למ2°	lexeme	
30		למ	lexeme	
31		למ	plural	singular
32		למ3°	lexeme	
33	3:18	למ	plural	singular
34	3:19	למ	lexeme	
35		-ל	lexeme	
36	3:20	למ	lexeme	
37	3:21	למ	plural	singular

Table 17.—Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives: Lexemes

Heb words (>1x): 29 Syr words: 35 1.21 Syr words/Heb word
total Heb (>1x): 132 primary Syr: 123 93.2% of Heb words by primary rendering
deviation factor: 0.26

Heb roots (>1x): 27 Syr roots: 34 1.26 Syr roots/Heb root

Table 18.—Adverbs, Prepositions, and Particles: Lexemes

Heb advs (>1x): 12 Syr advs: 22 1.83 Syr advs/Heb adv
total Heb (>1x): 85 primary Syr: 63 74.1% of Heb advs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 3.41

Table 19.—Conjunctions: Lexemes

Heb conjs (>1x): 2 Syr conjs: 4 2.00 Syr conjs/Heb conj
total Heb (>1x): 64 primary Syr: 61 95.3% of Heb conjs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 0.16

Table 20.—Word Classes

percentage of verbs/verbals represented by verbs/verbals: 94/96 = 97.9%
percentage of verbs represented by verbs: 74/75 = 98.7%
percentage of participles represented by participles: 7/12 = 58.3%
percentage of infinitives represented by infinitives: 4/7 = 57.1%
percentage of nouns/adjs represented by nouns/adjs: 65/70 = 92.9%
percentage of pronouns represented by pronouns: 42/42 = 100.0%

45	3:13	לו	,מח-
46	3:15	מהגיד	גשג
47	3:20	לנביא	גבג

Heb compounds: 47 Syr equivalents: 36 76.6% of Heb compounds rendered exactly

Word Order

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Syriac Variant</u>
48	3:1	1	גמח
49	3:6	2	גמב
50	3:11	1	גבג

Heb semantic units: 396 variations: 4 Heb word order followed 99.0% of the time

Quantitative Representation

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Variant</u>
51	3:1	+1	מח 1°
52		+1	גמג
53		+1	מ- 1°
54		+1	-ג 1°
55		+1	-ג 2°
56	3:2	+1	-ג 4°
57		+1	מח
58	3:3	+1	מ- 1°
59		+1	-ג 1°
60		+1	מ- 2°
61		+1	-ג 2°
62		+1	מ- 3°
63		+1	-ג 4°
64	3:5	-1	-ל
65		-1	-ג 5°
66	3:6	+1	ג 1°
67		+1	ג 2°
68		-1	-ל
69	3:7	+1	מ-
70		+1	-ג
71	3:8	+1	גמב
72		+1	ג 1°
73		+1	ג 2°
74		-1	-ג

75		+1	1° ג-ה-
76		+1	اطلقت
77		+1	צמחא ל
78		-1	1° ל-
79	3:9	-1	היה-
80		-1	ל-
81		-1	3° ג-
82	3:10	-3	כפעם ב-
83		+1	אתא
84		+1	2° חג
85	3:11	+1	2° ג-
86		+1	מ-
87	3:12	+1	1° ו-
88		-1	את
89	3:13	-1	1° ל-
90		+1	ממ
91		+1	ממ
92		-1	2° ל-
93		+2	למ
94	3:14	-1	1° ג-
95		+1	מ
96		+1	ג-
97		+1	1° ו-
98		+1	ג-
99	3:15	-1	1° את
100		+1	1° ג-
101		+1	1° מ-
102		+1	2° ג-
103		-1	מ
104		+1	3° ג-
105		-1	2° את
106	3:17	+2	מ
107		+1	מ
108		+1	1° חג
109		-1	מ
110		+2	3° ל
111		+1	2° חג
112	3:18	-1	ל-

113		-1	את
114		+1	מ-
115		+1	ל
116		+1	ב
117		+1	-ה
118	3:19	+1	מ-
119	3:20	+1	מ-
120		-1	ל ¹
121	3:21	+1	אחב
122		-7	כי נגלה יהודה אל שמואל בשל
123		+1	מ-
124		-1	יהודה ³

Heb semantic units: 425 Syr deviations: 85 80.0% agreement

Elimination of Variants

Deist characterizes P as follows: “On the whole the Peshitta follows the Massoretic tradition fairly faithfully. This is true especially of the Pentateuch, but also to a large extent of the books of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings.”⁸² This view of P is supported by the fact that the number of variants listed in the section on consistency is 30% shorter than the corresponding LXX list. A comparison of the first three Greek and Syriac tables shows that the lexical consistency of P is similar to that of LXX, being somewhat less consistent in the use of conjunctions and somewhat more consistent in lexical choices involving verbs, nouns, and adjectives. P tends to render words of one class in Hebrew by words of the same class in Syriac, though some deviation is evident in the rendering of nouns and adjectives. A significant amount of variation exists in the rendering of Hebrew verbals by verbals of the same class in Syriac; although the variation in participles is less than that in LXX, the translators of P clearly felt no compunction about rendering a participle or an infinitive by something other than a Syriac participle or infinitive.

As for grammatical consistency, the translators were absolutely consistent in rendering the person and number of verbs and the number of pronouns. They were very consistent in their rendering of the inflection of verbs (excluding verbals), verbal gender, and pronominal gender. They were fairly consistent in their rendering of verb stems, gender and number of nouns and adjectives, use of nouns and adjectives in the sentence, and definiteness of nouns and adjectives (though P does use the emphatic state fairly frequently when MT is indefinite). They were less consistent in their use of the emphatic

⁸²Deist, *Text of OT*, 145. Emanuel Schwartz says that P is fairly faithful to its original, though it takes many liberties; Emanuel Schwartz, *Die syrische Uebersetzung des ersten Buches Samuelis und ihr Verhältniss zu MT., LXX und Trg.* (Berlin: H. Itzkowski, 1896), 95.

state to render Hebrew articles (especially when the article is lacking in MT), and in the use of pronouns (though if objects of prepositions, which have a deviation factor of 19.13, are excluded, P becomes fairly consistent in this category). In comparison with LXX, P can be characterized as slightly more consistent in most categories related to consistency. In a few cases—namely, gender and use of nouns, rendering of articles and definiteness—P is much more consistent. One would suspect *a priori* that P would be much closer to MT in regard to both noun gender and use, since it is a cognate language, and the data supports this suspicion. The fact that P is quite a bit more consistent in rendering Hebrew articles and especially in indicating the definiteness of Hebrew nouns is somewhat unexpected, given the propensity of Syriac authors to use the emphatic state in most cases. This fact seems to indicate that the translators did have some inclination to use the emphatic state as an indicator of definiteness in the Hebrew text, but the data shows that it was not an overriding concern. One other surprise in the comparison of P with LXX is the lower deviation factor in LXX for the use of pronouns, when one would have expected the similarity of sentence structure and vocabulary to have made P have the lower deviation factor. The deviation factors of LXX and P are similar if the category of object of preposition is excluded from the Hebrew column, and the use of direct object in P for Hebrew objects of prepositions results from the omission of ל or לִּי with a pronominal suffix in every case.

P exhibits a greater tendency than LXX to render compound Hebrew words with compound Syriac words, but one out of four Hebrew compounds still goes unrepresented by a Syriac compound. Next, the translators of P were just as concerned as the translators of LXX to follow the Hebrew word order precisely. Finally, the initial data concerning quantitative representation yields a figure of 80% agreement with MT, a number quite close to the initial LXX agreement. One obvious difference between the two, however, is the lack of the long addition in 3:21 P that is found in LXX.

Variants Related to Consistency

Having given a general description of the initial data for P, it is time to begin examining specific cases. Variants 8 and 36 may be considered together, since both deal with names of God. In variant 8, ܠܗܘܐ renders אֱלֹהִים, where אֱלֹהִים is expected; in variant 36, אֱלֹהִים renders יְהוָה, where ܠܗܘܐ is expected. אֱלֹהִים appears only three times in the chapter, and it is rendered by אֱלֹהִים twice and ܠܗܘܐ once. יְהוָה appears sixteen times that are rendered, and only here does P have אֱלֹהִים. De Boer notes that ܠܗܘܐ renders אֱלֹהִים eight times in 1 Samuel 1-16, and אֱלֹהִים renders יְהוָה six times in those chapters (though he omits the occurrence in 3:20), which, he says, “proves that the names were supposed to be of similar signification,”⁸³ that is, that they were more

⁸³De Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, 23-24.

or less interchangeable. However, 6 occurrences of רלמא out of 222 instances of יהוה is hardly a trend, though 8 occurrences of רז out of 72 instances of אלהים is somewhat more significant. Nevertheless, the translators clearly show a tendency toward careful rendering of the divine names, and though some of the instances of רז for אלהים might reflect the influence of T (or a similar exegetical tradition), both of these variants should probably be considered significant.

In variants 10 and 11, the imperative ל appears for שוב in MT. A more literal translation of שוב in many contexts would be the cognate כא , but in the present instances, ל is used as a kind of auxiliary verb, just as שוב is in MT.⁸⁴ These variants are different from LXX variants 12 and 18 in that those variants ignored the auxiliary nature of the Hebrew verb. Thus, variants 10 and 11 are not significant, since they are merely an attempt to use idiomatic Syriac to render a Hebrew phrase.

The next four variants—variants 12, 15, 17, and 20—all deal with the rendering of prepositions. In the first three cases, P uses ל to render אל . The other renderings for אל in the chapter are ל (five times), לא (three times), and nothing (one time). It might have been expected that a literal translation of אל would be either ל or לא , which both have semantic fields comparable to אל , and, of course, both are frequently used, both in the chapter and elsewhere in P. In addition, ל is cognate with על , and one could perhaps postulate a Hebrew *Vorlage* of על in these three cases, and especially in the last two, which have some support from LXX. However, ל has a broader range of meanings than its Hebrew counterpart. It is frequently used of motion toward, whether concrete or abstract (as in the phrase, “the word of the Lord came to . . .”), and can even be used to indicate possession ($\text{ל} = \text{ל} = \text{ל}$). A look at surrounding chapters reveals that ל does render אל in other contexts (1:27; 2:27, 34 *bis*; 4:21 *bis*; 5:4; cf. 4:1 and 5:4 for ל ; 4:18 for בעד), in addition to rendering על . Thus, though 3:12 may have originally read על in both cases, the evidence of P cannot be used to support such a reading, so variants 12, 15, and 17, are not significant.

The other prepositional variant, variant 20, involves the rendering of עד by ל . The reason for this choice is that ל appears as part of the phrase לחם , which is equivalent to עד עולם and is its usual translation. Thus, this variant is not significant.

Variants 16, 29, and 32 all concern the translation of דבר by אמ . Syriac has no cognate to דבר , and אמ is obviously cognate to אמר . Furthermore, מל , which does frequently translate דבר , has a semantic field that is closer to דבר than אמ is. However, the range of meanings in אמ is larger than in אמר , and thus אמ is an appropriate translation for דבר in these three cases.⁸⁵ The variants, then, are not

⁸⁴Cf. J. Payne Smith, ed. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), s.v. “ ל ”; BDB, s.v. “ שוב ”; Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius’ Hebrew Grammar*, § 120g.

⁸⁵Cf. Holladay, *Lexicon*, s.v. “ אמר ”; *ibid.*, s.v. “ דבר ”; J. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, s.v.

significant.

Verse 13, as already noted, is a textually troubled verse. Variants 22 and 24 reflect the difficulties found in MT and presumably in the *Vorlage* of P. In variant 24, the Hebrew לָהֶם, a direct object (“them, themselves”) if taken as is, is rendered by the Syriac ܠܗܝܘܢܝܗܘܢ, a subject (“they”). Variant 22 is a change in the meaning of the verb, from “cursing” in Hebrew to “abusing” in Syriac. The Syriac in this clause seems to imply more than just speaking ill of someone and is a reference to the description of Eli’s sons in 2:12-17 and their mistreatment of the people. P also adds ܠܗܝܘܢܝܗܘܢ, “the people,” and the resulting clause is, “because he knew that his sons (they) were abusing the people.” Since both these differences from MT are attempts to make sense of a confused text, they should not be considered significant.

In variant 30, ܐܠܡܚܝܐ (“to be afraid”) stands for ܐܠܡܚܝܐ (“to conceal”). Later in the same verse (3:17) ܐܠܡܚܝܐ is translated by its equivalent ܐܠܡܚܝܐ. The usual Hebrew verb for “to fear,” in its appropriate form, is ܐܠܡܚܝܐ, but this word bears little graphic similarity to ܐܠܡܚܝܐ. The Hebrew word that most closely resembles ܐܠܡܚܝܐ and means something like “to fear” is ܐܠܡܚܝܐ, “to dread, be in awe of,” and ܐܠܡܚܝܐ is capable of carrying this meaning. It is unlikely that ܐܠܡܚܝܐ appeared in the *Vorlage* of P, since all eight occurrences of ܐܠܡܚܝܐ in 1 Samuel 1-12 (including 3:15) are translated by ܐܠܡܚܝܐ. There is a graphic similarity between ܐܠܡܚܝܐ and ܐܠܡܚܝܐ in both their Estrangela and Serta (t’Bt and ǎĪKt) forms, but the similarity is not as close as it is in Hebrew. Furthermore, there are no variants in mss of P that preserve a reading of ܐܠܡܚܝܐ here, despite its occurrence just a few words later. Therefore, though some doubt must remain as to whether the graphic confusion occurred in Hebrew or in Syriac, the chances are good that it happened during the transmission of the Hebrew text, so the variant is significant.

The last lexical variants to be considered are variants 34 and 35, and there is evidence of graphic confusion here as well. For the ܐܠܡܚܝܐ of MT, P has ܐܠܡܚܝܐ, presumably reflecting a ܐܠܡܚܝܐ in the *Vorlage*. The normal equivalent of ܐܠܡܚܝܐ in Syriac is ܐܠܡܚܝܐ. There is some graphic similarity in these forms in both Hebrew and Syriac (Estrangela, not Serta script). In either case, two letters would have to have been omitted or altered, but it is easier to suppose that a ܐ could have disappeared and a ܐ, been added than that a ܐ and a ܐ could both vanish, especially since ܐ is the smallest Syriac letter and ܐ one of the largest Hebrew letters (and the upper stroke of the ܐ is often exaggerated in the mss).⁸⁶ The Syriac ܐ is a valid translation of the Hebrew conjunction ܐ at times, but the translators did

“ܐܠܡܚܝܐ”; *ibid.*, s.v. “ܐܠܡܚܝܐ.”

⁸⁶One possible scenario in which the transformation could have occurred is that the ܐ could have been smudged and lost most of its top half, thus resembling a ܐ. A later scribe, seeing the nonsense word ܐܠܡܚܝܐ (perhaps without the diacritical mark that distinguishes ܐ from ܐ), could have conjectured that the first two letters should be interchanged, resulting in ܐܠܡܚܝܐ. Alternatively, the ܐ could have been lost altogether, and a later scribe could have added the initial ܐ by conjecture.

not avail themselves of other opportunities to translate it in this way (e.g., 3:2, 19; cf. 3:14). However, it is probable that an original ܩ was modified to a ܐ after the corruption of the verb in order to smooth out the sentence. Since it is probable that the confusion in both variants appeared in Syriac, they are not significant.

