CHAPTER 4

LITERARY/THEOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS
OF THE SECONDARY WITNESSES

The interest in literary approaches to narrative portions of Scripture has increased tremendously in recent years. Some of these approaches are purely literary, in the sense that they take the final form of the text (or, more accurately, one of the final forms of the text, usually MT) as the basis for analysis. Other approaches combine literary and theological considerations with information gleaned from historical-critical methods, especially form criticism. The variety of literary methods produces complementary and, at times, contradictory results when applied to specific texts (as do the more traditional disciplines), so care must be exercised when using them. For the present study, it is unnecessary to delve into all the details of narrative research and methodology. The issue at hand is the possibility that one or more of these methods might provide information that will alter the evaluation of specific variants as analyzed in the previous chapter, particularly in borderline cases.

It should also be noted that a certain amount of overlap exists between the methodology of Chapter 3 and that of the present chapter. In particular, certain stylistic characteristics of the secondary versions have already been identified and considered in the analysis of some of the variants. For example, P's penchant for substituting the emphatic case plus the relative particle for MT's construct constructions is an aspect of the style of the translation. V's variety in lexical selection, especially of conjunctions, is part of V's translation technique already noted. The theological concerns of T have also been noted and taken into account. The purpose, then, of the present chapter is not to go over old ground but rather to see if some of the newer approaches to narrative as applied to Samuel can shed additional light on the translation technique of any of the secondary witnesses.

One of the difficulties of using the newer literary approaches as an aid to the textual analysis of the chapter has already been hinted at, namely, that fact that most literary analyses begin and end with MT. It is true that some do take LXX into account, but few do a comprehensive study of LXX as a complete text in itself.[1] A purely literary analysis of P, T, or V in Samuel does not seem to exist, though theological analyses of T as a whole

---

[1] An exception to this generalization is the article by S. D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna." Though it deals only with 1 Samuel 1, the insights that Walters raises concerning the tendencies of the translators of LXX will be analyzed and, if appropriate, applied to chapter 3 as well.

abound. For these reasons, it seems preferable to begin this chapter with an analysis of 1 Samuel 3 in MT. Some of the insights claimed for MT may shed some light on the Hebrew texts that lay before the various translators of the secondary witnesses. Since the focus of this book is textual criticism, no attempt is made to deal with every literary aspect of 1 Samuel 3 that could be noted. Instead, only that information that might provide insight into one or more textual variants will be considered. During the discussion of literary insights related to MT, variants in the secondary witnesses that will be discussed later at the appropriate time are indicated.

First of all, some of the authors who have done extensive literary treatments of all or part of 1 Samuel 3 should be mentioned. Shimon Bar-Efrat, in his book *Narrative Art in the Bible*, presents an approach to analyzing biblical narrative as a literary work of art.[2] Though he does not do a comprehensive analysis of 1 Samuel 3, he does refer to various aspects of the chapter periodically. Furthermore, his method may be extended to other parts of the chapter. Bar-Efrat divides his discussion of biblical narrative into five chapters, which deal respectively with narrator, characters, plot, time and space, and style. Peter D. Miscall does a detailed literary study of the entire book of 1 Samuel. He expresses his dissatisfaction with the historical-critical approach to biblical studies, and he proposes his approach as a possible alternative, though he notes that his work is still preliminary.[3] Lyle M. Eslinger is a proponent of the close reading method. In his book *Kingship of God in Crisis: A Close Reading of 1 Samuel 1-12*, Eslinger defines close reading as an attempt "to uncover and describe the intricate reticular connections that unite the narrative (or poem), making it into a singular entity, however complex or devious its plot may be."[4] Unlike Miscall, Eslinger believes that the results of the historical-critical approach must be acknowledged and taken into account, even in a literary analysis of the text.[5] Robert Karl Gnuse's revised dissertation is entitled *The Dream Theophany of Samuel*, and it primarily treats 1 Samuel 3, discussing comparative literature from the

---

[2]Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, trans. Dorothea Shefer-Vanson, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 70, Bible and Literature Series, no. 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, Almond Press, 1989), 1.

[3]Miscall, *1 Samuel*, vii. It is perhaps better to speak of *approaches* rather than *approach* in Miscall's case, since he claims to employ a variety of approaches in his examination of the text (ibid., xvi). Though he does not attempt a thorough deconstructive analysis of 1 Samuel, he does make use of deconstructionist language and tactics to understand the text (ibid., xx-xv).

[4]Lyle M. Eslinger, *Kingship of God in Crisis: A Close Reading of 1 Samuel 1-12*, Bible and Literature Series, no. 10 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 40.