The first grammatical variants to be considered deal with the representation in P of participles in MT, variants 1, 4, 9, 13, and 23. The translators of P do not at first seem as systematic in their renderings of participles as were the translators of LXX, who consistently use a verb when the Hebrew consonants and context permit that interpretation. On the contrary, they sometimes use a verb and sometimes a participle (cf. table 20). It is important to note, though, that these variants represent all the Hebrew participles that deal with past time; those that deal with the present (i.e., those in 3:11-14) are rendered by Syriac participles, which are the equivalent of the present tense in these cases. Variants 1 and 23 have the Syriac continuous past tense, a periphrastic construction, rather than a simple tense, but since the piel participles in MT clearly refer to past time, the two versions are equivalent. It seems, then, that the Syriac translators were more concerned with idiomatic Syriac renderings than with conformity to the forms of Hebrew verbs. Moreover, the translators might have had traditions that considered some or all of the participles represented by variants 4, 9, 13, and 23 as verbs. As a result of this analysis, it must be concluded that none of these variants is significant.

Somewhat similar to the analysis of these participles is the analysis of variants 7 and 21, which concern verbs in MT paralleled by verbs in the continuous past tense in P. In variant 21, MT has a perfect, which P usually renders with a Syriac perfect; only here do the translators use the continuous past. However, it is possible that the translators wanted to emphasize that Eli's knowledge of his sons' misdeeds was not limited to isolated incidents but that he was aware of their ongoing sin, or it may be that the continuous past in the next verb influenced this one as well. In either case, the continuous past is appropriate. In variant 7, the continuous past in P reflects an imperfect in MT. The use of the imperfect in Hebrew to indicate a continuous condition has been discussed above (pp. 91-92), so it may suffice to say here that the continuous past is an excellent translation of the Hebrew. Neither of these variants, then, is significant.

Variant 14 has an imperative verb in Syriac where MT has a *waw* consecutive and a perfect. The meaning of the two versions is identical, and P also omits the *waw* and a previous ܐܘܪܝܢܐ . There are too few *waw* consecutive perfects in the chapter to determine any translation pattern in P, but it is probable that the shift from perfect to imperative was occasioned by the omission of the ܐܘܪܝܢܐ , since the sentence structure had then changed. This omission will be discussed below, but it may be concluded now that variant 14 is not significant.

The remaining variants that deal with verbal forms are all concerned with the

exegetical tradition⁸⁹) is a possibility. Thus, these variants should probably not be considered significant.

In variant 31, *כל מלך מלך* corresponds to *מכל הדבר* of MT. It is clear that *הדבר* in MT refers many words, whether the expression be taken to mean “of every word” or “of all the message” (i.e., as a collective noun), so the rendering in P is equivalent. Since no indication of textual difficulties is present in the verse in P, and since no apparent reason for omitting *כל*- appears in MT, this variant should not be considered significant.

The case is otherwise with the similar variant *כל מלך* in variant 37. In order to understand this variant, it is necessary to anticipate the last three variants in quantitative representation, namely, variants 122, 123, and 124. Variant 122 deals with the omission of a phrase found in MT by parablepsis, skipping from *בשל ה* to *בשלו*. Variants 123 and 124 concern the presence of the pronominal suffix *-מ* in P where *היה* appears in MT. It is probable that the pronominal suffix renders Hebrew characters such as *י* or *יה*⁹⁰ (the significance of these variants is discussed below). The plural indicated by the form of the pronominal suffix (and *seyāmē*) implies an additional *י* in the *Vorlage*, and such an addition could easily have arisen in Hebrew, either by dittography or by the use of a two-character abbreviation for *יהיה*. On the other hand, the singular in MT can be explained by haplography. The main point to make, however, is that the variation is probably due to a Hebrew rather than the Syriac scribe, so variant 37 is significant.

Only one case of a Syriac singular corresponding to a plural in MT is found in 1 Samuel 3: variant 27, which refers to the door(s) leading into the sanctuary. It is possible that the second *ה* in *דלתות* was either added or omitted in a Hebrew ms by dittography or haplography. On the other hand, it may be that the translators preferred to read “one door” to correspond to the single curtain leading into the sanctuary of the tabernacle (Ex 26:36), as contrasted with Solomon’s temple (1 Kings 6:31-34). However, the translators apparently have no problem with the much more troubling issue of Samuel sleeping in the sanctuary (cf. the reading of T), so it is hard to imagine great concern over the number of doors. Since graphic confusion, if it occurred, could have happened in Hebrew as easily as in Syriac, this variant should be considered significant.

Variant 6 has an active participle in P corresponding to an adjective in MT. The possibility that *כהות* should be pointed as an infinitive rather than an adjective has already been discussed above (p. 91), but the difference between infinitive and participle remains.

⁸⁹Cf. Koster, “Which Came First?,” 123, who discusses the common exegetical traditions of the translators of P and the Palestinian targums to the Pentateuch. Cf. also the discussion in Johann Cook, “Text and Tradition: A Methodological Problem,” *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 9 (1981), 3-11.

⁹⁰Cf. *IDBS*, s.v. “Abbreviations, Hebrew Texts,” by Michael Fishbane; Godfrey Rolles Driver, “Abbreviations in the Masoretic Text,” *Textus* 1 (1960): 112-31; idem, “Once again Abbreviations,” *Textus* 4 (1964): 76-94.

The reason for using a participle in P lies in the previous word, יִצְי . Whereas לְלִל cannot be followed by a participle to complete the verbal idea, יִצְי can.⁹¹ Therefore, the participle in P does not imply the presence of a participle in its *Vorlage*, so the variant is not significant.

The last variant in the category of consistency is variant 2, in which P has the preposition מִגֵּם where MT has the sign of the definite direct object סֵס . The present instance is the only time in the chapter in which סֵס is rendered by מִגֵּם . סֵס is used before הַהוֹה only one other time in the chapter: in verse 7, where P uses ל —a common equivalent—to render סֵס . De Boer notes three other places in 1 Samuel 1-16 in which P renders סֵס with מִגֵּם . This figure in itself is hardly overwhelming, but מִגֵּם is also used at times to render prepositions such as עַל , נִגַד , and עִם , and it is found in other constructions as well.⁹² An important parallel to this usage is found in T, which frequently uses מִגֵּם , or a circumlocution involving מִגֵּם , to avoid having יִצְי be the direct object of a verb. It is likely that P here reflects the influence of a Jewish tradition shared by T, though it is clear that P does not utilize this tradition to the same extent as does T. The variant, then, is not significant.

Having completed the variants dealing with consistency, the tables relating to this factor need to be adjusted by eliminating all data in them related to significant variants. Only five of the thirty-seven variants have been identified as significant, indicating that the *Vorlage* of P lies closer to the text of MT than does that of LXX. Only two tables, 17 and 27, are changed by eliminating the significant variants from the data; since Syriac is a Semitic language closely related to Hebrew, no other changes to the tables need to be made to reflect constraints on the translators. The changes resulting from the elimination of significant variants are as follows.

<u>Table</u>	<u>Changes</u>
17	Syr words: 32 1.10 Syr words/Heb word deviation factor: 0.22 total Heb (>1x): 128 primary Syr: 122 95.3% by primary rendering Syr roots: 31 Syr roots/Heb root: 1.15
27	deviation factor: 1.58

The changes to the tables representing the Peshitta translators' consistency do not consequentially alter the picture of the translation technique given above. A reevaluation of the data after the significant variants are removed still shows the translators very consistent in making lexical choices, and, though the level of their consistency may be said to have increased somewhat, they remain fairly consistent in rendering the number of nouns and adjectives.

⁹¹BDB, s.v. “ לְלִל ”; J. Payne Smith, *Dictionary*, s.v. “ יִצְי .”

⁹²De Boer, *1 Samuel i-xvi*, 24.

Variants in the Representation of Hebrew Lexemes by Syriac Lexemes (Segmentation)

Though the percentage of Hebrew compounds rendered exactly in P (76.6%) is higher than that in LXX (62.8%), it is still not very high, and it remains doubtful whether any deviation in this category is significant. A closer examination of the ten variations in segmentation reveals that six of them (variants 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, and 47) are cases of the failure of the Syriac translators to render the prepositions ל or לל. Instead, the translators preferred to use a pronominal suffix to attach the object directly to the verb. Though לל is so rendered only once in the chapter, the one time is the only occasion in which the pronominal object of the preposition could be understood as a direct (rather than indirect) object (following קרן). The five instances of omitting ל by joining the pronoun to the verb are examples of the frequency of this kind of translation in P. Therefore, none of these variants is significant.

The other variants in this category (variants 38, 41, 44, and 46) may also be easily dismissed. Though לפני is technically a combination of the preposition ל and the plural construct noun פני, it is used as the equivalent of a preposition throughout the OT, and P's translation סה is entirely appropriate. The use of two words גאלה וכתה to render בשלשית is an idiomatic rendering of the Hebrew.⁹³ Similarly, אלה וכתה was the translators' attempt to render the Hebrew phrase בפעם בפעם. Finally, the rendering of מהגיד by גססא has already been discussed and dismissed when dealing with variant 28. One may conclude, then, that none of the variants in the category of segmentation is significant.

Variants in Word Order

Just as the low percentage of agreement concerning compound words throws serious doubt from the beginning on the significance of any of the variants in that category, so the high percentage of agreement in word order leads one to suspect that all of the deviations in P are significant, unless other factors override the translators' tendency to follow word order. In the case of variant 48, MT reads יהוה היה יקר, whereas P reads אסו לו לו. Though it is of course possible that a transposition of adjacent words occurred in Syriac, the similarity of היה and יהוה (a similarity that does not exist between אסו and לו) suggests that it is more likely that היה was accidentally omitted in Hebrew, then reinserted in the wrong place later. Variant 48, then, should be considered significant.

Though no graphic similarity occurs in variant 49, it is likely that the transposition of the adverb meaning "again" occurred in Hebrew rather than in Syriac, in light of the translators' propensity of following the Hebrew word order. In fact, the absence of any

⁹³On the use of cardinal numbers with א in place of ordinals, see T. H. Robinson, *Grammar*, 128.

such adverb in LXX suggests that both עַד and אֲחֵרִים may be later insertions. At any rate, variant 49 is probably significant.

The final variant that deals with word order is variant 50. In Hebrew, the subject of the clause, if expressed, usually follows הַנְּהִי immediately (but cf. 2 Sam 14:7), especially if that subject is a pronoun. It is questionable whether Hebrew idiom allowed a construction such as הַנְּהִי עָשָׂה אֲנִי, which seems to be implied by P.⁹⁴ Furthermore, the usual word order for the Syriac present tense is participle + personal pronoun, as in this verse (cf. 1 Sam 12:3 P).⁹⁵ Therefore, it is doubtful that this variant is significant, since it probably arose in Syriac rather than in Hebrew.

When variants 48 and 49 are omitted from consideration, the number of Hebrew semantic units becomes 393, the number of variations becomes 1, and Hebrew word order is followed 99.7% of the time in P.

Variants in Quantitative Representation

The 80.0% agreement between semantic units in P and MT is almost identical to the agreement in the raw data for LXX, and it indicates initially that the translators of P were not overly concerned with matching their Hebrew *Vorlage* word for word in the translation, at least in certain contexts. The fact that P has a longer text fifty-five times as compared with thirty times for MT (almost a two to one ratio) suggests that the translators were more inclined to add to the text than to subtract from it. It remains to be examined if certain Hebrew constructions in particular lent themselves to modifications toward more idiomatic Syriac style, or if the translators' deviations from their *Vorlage* were relatively haphazard.

The use of anticipatory pronominal suffixes, either attached to verbs before a direct object or attached to substantives before the relative particle, is common in original Syriac works, and though it is not quite as prevalent in translated Syriac such as Samuel, it remains an important aspect of the translators' style.⁹⁶ Sixteen of the quantitative variants are related to this stylistic phenomenon: variants 53, 54, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 69, 70, 86, 101, 102, 114, 118, 119. Since this construction has no parallel in Hebrew, these variants are not significant.

Somewhat related to this construction is the Syriac preference for an emphatic noun with the relative particle in place of the Hebrew construct case. Variants 98 and 100 fall into this category and should not be considered significant.

Six other instances of the use of the relative particle in P in different constructions are present in the chapter: variants 55, 75, 85, 96, 104, and 117. The presence of so

⁹⁴Cf. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures*, 137-40, who does not include such a construction in his list of possible uses of הַנְּהִי in a sentence.

⁹⁵T. H. Robinson, *Grammar*, 60.

⁹⁶Brockelmann, *Grammatik*, 106; T. H. Robinson, *Grammar*, 82.

many extra relative particles leads one to suspect that they were added as stylistic devices rather than as indicative of a different *Vorlage*. Variant 75 represents an idiomatic substitution in Syriac for the Hebrew phrase. Variants 85 and 104 substitute the relative plus a finite verb for a verbal form in Hebrew. Variant 117 is forced to add the relative after inserting **ܐ** before **ܘܘܢܝܢܐ**. The other two variants simply appear to be additions that seemed stylistically preferable to the translators. Thus, none of these variants presupposes a *Vorlage* different from MT.

The next group of variants to be considered is the periphrastic constructions in P that are not periphrastic in MT. Variants corresponding to variants 51, 57, 90, and 91 have already been considered above under consistency and found to be nonsignificant. Thus, these variants should be considered nonsignificant from a quantitative standpoint as well.

Six conjunctions are found in one or the other of MT and P but not in the other (variants 56, 65, 81, 87, 94, 97). Three of these (56, 87, and 97) are present in P but not MT, and the other three (65, 81, 94) are in MT but not P. The translators thus appear to have no single tendency to either add or delete conjunctions. De Boer contends that “the connecting particle **ו** is *very often* not translated,” and he then lists ten examples in 1 Samuel 1-16, as well as seven cases in which the Syriac **ܘ** is added.⁹⁷ However, these few instances out of about eight hundred occurrences of the conjunction can hardly be called “very often,” and each case must be examined on its own merits.⁹⁸ Because variant 81 is so closely associated with variant 79, a discussion of its significance is reserved for later.

Variant 56 adds a conjunction where MT has **ו**, and it is supported in this addition by several Hebrew mss, LXX, and T. The presence of a conjunction at the beginning of a clause is of course standard Hebrew style, so this variant must be considered significant, since a good probability exists that the difference arose in the transmission of the Hebrew text.

Similarly, variant 94 lacks a conjunction where MT has **ו**. In this case, no Hebrew mss support the omission of the **ו**, but V does. However, the support of V here is probably worthless, since the data indicates that V often does not translate **ו** (thirteen times), and it also occasionally adds a conjunction (four times). KB³ says that **ו** occurs 188 times in the OT, and it lists several examples.⁹⁹ However, the Masora of *BHS* indicates that in only five of these instances is it preceded by **ו**. Therefore, scribes might have had the tendency to add a **ו** were it missing in their exemplar; it is less likely that they

⁹⁷De Boer, *I Samuel i-xvi*, 26 (italics mine).

⁹⁸The figure eight hundred assumes about fifty occurrences of **ו** per chapter, as in chapter 3. However, this figure may be somewhat low, since most of chapters 1-16 are longer than chapter 3, so the total number may approach one thousand.

⁹⁹KB³, s.v. “**ו**.”

would have omitted the 𐤁. Lacking other data, it seems best to count this variant as significant, since it could have arisen in Hebrew as easily as in Syriac.

The additional 𐤀 in variant 87 is the result of the association of the expression “in that day” with what precedes (v. 11) rather than what follows (v. 12). Either one of the texts of MT or P could have given rise to the variant through graphic confusion. In MT, a 𐤁 between 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓 could have dropped out when the eye of the scribe skipped from 𐤓𐤕- to -𐤓. In P, the extra 𐤀 could have arisen from an original 𐤕𐤀𐤓 𐤀𐤓 through dittography. On the whole, the latter seems the more likely possibility, so variant 87 is probably not significant.

The other two variants dealing with conjunctions can be explained as the translators’ attempt at an idiomatic rendering. In variant 65, 𐤕𐤕𐤓 𐤕𐤕𐤓 lacks a 𐤀 before the second word because the expression is an idiom with 𐤕𐤕𐤓 (similar to the English “and he went to sleep”). Furthermore, the lack of a conjunction between the preceding 𐤕𐤕𐤓 𐤕𐤕𐤓 may have influenced the translators. Finally, though Syriac has an equivalent for 𐤀𐤓 used as a negative in oaths (i.e., 𐤀𐤓), the translators in variant 97 have chosen to render it instead with the more obvious negative 𐤀, adding the conjunction to make the rest of the sentence an indirect statement; Hebrew idiom prefers that the oath formula be a direct statement. Therefore, none of these variants is significant.

The Hebrew preposition 𐤅 is rendered by 𐤕 in seven cases and is omitted in translation in the other seven cases. Thus, the omission of a rendering for 𐤅 is a normal equivalent and provides no evidence for the omission of the preposition in the *Vorlage* of P. Consequentially, variants 64, 68, 78, 89, 92, 112, and 120 must be considered nonsignificant.

P also has an extra preposition 𐤕 in four places: variants 66 and 67 and variants 72 and 73. These four variants are actually two occurrences of the same pairs of words, neither of which has a preposition in MT. The first word in each pair is 𐤕𐤕𐤓, an infinitive preceded by a preposition. Hebrew infinitives are often preceded by the preposition 𐤅, and Syriac infinitives likewise are frequently preceded by 𐤕. In fact, the use of the preposition with the infinitive is probably more prevalent in Syriac. In chapter 3, only two of the five infinitives construct in MT are preceded by 𐤅, whereas all six infinitives in P are preceded by 𐤕. Thus, it is probable that the presence of the 𐤕 in P is a stylistic convention rather than evidence of a varying *Vorlage*. The second word in each pair is 𐤕𐤕𐤓, with the initial 𐤕 acting as an indicator of the direct object, similar to 𐤕𐤕 in Hebrew. The question of whether the equivalents in MT are to be taken as vocatives or accusatives has been addressed above, but for the translators of P, the words were clearly accusatives, and since the 𐤕 is the normal sign of the accusative in Syriac, no Hebrew *Vorlage* different from MT can be postulated on the basis of this evidence. None of these variants, then, is significant.

equivalent in meaning, they chose instead to omit the word, without losing anything in the translation. Finally, variant 116 adds ܘܐܝܢ, so that the Hebrew “the good” becomes “all that is good,” a phrase that apparently sounded better to the translators. In conclusion, none of these variants that concern idiomatic expressions is significant.

Several explanatory additions appear among the quantitative variants, namely, variants 52, 71, 77, 84, 106, 108, 110, 111, 115, and 121. The fact that in every case the excess text appears in P leads one to suspect that the additions occurred either at the point of translation or during the later transmission of the Syriac text. This state of affairs is quite different from the case of LXX, where MT and LXX each had eight semantic units that were classified as explanatory. Some of the variants appear in other traditions, and others are unique to P, but the one-sidedness of these explanatory elements suggests that those variants that are shared with other traditions either appeared independently or arose as a result of contamination from other traditions.

Variants 52 and 115 have readings in common with LXX. In variant 52, P adds the description ܠܡܢܐܝܢ after the mention of Eli. Variant 115 adds the subject ܐܝܢ to clarify that it was he and not Samuel who was speaking. Scholars have often noted correspondences between P and LXX and have assumed that the translators of P borrowed readings from LXX. In the light of this examination of P, a modification to this assumption seems in order. The translators of P show no tendency to consult other versions in any category other than quantitative representation, so it is probable that they did not do so here, either. The addition of ܐܝܢ may well be an independent expansion, but the addition of ܠܡܢܐܝܢ might depend on LXX. If so, the point of borrowing was probably not at the point of translation but rather somewhere in the process of transmission.¹⁰¹ However, the fact that 2:11b P is identical to 3:1 P suggests that LXX may not have been involved at all.

Variants 71 and 121 both have an additional ܘܐܝܢ after ܘܐܝܢܐܝܢ, perhaps to clarify the meaning of the verb. These readings are based on the same construction as in 3:6. The fact that the reading of variant 71 is equivalent to that found in V is probably not important; the additional *adhuc* of V is most likely an independent phenomenon.

Variant 84 adds ܠܐܝܢ after ܐܝܢ, reflecting the instructions Eli gave to Samuel in the previous verse. It has been observed that several Greek mss contain this addition, but

¹⁰¹If this conclusion is true, and data from more chapters would have to be examined before one could conclude that it is, it might be relevant for the question of the socio-religious origins of P. If the translators did not use LXX but did use traditions found in T, as suggested above in a few places, it is likely that Jews rather than Christians or Jewish Christians were the translators of P. The occasional influence of LXX in the process of transmission would be natural after the transmission of the text were taken over by Christian scribes. This scenario would also seem to suggest that there was no distinct Old Syriac translation at least of Samuel, and perhaps of most or all of the OT. Rabbula's work, then, would be a revision and standardization of P rather than the creation of a new translation. This hypothesis, however, obviously requires further substantiation.

its presence in P is probably based on a desire for internal consistency rather than an attempt at conformity to Greek mss.

In variants 77, 108, and 111, explicit subjects have been added in order to clarify the sentences. לְיִצְחָק is the subject in variant 77, and וְיִצְחָק is the subject in the other two variants. The problem of a missing subject in verse 17 has been discussed in another context already (see pp. 89-90), and the translators of P insert the name twice in the verse, both times in Eli's question, and both times in the phrase וְיִצְחָק לֵאמֹר .

The last two explicatory variants are both prepositional phrases in verse 17: variant 106 adds לִי , and variant 110 adds לִי . The first variant clarifies who was being addressed, and the second completes the elliptical construction וְיִצְחָק לֵאמֹר . None of these explicatory variants can be considered significant.

Variant 79 concerns the failure to render וְיִצְחָק in P, and it is associated with the omission of ו in variant 81. In variant 81, P substitutes the imperative וְיִצְחָק for the *waw* consecutive plus perfect וַיִּצְחָק , which is equivalent to an imperative in the context (cf. V). There seems to be no explanation for the omission of וְיִצְחָק in Hebrew or Syriac apart from simple haplography. It is true that the omission of the word does not change the meaning of the text, but the translators rendered the similar expression וְיִצְחָק in 3:2, so one would expect them to render וְיִצְחָק here as well. On the other hand, וְיִצְחָק may be an addition in MT, perhaps based on the missing subject וְיִצְחָק about whom Eli is talking, and maybe even influenced by the question of the presence of וְיִצְחָק later in the verse and in the following verse. Though these last possibilities are highly suspect in light of the data, the omission should probably be considered significant, since it could have occurred as easily in Hebrew as in Syriac, and perhaps more easily in Hebrew. If it is significant, then the omission of the ו in variant 81 must also be considered significant.

Variant 93 concerns the addition of וְיִצְחָק in P in verse 13. The troubled nature of this verse resulting from the reading וְיִצְחָק has been discussed above. Whereas the translators of LXX rendered the original וְיִצְחָק , the translators of P attempted to make the best of the text they had, which apparently read וְיִצְחָק like MT. Instead of interpreting this word as the reciprocal object of the verb, they took it to be the subject (see above, p. 116). Since the verb required an object, the translators supplied וְיִצְחָק , based on the narrative in the previous chapter (2:12-17). This variant, then, is not significant.

The last three Syriac variants—122, 123, and 124—are related to one another and so must be considered together. The omission of six words found in MT is the result of parablepsis, the scribe's eye skipping from the first to the second reference to Shiloh. The fact that "Shiloh" is spelled differently in the two places in MT (שִׁלּוֹ and שִׁלֹּה) might suggest that the parablepsis occurred in P rather than in MT, since both occurrences are spelled the same in P and thus are more likely candidates for this type of error. As noted

Partial Translation Technique

Add-Oms

As is the case with P, the Aramaic translators of T generally render the sign of the definite direct object **קדם**, and they always render the prepositions **ל** and **ל**. However, T often substitutes the relative particle **ד** followed by a noun in the emphatic state for the Hebrew construct state, as is also frequently done in P. Thus, the addition of the relative in such cases will not be considered an add-om. See Appendix 2 for a list of add-oms in T.

Consistency

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Targum</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
1	3:1	קדם	preposition	DDO
2		בחי	lexeme	
3		כסי	lexeme	
4			participle	adjective
5		נבואה	lexeme	
6		גליא	lexeme	
7	3:2	עינוהי	plural	singular
8		למכהי	infinitive	adjective
9	3:3	1° יוי	lexeme	
10		עזרת ליואי	lexeme	
11		3° יוי	lexeme	
12	3:7	למדע	infinitive	verb
13		מן קדם	preposition	DDO
14	3:8	מתקרי	ithpeel	qal
15	3:10	אתגלי	lexeme	
16			ithpeel	qal
17	3:11	פתגמא	definite	not definite
18		ישמעניה	verb	participle
19	3:12	1° על	lexeme	
20		2° על	lexeme	
21		אגמר	lexeme	
22			verb	infinitive
23		אשיצי	verb	infinitive

Tiberian vocalization; Alejandro Díez Macho, *El Targum: Introducción a las traducciones aramaicas de la biblia*, Textos y estudios “Cardenal Cisneros,” no. 21 (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1982), 72-73. Cf. also p. 93, where he says that Jonathan is a Babylonian revision of an earlier Palestinian targum, and R. Le Déaut, *Introduction à la littérature targumique*, part 1 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966), 124-27.

24	3:13	חֲרִיתִי	perfect	perfect w/c
25		מִן	preposition	DDO
26		בַּחֲבוּבִין	plural	singular
27	3:14	יִשְׁתַּבְּקוּן	plural	singular
28		חֲבוּבִי	plural	singular
29		וּבִקְרַבְנֵיךָ	plural	singular
30	3:16	-ל	preposition	DDO
31	3:17	עִמָּךְ 1°	lexeme	
32		יְיָ	lexeme	
33		עִמָּךְ 2°	lexeme	
34	3:18	דַּחֲקִין	lexeme	
35			rel clause	noun
36		קְדַמוּהִי	lexeme	
37	3:19	בְּסַעֲדִיהָ	prep phrase	preposition
38		בְּטִיל	lexeme	
39	3:20	-בְּ	lexeme	
40		נְבוֹאָתָא	lexeme	
41		-דְּ	rel particle	preposition

Table 34.—Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives: Lexemes

Heb words (>1x): 31	Aram words: 34	1.10 Aram words/Heb word
deviation factor: 0.04		
total Heb (>1x): 139	primary Aram: 136	97.8% of Heb words by primary rendering
Heb roots (>1x): 29	Aram roots: 34	1.17 Aram roots/Heb root

Table 35.—Adverbs, Prepositions, and Particles: Lexemes

Heb advs (>1x): 12	Aram advs: 22	1.83 Aram advs/Heb adv
total Heb (>1x): 85	primary Aram: 71	83.5% of Heb advs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 2.22		

Table 36.—Conjunctions: Lexemes

Heb conjs (>1x): 2	Aram conjs: 2	1.00 Gk conjs/Heb conj
total Heb (>1x): 68	primary Aram: 68	100.0% of Heb conjs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 0.00		

Table 37.—Word Classes

percentage of verbs/verbals represented by verbs/verbals:	98/98	= 100.0%
percentage of verbs represented by verbs:	76/77	= 98.7%
percentage of participles represented by participles:	11/12	= 91.7%
percentage of infinitives represented by infinitives:	5/7	= 71.4%
percentage of nouns/adjs represented by nouns/adjs:	65/68	= 95.6%
percentage of pronouns represented by pronouns:	42/42	= 100.0%

Table 38.—Verbs: Inflection

deviation factor: 0.29

deviation factor (without verbals): 0.28

Table 39.—Verbs: Stem

deviation factor: 1.02

Table 40.—Verbs: Person

deviation factor: 0.00

Table 41.—Verbs: Gender

deviation factor: 0.04

Table 42.—Verbs: Number

deviation factor: 0.02

Table 43.—Nouns and Adjectives: Gender

deviation factor: 1.05

Table 44.—Nouns and Adjectives: Number

deviation factor: 0.50

Table 45.—Nouns and Adjectives: Use

deviation factor: 1.47

Table 46.—Nouns and Adjectives: Hebrew Articles, Aramaic Emphatic State

deviation factor: 1.14

deviation factor (without implied articles): 1.21

Table 47.—Nouns and Adjectives: Definiteness

deviation factor: 0.52

Table 48.—Pronouns: Gender

deviation factor: 0.00

Table 49.—Pronouns: Number

deviation factor: 0.00

Table 50.—Pronouns: Use

deviation factor: 0.34

Representation of Hebrew Lexemes by Aramaic Lexemes (Segmentation)

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Hebrew Compound</u>	<u>Aramaic Rendering</u>
42	3:18	בעינו	קדמוהי
43	3:20	ליהוה	דיוי

Heb compounds: 50 Aram equivalents: 48 96.0% of Heb compounds rendered exactly

Word Order

There are no deviations from the word order of MT found in T, as the following summary indicates.

Heb semantic units: 416 variations: 0

Heb word order followed 100.0% of the time

Quantitative Representation

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Variant</u>
44	3:1	+1	-ד
45	3:2	+1	-ל ^{1°}
46		+1	-ו ^{4°}
47	3:3	+2	ביח מקדשא
48		+1	-ד ^{1°}
49		+6	וקלא אשחמע מהיכלא דיוי
50		+1	-ד ^{4°}
51	3:7	+1	אוליקף
52		+3	אלפן מן קדם
53		+1	נבואחא
54		+1	-ד
55	3:8	+2	מן קדם
56	3:11	-1	אשר
57		+1	-ד
58	3:12	+1	אנש
59	3:13	+1	אנש
60	3:14	+1	קדשין
61	3:15	+1	מקדשא
62		+1	-ד
63		+1	נבואחא
64	3:18	+1	-ד
65	3:19	+1	מימרא
66		+1	-ד
67		+1	סעד
68		-2	ארצה
69		+1	חד
70	3:20	+2	בפתגמי
71	3:21	+1	-ד

Heb semantic units: 428 Aram deviations: 39

90.9% agreement

Elimination of Variants

Targum Jonathan is a mixture of literal renderings and midrashic elements and so is difficult to characterize by terms such as literal or non-literal.¹⁰⁴ Le Déaut describes it as

¹⁰⁴See Díez Macho, *Targum*, 12-30.

more paraphrastic than Onkelos, but otherwise substantially the same in regard to language and method of translation. Above all, it is a uniform (i.e., consistent) translation.¹⁰⁵ The preceding tables and lists of variants demonstrate the mixed nature of the translation. Though the total number of variants is about three-fourths of the total of LXX, the lexical consistency of T in representing verbs, nouns, and adjectives (table 34) is quite a bit greater than that of either LXX or P (cf. especially the deviation factors and the percentage of Hebrew words rendered by their primary renderings). The consistency in rendering Hebrew adverbs, prepositions, and particles by a single Aramaic equivalent (table 35) is comparable to the statistics of LXX and P, but T, like LXX, is absolutely consistent in rendering conjunctions (table 36). T is also more consistent than either LXX or P in rendering words of one class by words of the same class (table 37).