[5]Ibid., 42. He says,

The close reading of any biblical text   must be carried out in the light of the previous historical-critical readings of the text. We have been cued to the tensions, doublets and varying points of view and their location in the narrative by historical criticism. A close reading will have to describe the contextual role of such phenomena if the hypothesis that the narrative can be read as a unity is to be maintained.

ancient Near East and the biblical tradition, then turning to a discussion of the chapter within its context in the book of 1 Samuel.[6] Gnuse's method is thus not purely literary, for it uses historical-critical data in its analysis. Robert Polzin's *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History* deals exclusively with the final (Masoretic) form of the text. Though he makes use of historical-critical insights, he stresses the importance of applying these insights to the final form of the text, not just hypothetical earlier forms of the text. He uses the insights of Mikhail Bakhtin and other Russian formalists to illumine the text of Samuel.[7] Finally, Moshe Garsiel uses the method of comparative structures to analyze 1 Samuel in *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels*. He, too, acknowledges the contributions of the various historical-critical theories, but he focuses on the final form of the text, which he believes is "for the most part a work of deliberate artistry which deserves consideration on its own account."[8]

A number of articles or short studies on 1 Samuel also exist. Uriel Simon, like Eslinger a proponent of close reading, in his article "Samuel's Call to Prophecy: Form Criticism with Close Reading," uses a method similar to that of Bar-Efrat to supplement form-critical insights, though he notes his disagreement with many of the results of form criticism.[9] John T. Willis believes that 1 Samuel 1-7 is, for the most part, a unified narrative. He discusses a number of stylistic and structural indicators that tie these chapters together.[10] Similarly, Michael Fishbane sees the text of 1 Samuel 3 as more than a simple factual report; it is a narrative whose factual content is affected by literary presentation. He discusses how chiasm, verbal linkage, irony, and musicality affect both the form and the meaning of the text.[11] Matitiahu Tsevat focuses his attention on one specific stylistic indicator that he believes demonstrates the unity of 1 Samuel 1-4. Taking his initial observations from Benno Jacob, he investigates the use of patterns of repetition

---

[6]Gnuse, *Dream Theophany*, passim.

[7]Robert Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History*, part 2, *1 Samuel* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1989), 1-17.

[8]Moshe Garsiel, *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels* (Jerusalem: Revivim, Rubin Mass, 1990), 34.

[9]Uriel Simon, "Samuel's Call to Prophecy: Form Criticism with Close Reading," *Prooftexts: A Journal of Jewish Literary History* 1 (1981): 119-32, especially 119-21.

[10]John T. Willis, "An Anti-Elide Narrative Tradition from a Prophetic Circle at the Ramah Sanctuary." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 90 (1971): 288-308; idem, "Cultic Elements in the Story of Samuel's Birth and Dedication," *Studia Theologica* 26 (1972): 33-61; idem, "Samuel Versus Eli, I Sam. 1-7," *Theologische Zeitschrift* 35 (1979): 201-12.

[11]Michael Fishbane, "I Samuel 3: Historical Narrative and Narrative Poetics," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narrative*, vol. 2, ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis and James S. Ackerman (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1982), 191-203.

(*Abzählungen*), particularly patterns involving the number seven.[12]   Unlike the other authors discussed here, Joseph Bourke engages in a good deal of source-critical and redaction-critical work in his article, "Samuel and the Ark: A Study in Contrasts." However, he sees 1 Samuel 1-3 as basically a unity, and he uses insights into literary structures and patterns in the text to illuminate its meaning, an approach similar to that of Garsiel. Like Fishbane, he sees the story of Samuel's childhood as a literary interpretation of the real persons and events, conveying the theme of the "triumph of Good over Evil, worked out in this particular episode in Israel's history."[13]   In addition to the studies mentioned in these two paragraphs, other works, including commentaries, will be examined for the light they might shed on 1 Samuel 3.

Eslinger notes the similarity between 2:11 and 3:1, but he also notes what he believes are significant differences. Whereas 2:11 reads את פני עלי הכהן, 3:1 reads לפני עלי. Eli is no longer called "the priest" in 3:1, so Samuel is no longer said to serve (the face of) Eli but rather to serve *before* Eli[14] (LXX variant 70; P variants 2, 52; T variants 1, 2).