The translators of T¹⁰⁶ were generally more consistent in rendering syntactic structures than were the translators of LXX or P. Particularly noteworthy is the significantly greater degree of consistency in regard to rendering the number of nouns and adjectives (table 44), Hebrew articles and definiteness (tables 46 and 47), and the use of pronouns. In no category does either LXX or P demonstrate significantly greater consistency. The translators of T were absolutely consistent in rendering the person of verbs and the gender and number of pronouns. They were very consistent in rendering the inflection of verbs (including verbals), the gender and number of verbs, the number and definiteness of nouns and adjectives, and the use of pronouns. They were fairly consistent in every other category: verb stems, gender and use of nouns and adjectives, and Hebrew articles vs. emphatic state. No deviation factor exceeds 1.50.

The greatest shift toward consistency in T as compared with LXX and P is in the area of segmentation, where 96.0% of the Hebrew compound words are rendered by comparable Aramaic equivalents, as compared with 62.8% and 76.6% in LXX and P, respectively. No deviations from the Hebrew word order are reflected in T, though both LXX and P also contain few deviations. Another area of significantly greater consistency is in quantitative representation, where T shows 90.9% agreement with MT, as compared with about 80% for the preliminary figures of both LXX and P. The initial impression, then, is that T is more literal in many regards than either LXX or P, but this impression needs to be tested and qualified by a closer examination of the data.

Variants Related to Consistency

A glance at the list of variants related to consistency reveals that most of these

¹⁰⁵La Déaut, *Introduction*, 126.

¹⁰⁶The term “translators” here and throughout the section is used for the sake of simplicity, but it refers to any translators, scribes, or editors who played a role in the development of the text from its original oral forms in the synagogues to its final written form.

variants are lexical, rather than syntactical, in nature, contrary to the situation in P or LXX. This fact is an indication of the desire of the translators to render certain Hebrew constructions with a single equivalent Aramaic construction. The lexical variants will be examined first.

The first verse yields four lexical variants (variants 2, 3, 5, and 6), which may be considered together. These variants reflect the rendering of לִפְנֵי by בְּחַיִּי, of יָקָר by כְּסִי, and of אֵין חֲזוֹן נִפְרָץ by לִית נְבוּאָה גְלִיָּא. Variant 2 substitutes a temporal phrase for an improper preposition emphasizing location or relationship. It is also possible that the translators avoided the equivalent preposition קִדְּ because it had already been used of the relationship between Samuel and Yahweh, and they wanted to emphasize that Samuel's service to Yahweh was more important than his service to Eli. Variant 3 uses כְּסִי, "hidden," for יָקָר, "rare," because כְּסִי corresponds with גְּלִיָּא, "revealed," in the next clause. In addition, the translators might have wanted to convey the idea that the word of Yahweh, and thus Yahweh himself, was not absent from Israel, but was only awaiting a worthy individual to receive the revelation.¹⁰⁷ T generally avoids the idea that God communicates directly, either visibly or audibly, with mere mortals, and the substitution of נְבוּאָה, "prophecy," for חֲזוֹן, "vision," is designed to avoid the impression that Yahweh himself appeared to Samuel. Thus, none of these variants is significant.

Similar to variant 6 is variant 15, which reads a form of גְּלִיָּא instead of the בּוֹאֵ of MT. Rather than saying that Yahweh came, and was thus potentially perceptible to Samuel, T prefers to say that the Yahweh revealed himself, presumably in a way that would not require immediate contact with the divine.¹⁰⁸ The reasoning behind this lexical change is the same as in verse 1, so variant 15 is not significant.

Variants 9, 11, and 32 all use the abbreviated proper name יְיָ to render אֱלֹהִים. This rendering might seem to suggest a Hebrew יְהוָה, but in fact T is consistent in rendering אֱלֹהִים in the same way it renders יְהוָה, so the variants are not significant.

The next several lexical variants deal with apparent differences in the choice of prepositions. Variants 19 and 20 use לְ to render אֶל. These variants are interesting, because LXX in the first instance reads ἐπι, and P joins T in reading לְ in both places. As in the case of P, one might have expected the translators of T to use either לְ or לְוַח to render אֶל, as they do five and two times in the chapter, respectively. However, as with לְ, the semantic range of לְ is larger than that of אֶל, and it can carry the meaning "to, toward."¹⁰⁹ In lieu of more statistical data, and in light of the statistical summary at the

¹⁰⁷Cf. Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 74.

¹⁰⁸Several mss further remove Yahweh from Samuel by speaking of the "Glory of Yahweh" that reveals itself. See above, pp. 58-59, and cf. Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 57-59.

¹⁰⁹Levy, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. "לְ."

bottom of table 35,¹¹⁰ it seems likely at this stage of the investigation that the *Vorlage* of T read **ל** just as MT does. It is possible that the *Vorlage* read **על** in one or both places, of course, but the nature of the Aramaic data does not allow such a claim to be put forth with any degree of confidence.¹¹¹ Thus, these variants cannot be considered significant.

The next two prepositions to be considered are variants 31 and 33, where **ל** is rendered twice by **□□**. As in English, it is permissible in Hebrew for a person to speak either *to* (**ל**, **ל**) or *with* (**עם**) someone, and little, if any, difference exists between the meanings of the prepositions in such cases.¹¹² Sperber notes that T often uses **□□** to render both **ל** and **על** when they could be translated “with,” and many of his examples involve one person speaking with (to) another.¹¹³ Variants 31 and 33, then, are not significant.

Variant 36 involves the rendering of the expression **בְּעֵינָיו** by **קְדַמוּהִי**. The reason for avoiding the expression “in his eyes” is often taken to be the translators’ preference for substituting an expression that avoids an anthropomorphism, but some recent studies suggest that the rendering is simply a translational equivalent unrelated to the avoidance of anthropomorphism.¹¹⁴ In either case, this variant is not significant.

Though not strictly a lexical variant, a similar concern spawned variant 37, which reads **בְּסִמְעוֹ דִּיה**, “at his aid,” for MT’s **עִמּוֹ**. In this case, the translators wanted to avoid the idea that God was physically with Samuel, an idea further eschewed by the addition of **דְּמִימְרָא ד־** before **יְיָ**, so this variant is also nonsignificant.

The last lexical variant to deal with prepositions is variant 39, with which variants 40 and 41 are associated. T reads that Samuel was faithful **בְּפִתְגָמֵי נְבוֹאָתָא דִּי יְיָ**, where MT reads **לְנְבִיא לַיהוָה**. The intent of this rendering seems to be to shift the emphasis of the verse from the faithfulness of Samuel to the trustworthiness of the word of Yahweh. This type of shift in meaning is related to all those renderings which tend to exalt God

¹¹⁰Deviation factor 2.22, only 83.5% of Hebrew adverbs, prepositions, and particles rendered by the primary rendering.

¹¹¹Thus, the assertions by S. R. Driver (*Notes on the Books of Samuel*, 43) and McCarter (*I Samuel*, 96) that P and T support the reading **על** in the Hebrew must be questioned, since the evidence suggests that they could just as easily have read **ל**. Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:111, lists the readings represented by variant 19 as an example of the indiscriminate use of **ל** and **על** in MT.

¹¹²Cf. BDB, s.v. “עם.”

¹¹³Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:105-6.

¹¹⁴Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:37, says that “the Targum avoids using Biblical expressions, which speak of God as if being possessed of a body just like a human being, with hands and eyes etc.” However, Michael L. Klein, in a study of the Pentateuchal targums, demonstrates that the phrases **לְעֵינָי** and **בְּאֵזְנָי** are often rendered by the preposition **קְדַם**, even when referring to people; Michael L. Klein, “The Preposition **קְדַם** (‘Before’): A Pseudo-Anti-Anthropomorphism in the Targums,” *Journal of Theological Studies* 30 (1979): 505-7. Levine is certainly right in stating that targumic renderings often taken as anti-anthropomorphic should be understood in light of Jewish concerns for reverence in reference to God rather than Hellenistic conceptions of deity; Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 55.

rather than humans. Therefore, variants 39, 40, and 41 are not significant.

The next lexical variant to be considered is variant 21, in which אגמר in T corresponds to החל in MT. Whereas the emphasis in MT is on the complete fulfillment of God's word to the house of Eli, the emphasis in T seems to be that God will completely destroy his house.¹¹⁵ Despite this different emphasis, however, the result is the same: Eli's dynasty will be abruptly and completely ended, just as God has said. It is doubtful that any Hebrew word such as אסבד stood in the *Vorlage* of T, so this variant is not significant.

In variants 34 and 35, דחיקין stands for הטוב in MT. Though a rendering such as אצט might be more literal, the expression "what he determines" is roughly equivalent in meaning in the context, and the translators might have felt that their rendering safeguarded the sovereignty of God in making decisions more explicitly than did the reading of the Hebrew text before them.¹¹⁶ Therefore, these variants cannot be considered significant.

A similar concern for preserving God's sovereignty might explain variant 38, where T reads בטיל ("was vain") for הפיל ("he let fall") in MT. The thrust of the clause in both MT and T is that all of Samuel's prophetic words came to pass. However, to say that the Lord did not let any of Samuel's words fail could imply that God was at Samuel's bidding and was obliged to fulfill whatever he said. T corrects this possible misunderstanding by saying that none of Samuel's words was vain. This manner of stating the issue suggests that Samuel was controlled by God rather than vice versa. The lexical substitution, then, is not significant.

The final lexical variant to be considered is variant 10. Whereas MT in verse 3 says that Samuel was sleeping in the temple of the Lord, such an act would violate the regulations prohibiting anyone who was not a priest from entering the temple.¹¹⁷ In order to avoid the possibility that Samuel was guilty of breaking the law, T says that Samuel was sleeping "in the court of the Levites" outside the temple proper. Thus, this variant is not significant.

The next several variants deal with the use of an Aramaic word of one class to render a Hebrew word of another class. Variants 1, 13, 25, and 30 all have T using a preposition where MT has the sign of the definite direct object, אס . The first two in this list involve the use of the preposition קדן (in variant 13 קדן מן) in place of אס where היה is the direct object in MT. T often avoids constructions in which God is either the subject or direct object of a verb, and one of the most frequent means of changing the

¹¹⁵Cf. the translation of Harrington and Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan*, 109, of the final phrase of the verse: "I will consume and destroy."

¹¹⁶Cf. Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 52-54.

¹¹⁷Ibid., 120. Cf. also *bQiddushin* 78b.

structure of the sentence is by inserting or substituting the preposition $\square\kappa\delta$.¹¹⁸ Such a construction in T in no way implies any different construction in the *Vorlage* different from that found in MT, so these two variants are nonsignificant. Variant 25 has the phrase $\text{מחפרע אַנאַ מן אַנש ביתיה}$, in which מן in T stands in the place of את in MT. The reason for this substitution is Aramaic idiom, because when the ithpeel of פרע means “to punish,” the recipients of the punishment are often preceded by מן .¹¹⁹ Thus, variant 25 is not significant.

Variant 30 is different from the others in that no apparent reason for rendering את by ל exists. It is true that the Aramaic preposition ל can act as an indicator of a direct object, as in Syriac and late Hebrew. However, since the passage is translation Aramaic rather than original Aramaic, the question is whether the rendering implied if MT is assumed to be the *Vorlage* of T is consistent with the translation technique found elsewhere in T. A survey of all the occurrences of את את קר in the former prophets indicates that in every other instance, T uses ל to render את . Most of the cases in which את follows את קר involve one person naming another person or a place (e.g., Judg 1:17; 13:24), a double accusative construction. However, in all six cases in which את את קר means “to summon,” T renders את with ל , so this variant should be considered significant.¹²⁰

In several cases, T uses one verbal form while MT has another. The first such case is variant 12, where T has למדע , “to know,” for ידע , “he knew,” of MT. The reason for the difference is immediately apparent from a glance at the context, for T inserts the verb אולף before למדע , so a complementary infinitive was required. Thus, the variant is not significant.

In variant 18, T has the verb, ישמעני , in place of the participle שמעו .¹²¹ The verb is preceded, however, by the relative particle ד , so the particle plus the verb is the translational equivalent of the participle in MT. It is true that all the other participles found in MT in the chapter are rendered by participles in T, but none of them is part of a construct chain as this participle in MT is. T does not show nearly the propensity of P for converting construct chains into chain of words connected by the relative particle, but including a participle as a substantive in a construct chain seems to have been considered poor style, or perhaps even unidiomatic, for T also renders the similar construction with שמע in

¹¹⁸M. L. Klein’s study of the Aramaic portion of Daniel shows that the use of $\square\kappa\delta$ is a sign of reverence, not an avoidance of anthropomorphism, since the king is addressed in the same way as God. Similarly, the targums exhibit dozens of cases in which את before a human direct object is rendered by $\square\kappa\delta$. See M. L. Klein, “The Preposition $\square\kappa\delta$,” 502-7.

¹¹⁹Levy, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. “ פּרע .”

¹²⁰The six locations in which T renders את את קר “summon” with ל are Josh 8:34; 1 Sam 22:11; 2 Sam 13:17; 1 Kings 1:9, 10; 12:20. Josh 21:9 has את את קר in MT, but has a different construction in T.

¹²¹Ms f alone has a participle.

2 Kings 21:12 with a relative particle and verb.¹²² Thus, this variant does not appear to be significant.

On two occasions, variants 22 and 23, T has a verb where MT has an infinitive absolute. As has already been noted in the discussion of Syriac variants 18 and 19 above, the Aramaic languages lack a distinct infinitive absolute like Hebrew has, and the Aramaic infinitive does not have the same range of meaning as the Hebrew infinitive absolute. Sperber lists many examples in which T renders infinitives absolute with verbs, including the present verse.¹²³ Since it seems to have been characteristic of T to use a verb to render an infinitive absolute, variants 22 and 23 are not significant.

In variant 4, T has the passive participle ܐܘܢܐ in place of the adjective ܐܘܢܐ in MT. As noted in the discussion of variant 3, the translators apparently chose the word to correspond to ܐܘܢܐ later in the same verse. Just as ܐܘܢܐ is a passive participle, so also ܐܘܢܐ was made a passive participle. This shift in form does not alter the meaning of the phrase, since many adjectives are formed from the passive participle.¹²⁴ Therefore, variant 4 is not significant.

The last variant that deals with different word classes is variant 8, which uses an infinitive where MT has an adjective. The problem with MT's use of an adjective here has already been discussed, and it was pointed out that the same consonants found in MT could be pointed as an infinitive. Since significant variants are only those that presume a different consonantal text, this variant cannot be considered significant.

The only variant dealing with the inflection of the verb is variant 24, where T has a perfect corresponding to a perfect with *waw* consecutive in MT. Though one would expect T to use an imperfect to render a perfect with *waw* consecutive, and though the other two instances of this construction in the chapter are so rendered, three examples are not enough to get an idea of the translators' tendencies. However, the low deviation factor in table 38 suggests a tendency to render inflection consistently, and the possibility that the *Vorlage* might have been different from MT is supported by the fact that both LXX and V also use past tenses in the same place. Therefore, this variant should be considered significant.

On two occasions, reflected by variants 14 and 16, T uses the passive *ithpeel* stem where MT has the active *qal* stem. In both cases, the subject of the verb in MT is ܐܘܢܐ, and T alters the construction in order to avoid having God the immediate subject of an action that might be perceived as bringing him into direct contact with humans. Thus, concern for reverence of God dictated the shift in verb stem, so the variants are not significant.

¹²²So also Jer 19:3. Cf. 2 Kings 25:19, where T renders a participial ܐܘܢܐ in a construct chain with ܐܘܢܐ plus a verb.

¹²³Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:91.

¹²⁴Cf. Dalman, *Grammatik*, 57.

The next four variants all deal with the use of a plural noun in T where a singular noun appears in MT. Variant 7 reflects the *qere* reading of Hebrew ms L, as discussed above (p. 94), but since the variation between *kethib* and *qere* is merely orthographic, the variant is not significant. Variant 28, with which variant 27, a change in verbal number, must be considered, and variant 26 both employ plural forms of the noun ‏𐤒𐤓, “sin.” Sperber notes that T frequently renders singular words for sin by plurals,¹²⁵ so the plural in variants 26 and 28 probably does not suggest a different *Vorlage*. Variant 27 then is a modification to the verbal number in order to accommodate the plural noun that is the subject of the verb. Thus, none of these variants is significant. Finally, variant 29 is concerned with the rendering of the singular noun ‏𐤌𐤍𐤒𐤇 by the plural noun ‏𐤒𐤓𐤁𐤓. Table 44 indicates that the translators were generally concerned with a precise rendering of nominal number, but the previous several variants indicate that they could vary the number in certain circumstances. The translators might have been influenced by their rendering of the previous ‏𐤁𐤆𐤁𐤇 by ‏𐤁𐤓𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕, which contains a plural. The only other occurrence of the phrase ‏𐤁𐤌𐤍𐤒𐤇 that is translated in Targum Jonathan is in Isa 43:23, where it is also rendered by a plural, ‏𐤁𐤒𐤒𐤓𐤁𐤓. It is likely, then, that the translators felt that a plural rendering was more appropriate in the present case, even if the *Vorlage* was singular, so variant 29 is probably not significant.¹²⁶

The last variant to be considered under the rubric of consistency is variant 17, where a definite ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒𐤓𐤕 in T corresponds to an indefinite ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒 in MT. Table 47 indicates that the translators were inclined to be fairly precise in rendering the definiteness of their *Vorlage*, and a closer examination of the exceptional cases indicates that in all the other cases which deviate from MT, a different construction in T explains the deviation. The renderings of verse 17 would seem to indicate the translators’ care in rendering definiteness: in this verse ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒 is rendered ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒𐤓𐤕, but ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒 is rendered ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒𐤓𐤕 twice. However, this façade of precision does not continue throughout the book, at least as far as the word ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒 is concerned. Of the nine other renderings of ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒, absolute and without the article, in the book, T has ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒 five times and ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒𐤓𐤕 four times. Thus, the translators were inconsistent in their rendering of the definiteness of ‏𐤓𐤁𐤒, so variant 17 is not significant.

Only three of the variants related to consistency are significant, so few changes are necessary in the statistical tables on the basis of the discovery of significant variants. Like Syriac, since Aramaic is a Semitic language, no other factors necessitate modifying the tables further. Certain stylistic and theological tendencies have already been noted that affect the literalness of the translation, and it is often difficult in T to separate stylistic from

¹²⁵Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:96-97.

¹²⁶Could the tendency to render words for sin as plurals also affect words like ‏𐤒𐤓𐤁𐤓 and ‏𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕, which are means of removing sin?

theological tendencies. Since these tendencies have not been investigated in any consistent manner, their effect on the translation technique will be left until the next chapter. The following changes to the summaries at the bottom of the tables should be noted.

<u>Table</u>	<u>Changes</u>
35	Aram advs: 21 1.75 Aram advs/Heb adv total Heb (>1x): 84 84.5% of Heb words by primary rendering deviation factor: 2.02
38	deviation factor: 0.27 deviation factor (without verbals): 0.26

These changes to the statistical tables are minor in nature, and they in no way change the general perception of the literalness of the translation.

Variants in the Representation of Hebrew Lexemes by Aramaic Lexemes (Segmentation)

The tendency of the Aramaic translators to render each component of compound Hebrew words is much higher than that found in the either LXX or P, 96.0% as compared with 62.8% and 76.6%. This higher number suggests that the translators felt it important to render compound words as precisely as possible, and deviations from this pattern deserve scrutiny. However, both cases of deviation in T have already been discussed under the category of consistency (variants 36 and 41), and neither was found to be significant.

Variants in Word Order

T is absolutely consistent in following the word order reflected by MT in chapter 3.

Variants in Quantitative Representation

As already noted above, the 90.9% agreement between T and MT in quantitative representation is substantially greater than the initial figures of the other versions so far reviewed, reflecting only about half as many deviations from MT as LXX and P have. A separate tabulation of the positive and negative numbers in the list reveals that T's longer text amounts to thirty-six extra semantic units, while MT has only three extra semantic units. Most of the excess text in T can be accounted for in two ways. First, the translators' frequent use of the relative particle accounts for an extra ten units in T. Second, T's theological concern for preserving reverence for God accounts for most of the other excess text. It should be noted that the overlap between chapters 3 and 4 of this study is most clear in T, for no analysis of the style of T is possible without a consideration of the translators' theological concerns. Whereas the theological concerns of the translators of the other versions are generally subtle, and even obscure at times, many of the concerns of T's translators are manifest. Since so many quantitative variants in particular revolve around an

understanding of T's theological concerns, those that seem unambiguously expressed in the text and which have been documented in the works of Churgin, Sperber, Levine, and others will be dealt with in the present chapter.

The first variants to be addressed are those in which T adds the relative particle alone, namely, variants 44, 48, 50, 54, 57, 62, 64, 66, and 71. In every case, the relative renders part of a construct construction in MT (or what presumably would be a construct construction if the structure of MT were the same as that of T). Since the Hebrew used when Samuel was written did not yet have the particle לְ of later Hebrew, it is clear that no difference in *Vorlage* can be assumed; the use of לְ is simply a typical Aramaic equivalent for a Hebrew construct. Thus, none of these variants is significant.

The next several variants are those in which the longer text of T can probably be explained by reference to the theological concerns of the translators, and since the theological concern is so evident, they may be dealt with rather cursorily. Variants 47 and 49 may be considered together, since they are related. The translators had a problem with Samuel, who was not a priest, sleeping in the temple of the Lord. They solved the problem by having him sleep in the court of the Levites (see above, variant 10), but they preserved MT's reference to the temple by anticipating the call of Yahweh in the following verse.¹²⁷ The additional בֵּית מִקְדָּשׁ of variant 47 in turn anticipates the reference to the temple later in verse 3, and it also clarifies exactly which lamp is being discussed, so these variants are not significant. The addition of בֵּית מִקְדָּשׁ to בֵּית in variant 61 is a typical rendering of T, and it refers back to variant 47 as well, so it is not significant, either.

Variants 51 and 52 are an attempt to avoid saying that Samuel had a direct knowledge of God. Instead of saying that he did not yet know God, T says that he had not yet learned to know instruction about God. The targumic use of מִן קִדְּוֵי has already been mentioned above (variant 13, pp. 136-37); it is frequently used before יְיָ in T. Variant 55 also contains מִן קִדְּוֵי and so may be included along with variants 51 and 52 as nonsignificant variants.

In variants 53 and 63, T inserts the word נְבוֹאָה , "prophecy," after a reference to something revealed to Samuel (a word in v. 7 and a vision in v. 15). The translators seem to have been concerned again to emphasize that what Samuel heard and saw was not God himself; rather, Samuel received revelation through a prophetic audition or vision. These variants, then, are not significant. These additions may be compared with T's rendering of נְבוֹאָה in verse 20 as נְבוֹאָה , preceded by בְּפִתְחוֹת (variant 70). Here, too, the translators are apparently emphasizing the prophetic medium through which Samuel received his revelations, so variant 70 is also nonsignificant.

Variants 65 and 67 are attempts to preserve the holiness of God by distancing him from human beings, in this case Samuel. The rendering of עִמּוֹ by בְּסַעֲדֵיהָ has already

¹²⁷Cf. Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 120.

been discussed (see above, p. 135), and the addition of ׀ before ׀ is frequent in T.¹²⁸ Thus, these variants should not be considered significant.

The next three variants to be considered are probably not theologically motivated but rather simple translational equivalents. Variants 58 and 59 both add the word ׀ before ׀, referring to the “house” of Eli. The reason for adding the word is not clear, though perhaps the translators wanted to stress that judgment was coming upon the family rather than the buildings (cf. also 2:32 T). On the other hand, the addition may just be an Aramaic equivalent without special significance (cf. 3:14, חובי בית עלי). Either way, the variants are not significant.

Variant 60 concerns the addition of ׀ קדשי, “(holy) offerings,” after ׀, another word for “offerings.” The translators of T used a variety of word to render the Hebrew זבח: the cognate דיבח (1 Sam 1:21; 2:19), the word ׀ (1 Sam 2:13), and the compound ׀ קדשי (1 Sam 16:5; Josh 22:26, 28, 29). The variation in T, and particularly the frequent use of the compound ׀ קדשי, show that this variant is not significant.

The remaining variants all have a somewhat more forceful claim to represent a *Vorlage* different from that found in MT. Variant 45 has an additional ׀ in T preceding an infinitive. The two other Hebrew infinitives in the chapter that stand alone and that are rendered by T as infinitives (3:6, 8) also lack a ׀ in T, but T renders ׀ in 3:15 with ׀, which has both prepositions ׀ and ׀ preceding the infinitive. An investigation of other infinitives in 1 Samuel reveals that, though the translators usually omit ׀ before an infinitive when MT does, they occasionally add it (cf. 1 Sam 17:28), especially after some form of ׀ (Dt 2:25, 31; Josh 3:7), as in the present verse. This data suggests that the variant is probably not significant, but that the translators probably understood their *Vorlage* as an infinitive rather than an adjective.

In variant 46, T has an extra conjunction ׀ as compared with MT. Table 36 shows that MT and T share fifty-eight occurrences of ׀, and the list of add-ons indicates that T never fails to render a conjunction found in MT. Moreover, variant 46 is the only instance in which a conjunction was added. These statistics indicate that the translators were concerned to render conjunctions as accurately as possible (except when added as part of a theological expansion, as in variant 49). Supporting evidence comes from the versions and from ten Masoretic mss listed by Kennicott, one of which (187) Goshen-Gottstein considers important. The evidence suggests, then, that the *Vorlage* of T contained a conjunction, so the variant is significant.

Variant 56 is the first variant to be considered in which MT has the longer text; it has the particle ׀, and T has nothing corresponding. Table 35 indicates that the translators rendered the other five occurrences of ׀ in the chapter with ׀, and a perusal

¹²⁸Ibid., 59-60.

of other occurrences of אִשָּׁר in the book shows that ׀ was indeed the normal rendering. No obvious graphic similarities in either Hebrew or Aramaic suggest themselves as reasons for accidental omission, though the haplography of a single word or letter is certainly plausible in either language. The failure of many mss of LXX to render the word, however, suggests the likelihood of Hebrew mss that omitted the particle. Thus, variant 56 is probably significant.

The last two variants to be considered, numbers 68 and 69, must be treated together. MT says וְלֹא הִפִּיל מִכֹּל דְּבַר יְיָ אֲרֻצָּה, and T reads וְלֹא בִטִּיל מִכֹּל דְּבַר יְיָ אֲרֻצָּה. Both versions of this clause carry the same basic meaning, that none of Samuel's words failed. However, whereas MT uses the colloquialism "fell to the ground," T substitutes "was vain" for "fell" to make the meaning more obvious. As a result, the translators were also forced to substitute "one" for "to the ground," in order to have the resulting clause make sense. This explanation of the data seems the most satisfactory one, despite the fact that a presumed אֲרֻצָּה bears some graphic similarity to אֲרֻצָּה.¹²⁹ Thus, the variants are probably not significant.

A review of the quantitative variants in T reveals that only two of the thirty-nine deviations are significant, raising the percentage of agreement between MT and T to 91.3%. Thus, in spite of the translators' theological concerns, they still produced a translation that is more literal than P, though it is less literal in this area than the adjusted figures for LXX. However, when the theological modifications and the use of the relative to render the construct are dropped from consideration, T become extremely literal in quantitative representation, on the order of 98.4% agreement between T and MT, a figure almost identical to the 98.3% agreement in quantitative representation between LXX and MT. These figures suggest that the translators of T were generally concerned with a precise rendering of their *Vorlage*, but this desire for consistency could be overridden if some theological or haggadic clarification of the text were necessary. For the textual critic, the data suggests that all those variants that do not result from some known theological tendency of the targumists deserve careful scrutiny.

Vulgate

Limitations of Latin for Rendering Hebrew

Latin, like Greek, is an Indo-European language, so it naturally differs from Hebrew in several ways in regard to vocabulary, grammar, and idiom. A highly inflected language, Latin has six cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, ablative, and

¹²⁹Cf. the comment by Churgin: "The general underlying principle in the exegesis of T. Jonathan consists in an attempt to render intelligible *to the fullest possible degree* that which is obscure," [italics mine]; Pinkhos Churgin, *Targum Jonathan to the Prophets*, Yale Oriental Series, vol. 14 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1907), 78.

vocative), three genders (masculine, feminine, and neuter), and two numbers (singular and plural).¹³⁰ Word order, so important in Hebrew, is extremely flexible in Latin, since the case endings on the nouns allow them to be placed in many different places within the sentence without altering the meaning. Thus, a close correspondence in word order between Hebrew and Latin would indicate a certain measure of commitment to literalness. Because Hebrew and Latin share almost no common roots, little similarity should be expected in regard to vocabulary. Similarly, it is unlikely that the correlation between the gender of nouns in Hebrew and Latin, unless they reflect true gender, will be any greater than might be expected from random similarity.

One significant difference between Latin and Hebrew is the lack of a Latin article. Definiteness in Latin common nouns is usually implied from the context rather than explicitly indicated, though the Latin translators could use demonstrative adjectives to emphasize definiteness, if they so chose.¹³¹ However, at the stage of development of the Latin language represented by the Vulgate, extensive use of demonstratives to indicate definiteness is not a common feature, so the absence of a demonstrative to reflect a Hebrew article, for example, should not be seen as a deviation from literalness.

A number of differences between Hebrew and Latin also appear in the respective verbal systems. As noted earlier, Hebrew verbs can be classified by stem, inflection, person, gender, and number. Latin verbs can be classified by tense, voice, mood, person, and number. As is the case with Greek, Latin person and number will generally reflect Hebrew person and number, and since gender is not represented in the Latin verb, one common form must be used for both masculine and feminine in Hebrew.