Gnuse says that the phrase "before the lamp went out" in verse 3 indicates that the lamp is not to be identified with the lamp that never went out, referred to in Ex 27:20 and Lev 24:2. Eslinger, on the contrary, does identify these lamps, suggesting that the fact that the lamp is still burning indicates that God had not yet cut off relations with Israel on account of Eli and his sons. Fishbane goes further, seeing in the lamp either a symbol that Eli was not yet dead or blind or that the spiritual illumination of the time, though diminished, was not yet entirely extinguished. Merrill says that the clause is a veiled allusion to the king, since David is called the "lamp of Israel" in 2 Sam 21:17[15] (LXX variant 9).

Bar-Efrat discusses the use of repetition in narrative, noting that repetition is common in biblical narrative. Though the purpose of repetition varies from case to case, a frequent reason for repeating material is to stress some matter of importance in the story.[16]

---

[12]Matitiahu Tsevat, "Abzählungen in 1 Samuel 1-4," in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard W. Steggemann (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 207-14.

[13]Joseph Bourke, "Samuel and the Ark: A Study in Contrasts," *Dominican Studies* 7 (1954): 73-103, quotation from p. 87. On the same page he says that the narrative of Samuel's childhood "is a remarkable example of how a Hebrew writer can use literary form to convey meaning."

[14]Eslinger, *Kingship*, 145-46.

[15]Gnuse, *Dream Theophany*, 153; Eslinger, *Kingship*, 148-49; Fishbane, "I Samuel 3," 197 (more accurately, Fishbane sees the text as referring to *both* of these options; 3:1-2 is a "remarkable bivalent image"); Arthur L. Merrill, "I Sam 1-12: A Traditio-Historical Study," Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1962; quoted in Gnuse, *Dream Theophany*, 153-54. Cf. also Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist*, 52-53, who draws a parallel between יכבה in verse 3 and תכבה in 2 Sam 21:17, used with reference to David.

[16]Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 116.

Several variants deal with the presence or absence of an element found elsewhere in the narrative (e.g., P variant 52; T variants 53 and 63; V variant 92), but the application of Bar-Efrat's insights concerning repetition is unclear in most of these cases. In one particular set of variants, however, the factor of repetition needs to be investigated, namely, those variants that deal with God's four-fold call of Samuel in verses 4-10. In this context, Schulz's observation that repetition in Samuel regularly involves variation should be taken into account[17] (LXX variants 12, 18, 20, 75, 76, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 89, 90, 91; P variants 10, 11, 49, 71).

Eslinger comments on another repetition, namely, the repeated טרם in verses 3 and 7. He suggests that the meaning of the two-fold use of טרם in verse 7 is conditioned by the use of טרם in reference to the lamp in verse 3 (LXX variant 86). Willis characterizes yet another repetition—"my son," in verses 6, 9, and 16—as connectives in the narrative[18] (LXX variants 83, 89; V variants 84, 92, 97, 99, 104, 107, 108, 113, 118).

Simon discusses Samuel's failure to mention God's name in verse 10, comparing it to Eli's aversion to speaking of God in verse 17. Polzin explains the omission differently. The first three chapters of 1 Samuel is, in a sense, a parable of the first readers' situations in the postexilic period, when it was no longer possible to converse directly with God. "The situation of a partially absent LORD, one who hears humans and whom humans hear but do not—or cannot—respond to directly, is indicative of these opening chapters, but expressed in a special way in chapter 3: precisely where Samuel has an opportunity directly to speak to the LORD, he is commanded by Eli to express a willingness simply to listen—and even then Samuel unaccountably omits the LORD's name"[19] (LXX variants 42, 45; P variants 84, 108, 111; T variant 32; V variant 40).

---

[17] Alfons Schulz, "Narrative Art in the Books of Samuel," in *Narrative and Novella in Samuel: Studies by Hugo Gressmann and Other Scholars 1906-1923*, ed. David M. Gunn, trans. David E. Orton, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series, no. 116, Historic Texts and Interpreters in Biblical Scholarship, no. 9 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, Almond Press, 1991), 148-51. Cf. also Simon, "Samuel's Call to Prophecy," 125-27; Gnuse, *Dream Theophany*, 154; Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist*, 40. Willis sees "clearly defined gradations" in the various calls of Samuel; Willis, "Anti-Elide Narrative Tradition," 293-94; cf. Budde, *Bücher Samuel*, 27. Jacob Licht, *Storytelling in the Bible* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press for the Hebrew University, 1978), 55, disputes the idea that the subtle variations in the four calls are significant as conveyers of meaning:

> Such subtleties, however, should not lead us to the mistaken conclusion that repetitive patterns with variations are built as exercises for 'close reading.' The basic and truly relevant feature is the pattern itself, which is not subtle at all; the subtleties, where one does find them, are accidental elaborations.