Hebrew inflection is represented, to a large extent, by a combination of Latin tense and mood. Though the simple Hebrew perfect does not always represent past time, it is generally rendered in Latin by one of the past tenses (perfect, imperfect, or pluperfect) in the indicative mood. The simple Hebrew imperfect is usually rendered in Latin by a present or future tense (present, future, or future perfect) in the indicative. A tense other than one of the usual ones was often employed by the translators if they felt that the subjunctive mood was more appropriate. Furthermore, the use of the *waw* consecutive with the Hebrew perfect or imperfect usually reversed the above characterization. Hebrew imperatives were rendered consistently with Latin present imperatives.

The division of Hebrew stems into three groups—basic, intensive, and causative—has been discussed above. Latin does not reflect these distinctions, but it does differentiate

¹³⁰The Proto-Indo-European dual, reflected in classical Greek, disappeared from the Italic family of languages, including Latin, in prehistoric times; Carl Darling Buck, *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), 170-71.

¹³¹In fact, the article that is present today in the Romance languages is descended from the Latin demonstrative pronoun *ille*; Frederic M. Wheelock, *Latin: An Introductory Course Based on Ancient Authors*, 3d ed. (New York: Harper & Row, Barnes & Noble, 1963), 44.

between active and passive voice. Thus, active stems (qal, piel, hiphil) are generally represented by a Latin verb in the active voice, and passive stems (niphal, pual, hophal), by a Latin verb in the passive voice. Since there is no Latin reflexive voice, nor is there a middle voice as in Greek, the reflexive stems (niphal, hithpael) have no natural parallel in Latin.¹³² It might be expected, then, that these stems would not be rendered as consistently as the others.

Latin, like Hebrew, has other verbal forms that cannot be classified as finite verbs. The uses of the Latin infinitive correspond fairly closely to those of the Hebrew infinitive, so a fairly high degree of correlation was possible in translation. One common difference, however, is the failure of the Latin translators to render the Hebrew preposition ל before infinitives. Some correspondence of use also exists between Hebrew and Latin participles, although the use of a Latin participle as a finite verb was not common. Finally, Latin has two other verbal forms that have no equivalent in Hebrew, the verbal nouns called the gerund and the supine. Since their use in Latin corresponds most closely to Hebrew participles and infinitives, they, too, may be considered literal renderings of these Hebrew verbals.¹³³

Partial Translation Technique

Add-Oms

Like Greek, Latin does not need to render the Hebrew sign of the definite direct object אִשׁ or various Hebrew prepositions in order to clarify the meaning of a passage. Of course, it would have been easy for Jerome to use equivalent Latin prepositions, but he did not always choose to do so. In the light of an examination of the primary renderings of the Hebrew prepositions and sign of the definite direct object, the omission of ל, אִשׁ, אִשׁ, אִשׁ, or אִשׁ will not be considered add-oms. See Appendix 2 for a list of add-oms in V.

Consistency

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Variation</u>	<u>Vulgate</u>	<u>Masoretic Text</u>
1	3:1	<i>autem</i>	lexeme	
2		<i>ministrabat</i>	verb	participle
3		<i>manifesta</i>	adjective	participle
4	3:2	<i>ergo</i>	lexeme	
5		<i>iacebat</i>	verb	participle

¹³²The Latin deponent passive, though related to the medio-passive voice in Proto-Indo-European, from which the Greek middle voice developed, came to be considered a passive form with active meaning by Latin speakers; Buck, *Comparative Grammar*, 237.

¹³³Harry E. Wedeck, *Third Year Latin*, 2d ed., The Heath Latin Series, ed. Wilbert Lester Carr (Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1938), 311.

6		<i>oculi</i>	plural	singular
7		<i>caligaverant</i>	verb	verb phrase
8		<i>nec</i>	conjunction	negative particle
9	3:3	<i>autem</i>	lexeme	
10		<i>dormiebat</i>	verb	participle
11	3:4	<i>respondens</i>	participle	verb
12	3:6	<i>consurgens</i>	participle	verb
13		<i>respondit</i>	lexeme	
14	3:7	<i>neque</i>	lexeme	
15	3:8	<i>vocavit</i>	verb	infinitive
16		<i>consurgens</i>	participle	verb
17		<i>vocaret</i>	verb	participle
18	3:9	<i>audit</i>	verb	participle
19	3:10	<i>audit</i>	verb	participle
20	3:11	<i>facio</i>	verb	participle
21		<i>quicumque</i>	lexeme	
22		<i>audierit</i>	verb	participle
23	3:12	<i>adversum</i>	lexeme	
24		<i>super</i>	lexeme	
25		<i>incipiam</i>	verb	infinitive
26		<i>conplebo</i>	verb	infinitive
27	3:13	<i>praedixi</i>	lexeme	
28			perfect	perfect w/c
29		<i>iudicaturus essem</i>	periphrasis	participle
30		<i>in</i>	lexeme	
31		<i>propter</i>	lexeme	
32		<i>agere</i>	lexeme	
33			infinitive	participle
34	3:16	<i>respondens</i>	participle	verb
35		<i>praesto</i>	lexeme	
36		<i>sum</i>	lexeme	
37			verb	pronoun
38	3:17	<i>interrogavit</i>	lexeme	
39		<i>verbis</i>	plural	singular
40			passive	piel
41	3:18	<i>respondit</i>	lexeme	
42		<i>est</i>	verb	pronoun
43		<i>oculis</i>	plural	singular

44	3:19	<i>cecedit</i>	active	hiphil
45	3:20	<i>fidelis</i>	adjective	participle
46	3:21	<i>appareret</i>	verb	infinitive
47		<i>iuxta</i>	lexeme	

Table 51.—Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives: Lexemes

Heb words (>1x): 29	Lat words: 45	1.55 Lat words/Heb word
deviation factor: 2.13		
total Heb (>1x): 134	primary Lat: 108	80.6% of Heb words by primary rendering
Heb roots (>1x): 27	Lat roots: 43	1.59 Lat roots/Heb root

Table 52.—Adverbs, Prepositions, and Particles: Lexemes

Heb advs (>1x): 12	Lat advs: 30	2.50 Lat advs/Heb adv
total Heb (>1x): 82	primary Lat: 55	67.1% of Heb advs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 5.41		

Table 53.—Conjunctions: Lexemes

Heb conjs (>1x): 2	Lat conjs: 12	6.00 Lat conjs/Heb conj
total Heb (>1x): 55	primary Lat: 37	67.3% of Heb conjs by primary rendering
deviation factor: 30.98		

Table 54.—Word Classes

percentage of verbs/verbals represented by verbs/verbals:	95/97 = 97.9%
percentage of verbs represented by verbs:	74/76 = 97.4%
percentage of participles represented by participles:	0/12 = 0.0%
percentage of infinitives represented by infinitives:	3/7 = 42.9%
percentage of nouns/adjs represented by nouns/adjs:	57/68 = 83.8%
percentage of pronouns represented by pronouns:	36/40 = 90.0%

Table 55.—Verbs: Hebrew Inflection, Latin Tense and Mood

deviation factor (discrete tense/mood combinations): 6.15
deviation factor (grouped): 1.53
deviation factor (grouped, without verbals): 0.25

Table 56.—Verbs: Hebrew Stem, Latin Voice

deviation factor: 0.63

Table 57.—Verbs: Person

deviation factor: 0.00

Table 58.—Verbs: Number

deviation factor: 0.02

Table 59.—Nouns and Adjectives: Gender

deviation factor: 31.64

Table 60.—Nouns and Adjectives: Number

deviation factor: 2.95

Table 61.—Nouns and Adjectives: Use vs. Case

deviation factor: 13.58 (discrete use/case combinations)

deviation factor: 1.02 (grouped)

Table 62.—Pronouns: Gender

deviation factor: 0.22

Table 63.—Pronouns: Number

deviation factor: 0.00

Table 64.—Pronouns: Use vs. Case

deviation factor: 9.91 (discrete)

deviation factor: 3.44 (grouped)

Representation of Hebrew Lexemes by Latin Lexemes (Segmentation)

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Hebrew Compound</u>	<u>Latin Rendering</u>
48	3:1	לפני	<i>coram</i>
49	3:2	לראות	<i>videre</i>
50	3:5	לי	<i>me</i>
51	3:6	לי	<i>me</i>
52	3:7	אליו	<i>ei</i>
53	3:8	בשלישית	<i>tertio</i>
54		לי	<i>me</i>
55		לנער	<i>puerum</i>
56	3:9	אלידך	<i>te</i>
57	3:10	כפעם בפעם	<i>sicut vocaverat secundo</i>
58	3:13	לו	<i>ei</i>
59		בם	<i>eos</i>
60	3:14	לבית	<i>domui</i>
61		בזבח	<i>victimis</i>
62		ובמנחה	<i>et muneribus</i>
63	3:15	מהגיד	<i>indicare</i>
64	3:17	ממני	<i>me</i>
65		לך	<i>tibi</i>
66		אלידך	<i>tibi</i>
67	3:18	לו	<i>ei</i>
68	3:20	לנביא	<i>propheta</i>
69		ליהוה	<i>Domini</i>

Heb compounds: 49 Lat equivalents: 27 55.1% of Heb compounds rendered exactly

Word Order

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Latin Variant</u>
70	3:17	1	<i>oro te ne</i>
Heb semantic units: 372		variations: 1	Heb word order followed 99.7% of the time

Quantitative Representation

	<u>Ref</u>	<u>Number of Variations</u>	<u>Variant</u>
71	3:2	+1	<i>factum</i>
72		-1	-1 2°
73		-1	החלו
74	3:3	-1	-1 1°
75		-1	אשר
76		+1	<i>erat</i>
77	3:4	-1	-1 2°
78		+2	<i>qui respondens</i>
79	3:5	-1	-1 3°
80		+1	<i>qui</i>
81	3:6	-1	-1 3°
82		-1	-1 5°
83		+1	<i>qui</i>
84		+1	<i>te</i>
85		+1	<i>et 3°</i>
86	3:7	+1	<i>fuerat</i>
87	3:8	+1	<i>et 2°</i>
88		+1	<i>adhuc</i>
89		-1	-1 2°
90		+1	<i>qui</i>
91		-1	-1 3°
92	3:9	-1	עלי
93		+1	<i>et 3°</i>
94		-1	היה
95		+1	<i>deinceps</i>
96		-1	-1 3°
97	3:11	-1	1- 1°
98	3:12	+1	<i>sum</i>
99	3:13	-1	אני
100		+1	<i>essem</i>
101		+1	<i>quod</i>

102		-1	כִּי 2°
103		+1	<i>indigne</i>
104		-2	לָהֶם
105	3:14	-1	-וַ 1°
106		+1	<i>quod</i>
107		+1	<i>eius</i>
108		-1	עָלַי
109		+1	<i>usque</i>
110	3:15	-1	אֵל
111	3:16	-1	-וַ 3°
112		+2	<i>qui respondens</i>
113	3:17	+1	<i>eum</i>
114		+1	<i>est</i> 1°
115		+1	<i>est</i> 2°
116		+1	<i>te</i> 2°
117		+1	<i>sunt</i>
118	3:18	+1	<i>ille</i>
119		+1	<i>quod</i>
120		+1	<i>est</i> 2°
121	3:20	-1	-וַ 2°
122		+1	<i>esset</i>
123	3:21	+1	<i>fuerat</i>
124		-1	אֵל

Heb semantic units: 424 Lat deviations: 57 86.6% agreement

Elimination of Variants

The textual history of a version is important to consider when evaluating the variants exhibited by that version. This statement particularly applies to an evaluation of V, for, as noted above, Jerome made use of both *it* and LXX, as well as later Greek versions, when producing his translation. In his introduction to the Latin Bible, Friedrich Stummer says that Jerome's agreements with LXX or the later Greek versions should generally be excluded from consideration, unless further evidence for a deviating Hebrew text exists.¹³⁴ Nevertheless, it must also be remembered that he was translating from a Hebrew ms, the

¹³⁴Friedrich Stummer, *Einführung in die lateinische Bibel*, 123. He says, in part,

Wo Hieronymus mit der Septuaginta oder den späteren Übersetzern gegen unseren heutigen Masoralextext übereinstimmt, scheidet er m. E. überhaupt aus. Denn das beweist höchstens, daß die Septuaginta seiner Zeit oder einer der Späteren so und so las, nicht aber ohne weiteres, daß auch der hebräische Text, der ihm vorlag, von dem unseren verschieden war.

character of which is problematical.¹³⁵ Stummer does not explain what further evidence he might accept as supporting a reading different from MT in the *Vorlage* of Jerome, but he seems to imply that support from the other versions would constitute such evidence. Surely another type of supporting evidence, however, would be Jerome's failure to render simple Hebrew vocabulary and sentence structures in a way consistent with his translation technique. It is undoubtedly true that Jerome frequently resorted to LXX or the other Greek versions (especially Symmachus)¹³⁶ when he faced a Hebrew passage that was difficult to understand. However, his knowledge of Hebrew was surely good enough to enable him to translate "easy" Hebrew without recourse to the Greek. Therefore, variants in V that would otherwise be considered significant will be compared with the extant Greek versions and the OL to see if any influence from these versions is present. A reading in V that agrees with one of these other versions will not be considered significant if the Hebrew at that point in the text is difficult, either lexically or grammatically. However, if the Hebrew would probably not have been the sort that Jerome would have found difficult to translate, the variant will be considered significant, even if it is supported by other versions. It is clear that determining what Jerome would and would not have been able to translate without recourse to the versions is subjective, but it seems best to proceed in this fashion in order to avoid the extremes of including too much or too little.

Jerome himself states that his approach to translation is to render "with complete fidelity what stands in the Hebrew," but not necessarily to create a word for word translation, for "if we follow the syllables, we lose the understanding."¹³⁷ Jerome's skill and originality as a translator are most notable in the historical books, including Samuel, where he follows the Hebrew more closely than in the prophetic books.¹³⁸ A more precise initial estimate of his translation technique may be gleaned from an analysis of the tables.

The first fact to be noticed is the decided propensity for variety in lexical choice indicated by the first three tables.¹³⁹ The use of Latin verbs to render Hebrew verbs (table 54) is comparable to that in other versions, but V's rendering of verbals by the same class of verbals is even lower than that of LXX, and none of the participles is rendered by a

¹³⁵Deist, *Text of OT*, 209.

¹³⁶"Where the Vulgate exhibits a rendering which deviates alike from the Hebrew text and from the LXX, the clue to its origin will generally be found in one of the other Greek translations, especially in that of Symmachus"; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, liv; cf. also lxxxii-lxxxiii.

¹³⁷Jerome, *Epistle to Sunnia and Fretela*, cited in Robert H. Pfeiffer, *Introduction to the Old Testament* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1948), 124.

¹³⁸Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, 124. Cf. also Jerome's comment in his prologue to the books of Samuel and Kings, cited in V^S: "Et cum intellexeris quod antea nesciebas, vel interpretem me aestimato, si gratus es, vel παραφραστῆν, si ingratus, quamquam mihi omnino conscius non sim mutasse me quippiam de hebraica veritate"; *Biblia Sacra Stuttgartensia*, 1:365.

¹³⁹A comparison of V's deviation factors of 2.13, 5.41, and 34.65(!) with those of the other versions highlights this tendency.

participle. The percentage of nouns, adjectives, and pronouns rendered by words of the same class is also substantially lower in V than in the other versions. This variety exhibited in both vocabulary and rendering of word class does not appear to the same extent in V's rendering of grammatical categories. In fact, the deviation factors for the grammatical tables (tables 55 through 64) are quite similar to those of LXX, the other version in an Indo-European language, and are often lower. The rendering of the person of verbs and the number of pronouns is absolutely consistent. V is very consistent in its renderings of the inflection of verbs (when grouped, without verbals), verb stem, the number of verbs, and the gender of pronouns. It is fairly consistent in rendering verbal inflection (grouped, including verbals) and number of nouns and adjectives. V is fairly inconsistent in rendering the use of pronouns. Finally, it is very inconsistent in rendering the use and the gender of nouns and adjectives, as would be expected from the differences between Latin and Hebrew. As in LXX, the Hebrew use most inconsistently rendered among nouns, adjectives, and pronouns is the object of the preposition.

In categories other than consistency, the representation of all the elements of compound words is lower in V than in any other version, though it is fairly close to LXX in this regard. V agrees with the other versions in closely following the Hebrew word order, but in the category of quantitative representation, V has more variations from MT than any other version, though its percentage of agreement is not significantly lower than the initial figures of LXX and P. In summary, V is closest to its Indo-European ally in many areas, but its variety of lexical choice is higher than that of any of the other versions.

Variants Related to Consistency

Eighteen of the forty-seven variants related to consistency are lexical variants, and the variety of renderings in tables 51, 52, and 53 suggests that few, if any, of them are significant. The least consistency is clearly present in the rendering of conjunctions, and variants 1, 4, 8, and 9 deal with the rendering of conjunctions. In light of the inconsistency reflected in the rendering of conjunctions, none of these variants should be considered significant.

Variants 23, 24, 30, 31, and 47 are all lexical variants that deal with prepositions. Table 52 shows that V is less consistent in rendering adverbs, prepositions, and particles than might be expected in a version characterized as literal. It has a tendency to use several different words to render the same Hebrew word, even though it often prefers one reading (cf. the renderings of ל and הנה). The number of variations from a single main rendering suggests that Jerome was more concerned to produce a smooth Latin translation of these words than to render each Hebrew preposition with a single Latin preposition. In variants 23 and 24, V reads *adversum* and *super*, respectively, and MT reads ל in both places. It is possible that Jerome based his renderings on LXX, which reads επι and εϋ in these

two places, but the Hebrew is far from difficult, so he would have had no compelling reason to consult another version. On the other hand, he may have felt that *adversum* and *super* better conveyed the meaning of the prepositions in the context. Furthermore, the semantic range of אֶל overlaps that of עַל in the books of Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel more than in other books.¹⁴⁰ Thus, Jerome's rendering has at least as much probability of being based on inner-Latin considerations as on differences in the *Vorlage*, so these variants should probably not be considered significant.

The other lexical variants that concern prepositions may be dealt with similarly. Variant 30 reads *in aeternum* for עַד עוֹלָם in MT. Though עַד is usually rendered by *usque* in the chapter, *in aeternum*, "forever," is an idiomatic rendering of the prepositional phrase. In variant 31, *propter iniquitatem* stands for בְּעוֹן. *In* or simply a case ending are the usual ways which V renders ב, but ב can sometimes have a causative force, as in the present case, and *propter* is an appropriate rendering in such a case. Variant 47 has *iuxta verbum* for כְּדַבֵּר in MT. It is possible that Jerome read כְּדַבֵּר in his *Vorlage*; on the other hand, *iuxta* might simply be another example of contextual rendering, much like *propter* in the previous variant. Lacking further evidence of V's pattern of rendering the prepositions ב and כ, the freedom with which prepositions are rendered in general prohibits concluding that the *Vorlage* was different from MT. Thus, none of these variants should be considered significant.

In variant 14, the particle *neque*, "and not," is used to render מְרַם; elsewhere, מְרַם is rendered by *necdum* and *antequam*, both of which modify the negative idea by limiting its scope: "not yet, before." It is unlikely, however, that *neque* here suggests a pure Hebrew negative (לֹא), and the fact that it follows *necdum* in the same verse suggests that the meaning attached to the enclitic *dum* carries over to *neque* as well. Variant 14, then, is not significant.

Most of the other lexical variants may be dealt with more briefly. Variants 13, 41, and 38 render אָמַר with *respondit* (in the first two cases) or *interrogavit* (in the last case). Though these are not the usual renderings *aio* or *dico*, they do adequately and accurately render the words in MT, and table 51 does suggest a tendency toward freedom in choice of vocabulary. *Quicumque* (variant 21), though not a form of *omnis* or *universus*, is a good contextual rendering of כָּל. *Praedixi* for הִגַּדְתִּי (variant 27) and *praesto sum* (variants 35 and 36) for הִנַּנִּי are also acceptable contextual renderings, though in each case they avoid the more common translation equivalents. None of these variants is significant.

The final lexical variant is *agere* in variant 32. Unlike the other variants considered to this point, the MT of verse 13 is not straightforward, a fact evidenced by the variety of renderings among the versions. Jerome's *Vorlage* seems to have been the same as MT, for he paraphrases the difficult אֲשֶׁר יָדַע כִּי מִקְלָלִים לָהֶם בְּנֵי of MT (he shows no

¹⁴⁰BDB, s.v. "אֶל," note 2.

knowledge of the *tiqqun sopherim*) by *eo quod noverat indigne agere filios suos*, “because he knew that his sons were acting shamefully.” This rendering, though not strictly literal, certainly captures the import of the clause. Thus, variant 32 is not significant.

The next several variants deal with words in one class rendered by words in another. The most common example of this inter-class rendering is when V uses something other than a participle to render a participle in MT, as in variants 2, 3, 5, 10, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 29, 33, and 45. Since table 54 indicates that Hebrew participles are regularly rendered by something other than participles in the chapter, none of these variants is significant.

Another common shift in word class involves the rendering of an infinitive in MT by a verb in V (variants 15, 25, 26, and 46). Another look at table 54 reveals that less than half of the infinitives in MT are rendered by infinitives in V, so it seems that Jerome was not overly concerned with translating Hebrew infinitives with Latin infinitives. Variants 25 and 26 are special cases, since they render infinitives absolute in MT. The Hebrew construction would not have lent itself to idiomatic Latin renderings with an infinitive, so these variants cannot be considered significant. The other two variants both appear as part of the rendering of a phrase associated with וַיִּסַּף, “and he repeated.” As mentioned above in the discussion of LXX variant 13, וַיִּסַּף can be followed either by an infinitive or by *waw* and another verb. It is possible, then, that variants 15 and 46 reflect a variant Hebrew text that did not have an infinitive. Variant 46, however, has *ut appareret* instead of an infinitive, and since this expression is a common equivalent in V, it is not significant.¹⁴¹ Variant 15 reads *et adiecit Dominus et vocavit*, whereas MT has an infinitive for the second verb. LXX here follows MT, though in 3:6 it reads καὶ προσεθετο κυριος και εκαλεσεν. It is possible that V here reflects a Hebrew text divergent from MT and all the other versions, but the second *et* may also be an inner-Latin corruption of *ut*. In light of this latter possibility, and pending a more thorough examination of V’s rendering of such constructions in a wider context, the evidence of chapter 3 does not support considering variant 15 significant.

In variants 11, 12, 16, and 34, V has a participle corresponding to a verb in MT. Variants 12 and 16 are renderings of וַיִּקַּם וַיִּלֶךְ, and in both cases the participle *consurgens* transforms an independent clause in Hebrew into a dependent clause in Latin. Variants 11 and 34 render וַיִּשְׁמַע with *qui respondens*. Though not the exclusive rendering, this sort of transformation from compound to complex sentence is common in V.¹⁴² These variants, then, are not significant.

¹⁴¹W. E. Plater and H. J. White, *A Grammar of the Vulgate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926), 23-24.

¹⁴²Ibid., 117: “The *Double* [i.e., compound] *Sentence*, connected by *vav*, and constantly found in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, is as a rule skilfully woven into a *Complex Sentence* of the well-known classical type.” Cf. also p. 127: “In the Vulgate, and especially in the Old Test., *qui* is constantly used as

In two cases, variants 37 and 42, V uses a verb where MT has a pronoun. In each case, the Hebrew text of MT has a nominal clause which V renders by including the proper form of the copula *sum*. Nominal sentences were certainly possible in Latin, but the use of the copula was increasing in later Latin.¹⁴³ Thus, these variants are not significant.

Closely related to the variations in word class is variant 7, where V uses a verb *caligaverant* where MT has a verb phrase **הֶחְלֹו כַחֲזוֹת**. Though table 54 indicates a concern for rendering verbs more exactly than either participles or infinitives, the reason for the paraphrastic rendering here is obvious. V uses a single Latin word to convey the meaning found in an idiomatic Hebrew expression whose literal translation would not have been readily understood by Jerome's non-Semitic audience. Thus, variant 7 is not significant.

The differences in the verbal systems of Latin and Hebrew make correlation more difficult than between Hebrew and the other Semitic languages, but V does show more consistency in rendering the grammatical categories of verbs than in rendering either lexemes or certain aspects of word class. Variant 28 has a Latin perfect corresponding to a Hebrew perfect with *waw* consecutive. Thus, V has God refer to a message he had proclaimed previously (note also the *prae* prefix), probably in 2:27-36. The third deviation factor listed for table 55 indicates a high degree of consistency in the rendering of Hebrew verbs, so this variant, supported also by LXX and T, should be considered significant.

Two variants deal with the rendering of the Hebrew stem in V: variants 40 and 44. In variant 40, V has the passive *dicta sunt* where MT has the piel (active). As noted in the discussion of LXX variant 45, the lack of an explicit subject in the verse might have led Jerome to read the verb in his Hebrew text as a pual rather than a piel. Although he might just have preferred to render the word as a passive, table 56 indicates a fairly consistent tendency to render Hebrew verbs by their "natural" equivalents. In either case, however, the consonantal text would have been no different from MT, so variant 40 is not significant. Like Greek, Latin lacks a voice to express the causative idea found in the hiphil of **הִפִּיל**. V sometimes uses *facio* or *do* as auxiliaries to express the causative idea, but this construction is not used consistently.¹⁴⁴ In fact, all other hiphils in the chapter are rendered by the active voice alone, and though none of them has a distinctive causative meaning, it is unlikely that the *Vorlage* of V read a qal rather than a hiphil.

All of the remaining variants deal with variations in the number of nouns. Two of them, variants 6 and 43, have a plural of *oculus* where MT reads **עֵינָיו**. Since in both cases

a connecting link between two sentences.”

¹⁴³J. B. Hofmann and Anton Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, division 2, part 2, vol. 2 (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1965), 419-23, especially 419-20.

¹⁴⁴Plater and White, *Grammar*, 23.

ע"יננ is apparently simply an orthographic variant of ע"יני (the *qere* of MT ms L; see above p. 94), as in the other secondary versions, neither variant can be considered significant. The last variant under the heading of consistency is variant 39, where V reads the plural *verbis* and MT reads the singular הדרבר. As in the case of LXX variant 43, Latin idiom probably required the use of the plural rather than the singular, since the Hebrew noun was a collective singular. Thus, variant 39 is not significant.

Only one of the variants related to consistency in V can be considered significant, so the initial picture of the translation technique does not change much. Only table 55 is affected, as follows.

<u>Table</u>	<u>Changes</u>
55	deviation factor (discrete tense/mood combinations): 6.26 deviation factor (grouped): 1.54 deviation factor (grouped, without verbals): 0.23

Variants in the Representation of Hebrew Lexemes by Latin Lexemes (Segmentation)

As is the case with LXX and, to a lesser extent, P, V shows little interest in rendering each individual lexeme in compound words. In fact, only 55.1% of the compound words in the chapter are rendered exactly. In particular, prepositions, which are necessary in Hebrew, are superfluous in Latin with its various cases of nouns and adjectives. Some prepositions are rendered, but no consistency appears. Such a low percentage of exact renderings makes it unnecessary to examine individual cases in detail. None of the variants in segmentation appears to be significant.

Variants in Word Order

In sharp contrast to its lack of concern for rendering all the lexemes in compound words, V shows a penchant for following the Hebrew word order wherever possible, as do each of the other secondary witnesses. Since postpositive conjunctions are not counted as variants in word order if they are as close to the Hebrew conjunction as possible, the only variant in word order is variant 70, which reads *oro te ne* for וְלִי וְלָךְ, with *oro te* being the rendering of וְלִי. The overwhelming concern for following Hebrew word order implies that this variant should be taken as significant, unless Latin usage demands the variation. It seems that such is indeed the case. Since Jerome chooses to use *oro te* with a subjunctive following *ne*, the word order of V is apparently necessary for idiomatic Latin,¹⁴⁵ so the variant is not significant after all.

Variants in Quantitative Representation

As is the case with Greek, Latin has no equivalent for the Hebrew particle וְלָךְ, so

¹⁴⁵Hofmann and Szantyr, *Syntax und Stilistik*, 533-34.

the omission of this particle in V will not be considered a variant. Furthermore, Latin also has no means of representing the Hebrew article or state of definiteness (though means to do so did develop in the Romance languages),¹⁴⁶ so the omission of articles will be ignored.

In the area of quantitative representation, V's percentage of agreement with MT (86.6%) is between the initial figures of LXX and P, on the one hand, and T, on the other. As with P, most of V's deviations from the text of MT can be explained as stylistic deviations that bring the text closer to the idiom of the target language. A perusal of the list of quantitative variants indicates that of the fifty-seven deviations, thirty-three are instances of a longer text in V and twenty-four of longer text in MT. Thus, V has a longer text somewhat more frequently than MT does. The individual quantitative variants may now be examined in more detail.

On twelve occasions (variants 72, 74, 77, 79, 81, 82, 89, 91, 96, 105, 111, 121), the conjunction ׀ in MT has no equivalent in V; in three other cases (variants 85, 87, 93), V has *et* where MT has no conjunction. Though it is true that the addition or omission of conjunctions is probably the most common variant in extant Masoretic mss, two factors combine to cast doubt on the significance of any of these variants in V. First, the sheer frequency of the variations (particularly the apparent omissions) leads one to infer that Jerome did not consider the omission or, perhaps, the addition of conjunctions as detrimental to his attempt to render the Hebrew into Latin. Second, the large number of different words used to render conjunctions (see table 53) suggests more concern for Latin idiom than for exact correspondence between source and target language in this area. Though one or another of the omissions might have been the result of a difference in *Vorlage*, the translation technique of V, as described to this point, does not allow one to draw such a conclusion in any specific case. None of the omissions of ׀ should be considered significant.

The addition of *et* is less frequent than the omission of ׀, but unless some other factor intervenes, these variants should be disregarded as well. Variants 85 and 93 both occur in similar contexts, in the phrases *revertere et dormi* and *vade et dormi*. Though *revertere dormi* appears in verse 5 without *et*, it is likely that the inclusion of the conjunction was more in accord with typical Latin idiom. In any case, Jerome might have been following the language of LXX here, so these variants cannot be considered significant. Variant 87 has already been dealt with in the context of the discussion of variant 15, where it was decided that evidence does not allow one to suppose that the variant is significant. Therefore, variant 87 should also be considered nonsignificant.

Closely related to these variants are variants 75, 101, 102, and 106, which also deal with the presence or absence of conjunctions. In variant 75, MT reads ׀ אֲשֶׁר שָׁם, and V

¹⁴⁶Cf. *ibid.*, 191-92.

reads *ubi*. The Latin conjunction *ubi* combines the relative idea of וְשֵׁנִי with the local idea of אֵינִי, so no content is lost (cf. LXX), and the variant is not significant.

Variant 101 is also an example of the use of two words in one language rendering one in another, but this time the longer text is in V, which uses *eo quod* to render וְשֵׁנִי. The text of this difficult passage has already been discussed above to some extent under variant 32. The reason for the compound conjunction *eo quod* seems to be to delineate sharply the clause it introduces in Latin; it is not so carefully distinguished from the preceding clause in Hebrew (in fact, Masoretic punctuation associates it closely with the preceding word). Since וְשֵׁנִי can sometimes be used as a conjunction,¹⁴⁷ V's rendering can be said to be a literal rendering of the text found in MT, even though the phrasing is different from MT. Thus, variant 101 is not significant. The omission in variant 102 may also be considered here briefly. Since Jerome rearranged the phrasing of the verse, the second וְ in Hebrew became superfluous and was apparently omitted for this reason.

In variant 106, V reads the conjunction *quod* where MT has no conjunction. The effect of this insertion in V is to turn a direct speech into an indirect speech. The looseness with regard to the insertion and omission of conjunctions in V leads one to conclude that this insertion is demanded by good style rather than by a varying *Vorlage*, as also in P.

V frequently uses periphrastic forms of verbs to render Hebrew forms which are not periphrastic, namely, variants 71, 86, 98, 100, 115, 117, and 123. In each case, normal Latin idiom demands the use of a periphrastic form, either to express a passive idea (variants 71,¹⁴⁸ 86, 117, 123), because the verb was deponent (variants 98, 115), or to express a future idea in the subjunctive (variant 100). Thus, the extra words in V cannot be considered significant.¹⁴⁹

On four occasions, V has an extra form of *sum* which has no counterpart in MT and is not part of a periphrastic construction, namely, variants 76, 114, 120, and 122. In each case, MT has a nominal sentence. Though nominal sentences are permitted in Latin, it seems that, in the present chapter at least, copulative sentences were used instead, since all four instances of Hebrew nominal sentences are translated in this way. Because the addition of the copulative *sum* is apparently part of the translation technique, these variants are not significant.

Another apparent aspect of V's translation technique is the substitution of hypotaxis for parataxis by means of a clause beginning with *qui* and the omission of the Hebrew וְ (variants 78, 80, 83, 90, and 112). This type of construction is common in V, especially

¹⁴⁷BDB, s.v. "וְשֵׁנִי."

¹⁴⁸Cf. Plater and White, *Grammar*, 118.

¹⁴⁹For a discussion of the form *revelatus fuerat* rather than *revelatus erat*, see Hofmann and Szantyr, *Syntax und Stilistik*, 321.

in the OT.¹⁵⁰ The additional *respondens* in variants 78 and 112 could conceivably reflect an additional ׀ע״ׁ in the *Vorlage* (cf. 9:12, 21), but it is more likely that *respondens* is simply an expansion original with V (cf. 2:16). Thus, none of these variants is significant.

Variants 110 and 124 are examples of the omission of the preposition לֹ. The reason for this omission is the same as it was for the omission of לֹ in the category of segmentation, namely, that Latin has no need to use a preposition to convey the meaning, since it is an inflected language. Thus, these two variants are not significant.

The appearance of an extra pronoun in either MT or V is frequent in the chapter, occurring eight times (variants 84, 97, 99, 104, 107, 113, 116, and 118). In three cases (variants 97, 99, and 104) MT has the longer text. Variant 99 is an example of V's tendency to render verbal participles with full verbs, so, since the pronoun is implied in the verb ending, this variant cannot be considered significant. The end of verse 13, where variant 104 is located, is difficult to render, as has already been noted in the discussion of variant 32. The text of V here, though not strictly literal, does not seem to presume a text different from MT, so the variant is not significant. Syntactic variation or semantic difficulty are not involved in variant 97, where V does not render the pronominal suffix found in MT. It is possible that the pronoun was omitted as not necessary in the context, but, as the two previous variants show, V does not seem to omit pronouns without a good reason. It seems probable that a Hebrew scribe accidentally omitted the ׁ, though it is also possible that an original *id* was omitted in the course of the transmission of V. It is probably best, then, to consider variant 97 significant.

In variant 116, the clause *oro te* is used to render the Hebrew particle ׀, so this variant is not significant. Variant 118 involves the addition of a pronominal subject *ille* to specify who is speaking. The use of *ille* to refer to a subject previously mentioned is characteristic of Latin,¹⁵¹ and the insertion of ׀ׁׁ or some form of the demonstrative would not clarify matters in Hebrew, so this variant is not significant, either.

Variant 107 needs to be considered alongside variant 108, since they are apparently substitutional variants: whereas V simply reads “his house,” MT reads “the house of Eli.” It is possible that the repetition of “the house of Eli” in the verse was considered redundant and so was modified at the point of translation. However, no other evidence for such a concern appears in the chapter, at least as so far analyzed. Moreover, it is just as possible that “the house of Eli” earlier in the verse also affected the later part of the verse. Thus, these variants should be considered significant.

In variant 84, V reads *non vocavi te fili mi*, where MT reads לֹ קראתי בני, and LXX reads ου κεκληκα σε. It appears that V is a conflation of the texts found in MT and LXX. As noted in the discussion of LXX variants 83 and 84, בני and ׁ- are probably

¹⁵⁰Plater and White, *Grammar*, 127.

¹⁵¹Hofmann and Szantyr, *Syntax und Stilistik*, 187, 413.

substitutional variants that occurred in Hebrew. Since V shows no other signs of conflating MT and LXX in the chapter, it is probable that the conflation occurred in Hebrew, so variant 84 is significant.

Variant 113 is the only purely explanatory addition in V in the chapter (excluding substitutional variants 84, 107, and 108). Unlike P, which has ten explanatory additions, all in P itself, or LXX, where both MT and LXX have eight explanatory additions relative to one another, variant 113 is the only one found in V (variant 92, considered below, is the only explanatory addition in MT relative to V). The small number of explanatory forms demonstrates the proximity of the *Vorlage* of V to MT, but it also indicates that explanatory additions are not typical in V. The only other secondary witness that has this addition is P, but it is probable that the expansions occurred independently in the two traditions. It is possible that the addition occurred in the transmission of V, though no evidence exists that it did (the first hand of one ms omits *eum*), but it is equally possible that the variant was in the *Vorlage* of V. In light of these facts, variant 113 should probably be considered significant.

As mentioned above, variant 92 is the only explanatory addition in MT relative to V in the chapter. Whereas MT (along with P and T) specifies both the subject and the object of the verb, V does not include the subject “Eli.” A look at LXX is instructive here, for it omits both subject and object (see LXX variant 87). Since V does not agree completely with LXX, it is unlikely that the reading of V is based on LXX here. Nothing in V’s translation technique, as discerned to this point, suggests that such an omission is characteristic of V, so the variant should be considered significant.

In variant 73, MT reads וַעֲיַנְיָו הַחֲלוּ בַחֹרֶת, but V fails to render the second word, reading *et oculi eius caligaverant*. The expression “began to be dim” is fine Hebrew idiom, but it is likely that Jerome did not believe it would communicate effectively in Latin. V’s rendering “and his eyes had been blind” avoids the foreign idiomatic expression but captures the meaning, so variant 73 should not be considered significant.

Variants 88, 95, and 109 are adverbs in V that have no corresponding word in MT. Variant 95, which has an additional *deinceps* in V, should perhaps be considered alongside variant 94, which has הַיָּהּ in MT not represented in V. To have the expression הַיָּהּ in a conditional sentence is typical Hebrew, but it is not idiomatic Latin, and Jerome appears to have omitted הַיָּהּ for this reason. It may be that he added *deinceps* to replace the omitted הַיָּהּ. On the other hand, the three variants listed above may indicate some tendency to add adverbs, though the evidence available is not conclusive. Variant 109 is almost surely an addition original with V, and probably coming from Jerome himself, since *usque* merely strengthens the following *in aeternum*. In fact, Jerome probably would not have considered the word an addition, since it adds nothing to the meaning of the verse. Variant 88 is the most difficult of these variants to evaluate, for a floating “again” appears

in all the versions under consideration except LXX from time to time (verses 6 [MT, T, LXX^L], 8 [P, V, LXX^O], 21 [P]). Since verses 6 and 8 represent the second and third of Yahweh's calls to Samuel, the appropriateness of such adverbs is apparent. The additions could have arisen in either Hebrew or the versions, but the agreement of LXX^O with V suggests that variant 88 should probably be considered significant; the other adverbial additions should not.

The context of variant 103 has been discussed above, and it was noted that, though Jerome restructures the Hebrew text, it does not appear to have been any different from MT. The same conclusion applies as well to the present variant, for the additional *indigne* describes his sons' behavior: they were acting shamefully. Thus, the variant is not significant.

In variant 119, V inserts a relative pronoun to make the passage more understandable. Rather than rendering "the good in his eyes" literally, as does LXX, V inserts *quod*, so that the phrase becomes "what is good in his eyes." Since the insertion is a matter of idiom rather than difference in *Vorlage*, the variant cannot be considered significant.

All of the quantitative variants have now been evaluated, and only seven of them have been considered significant. Eliminating these variants from the statistics, the percentage of agreement between V and the presumed *Vorlage* rises to 88.0%. Comparing this figure with those of the other versions, Jerome was apparently somewhat more interested in representing each Hebrew word by a single word in translation than were the translators of P, though the figure does not approach the fidelity to quantitative representation found in LXX or T (after theologically motivated factors are eliminated in T).

Evaluation of Partial Secondary Witnesses

As was the case in Chapter 2, the partial secondary witnesses will not be dealt with in the same exhaustive manner in which the proper secondary witnesses were. Instead, from the list of accepted readings given there for each of these witnesses, those which might reflect a Hebrew reading different from MT will be selected, with little comment on individual choices.

Aquila

None of the readings of α' stem from any Hebrew text different from the consonantal text of MT. However, variant 3 apparently renders $\alpha\psi$ instead of $\alpha\psi$, and $\eta\mu\alpha\rho\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu$ in 3:13 (variant 5) uses the root I $\eta\eta\eta$ found in verse 2 rather than II $\eta\eta\eta$. Since these differences do not affect the consonantal text, they will not be considered further.

Symmachus

The readings attributed to σ´ sometimes correct LXX in the direction of MT, and sometimes they are simply different (better) Greek readings. None of them, however, implies a Hebrew reading not found in MT.

Theodotion

Like the previous two witnesses, none of the readings of θ´ implies a Hebrew text different from MT.

Other Readings Attributed to οἱ γ´

The reading attributed to the three translators that has the best claim to represent a variant Hebrew text is καὶ κατεστη καὶ ἐκάλεσε in verse 4 (variant 7). It is probable, though, that the reading is a partial harmonization with verse 10. If the reading reflected a true Hebrew variant, one would expect the subject κυριος to appear after the first verb, as it does in verse 10. Thus, none of the variants attributed to the three in general can be considered significant.

The Lucianic Recension

S. R. Driver characterizes the Lucianic recension as employing the substitution of synonyms, double renderings, and renderings that are different from both LXX and MT, and frequently superior to both.¹⁵² For the present, whether a reading is superior to MT is not the question, but rather whether it is based on a Hebrew reading independent of MT. One characteristic not mentioned by Driver, but which appears with enough consistency in the chapter to note it, is the tendency to add explanatory words or phrases, especially implied subjects or objects (cf. variants 14, 16, 33, 34, 41).¹⁵³ Another characteristic noted in LXX^L is the tendency toward consistency of expression in similar passages (cf. variants 5, 7, 13, 17, 18).

There are a few readings that suggest themselves as significant. Variant 8 is similar to the reading of MT, but it supposes a different position for עֲנֵה. Variant 12 suggests a different word order from MT. Variant 13 makes the third call of Samuel resemble the first two (in LXX and LXX^L) by adding a second Σαμουηλ. Variant 20 implies a missing conjunction and a different preposition. Variant 30 moves the second occurrence of Σαμουηλ to the end of the verse, an odd position, perhaps supporting the omission in the hexaplaric mss. Variant 40 deletes a conjunction, which could have arisen as a result of dittography from the preceding עֲנֵה or been deleted by haplography in

¹⁵²S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, xlix.

¹⁵³S. D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna," 393, n. 14, notes LXX^L's tendency to insert proper names.

Hebrew. Finally, three variants to the long addition in verse 21 are taken as significant (variants 46, 47, and 48), since they might alter the evaluation of the Hebrew text lying behind the Greek addition.¹⁵⁴

One rejected reading that deserves some note is variant 23, which inserts $\epsilon\pi\iota$ after $\epsilon\kappa\delta\iota\kappa\omega \epsilon\gamma\omega$. The expression $\epsilon\kappa\delta\iota\kappa\omega \epsilon\pi\iota$ is common in the prophets, but almost always as a translation of פִּקֵּד , and never as a translation of שָׁפַט . It is probable that $\epsilon\pi\iota$ in variant 23 is an inner-Greek corruption based on Septuagintal idiom, and perhaps also on the graphic similarity between $\epsilon\pi\iota$ and $\epsilon\gamma\omega$.

The Hexaplaric Recension

Since all the hexaplaric readings that agree with either MT or LXX have been omitted in the list in Chapter 2, it is not surprising that a number of the readings that remain are significant. Variant 1 apparently reads בִּית for הַיִּכָּל (cf. 1:9). Variant 2 bears witness to a free-floating “again” mentioned above. Variant 3 adds $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon$ after $\lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota$ to make verse 10 conform with verse 9 (unlike LXX^L, LXX^O shows little tendency towards internal consistency at the expense of fidelity to the *Vorlage*). Variant 8 seems to read אֱלֹהֵי־הַיָּם instead of יְהוָה . Variant 9 omits the second occurrence of $\Sigma\alpha\mu\upsilon\eta\lambda$ (cf. LXX^L). Finally, variants 10 and 11 are variants to the long addition of verse 21.¹⁵⁵ It is interesting to note that two exact agreements (LXX^O variants 3 and 5) and three apparently related readings (LXX^O variants 1, 9, and 10) between LXX^L and LXX^O do exist among the significant variants.

Other Possible Hebrew Readings

Since these readings, which reflect variants within the ms tradition of the secondary witnesses themselves, were chosen specifically as those which are probably significant, all three of them will be included. With this note, the evaluation of the lexical, grammatical, and stylistic characteristics of the secondary witnesses comes to a close. The majority of the work toward determining the translation technique of each of the witnesses is finished. All that remains is an analysis of such literary and theological factors as can be determined from a careful study of the chapter as a whole, using various available techniques.

¹⁵⁴Since this passage in LXX (the long addition in 3:21) has been found to be significant, and since the Greek text here preserves a passage not found in Hebrew, all variants to the text of LXX, including those in the partial secondary witnesses, become significant, just as all Hebrew variants are significant by definition.

¹⁵⁵See the previous note.