Garsiel classifies the repeated calls of Samuel as an example of a "recurrent structure"; Garsiel, *First Book of Samuel*, 31.

[18] Eslinger, *Kingship*, 151 (cf. also Fishbane, "I Samuel 3," 198-99); Willis, "Anti-Elide Narrative Tradition," 294.

[19] Simon, "Samuel's Call to Prophecy," 132, n. 15; Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist*, 52. Cf. also Schulz, "Narrative Art," 148-51.

While discussing the points of comparison and contrast between the Eli's sons and Samuel, Garsiel notes the repeated use of the verb ידע in chapters 2 and 3. The sons of Eli did not know the Lord (2:12), Samuel did not yet know the Lord (3:7), Eli knew his sons' sins (3:13), and all Israel knew that Samuel had been established as a prophet to the Lord (3:20)[20] (LXX variants 94, 95).

Bar-Efrat says that flashbacks in the narrative, though relatively rare, are important when they occur. They serve to introduce new characters, explain the actions or utterances of people or the origin of situations, insert information about a character or event outside the main story-line, synchronize events, and provide emphasis. God's message to Samuel concerning Eli's family is related to the prophecy of 2:27-36, and it may be that flashback is a factor in 3:13-14. On the other hand, Polzin emphasizes the repeated use of verbs in the present or future tense in verses 11-14, which suggests that "this story from Israel's past has present meaning for the author's present audience"[21] (LXX variant 30; T variant 24; V variant 28).

In his discussion of the use of characters in the narrative, Bar-Efrat notes:

> The characters' actions are also the building blocks of the plot, though the protagonists should not be regarded merely as a means for getting the story going. The narrative is concerned not only with the events which occur but also with the people involved.[22]

He points out that the reference in 3:15 to Samuel opening the doors of the house of the Lord after receiving the vision is a way of characterizing Samuel. "The tremendous event—the revelation of God—does not turn his head (even though 'the word of the Lord was rare in those days,' 'there was no frequent vision'), he does not become conceited but continues fulfilling his duties as usual."[23] Bourke sees a different significance in verse 15b, pointing to it as the beginning of the seventh scene in chapters 1-3[24] (LXX variant 96).

In his discussion of the repetition of words as a stylistic device, Bar-Efrat notes that in 3:17, the same words appear at the beginning and at the end of Eli's speech to Samuel, forming an envelope. The purpose of such a framework, he says, is to provide emphasis. Alongside this analysis, Miscall points out the repeated use of words related to hearing in

---

[20] Garsiel, *First Book of Samuel*, 40-41.

[21] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 175-79; Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist*, 51.

[22] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 77.

[23] Ibid., 79. Polzin's view of Samuel is quite different; Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist*, 50-51. Cf. Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching, ed. James Luther Mays, Patrick D. Miller, Jr., and Paul J. Achtemeier (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990), 25, who sees Samuel as "perfectly responsive (v. 10). Moreover he is fully supported by Eli, who is now dependent upon him (v. 18)."

[24] Bourke, "Samuel and the Ark," 81.

verses 11-14, an observation that might be relevant as well in verse 17[25] (LXX variants 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 100, 101; P variant 31; V variants 39, 40).

Eslinger discusses the structure of verse 21, noting that MT contains two parallel sentences with a prepositional tag added to the second. This tag, בדבר יהוה, standing outside the parallelism, is thereby "foregrounded." Furthermore, "the repetition of 'in Shiloh' emphasizes that the renewal through Samuel reaches to the very heart of the damages done by the Elides, for it was in the cult at Shiloh that they carried on their priestly malpractise." Tsevat, in his examination of patterns of repetition, notes that דבר in the singular, denoting the word of Yahweh, occurs seven times in chapter 3, which is a distinct unit. He believes the significance of this patterned repetition is that it stresses that it is through the word of Yahweh given to him that Samuel becomes a prophet. In Fishbane's discussion of the chiastic pattern in chapter 3, he mentions a "micro-chiasm" that begins with *Samuel* in verse 1, followed by a reference to the *national* situation of divine absence; in verse 21, the divine presence comes to *all Israel*, because Yahweh was revealed to *Samuel* at Shiloh, "by the word of the Lord"[26] (LXX variants 104, 105).

Having discussed some of the aspects of various literary investigations of MT that are related to variants in one or more of the versions, it is time to turn to those versions for further analysis of the variants.

<u>Septuagint</u>

<u>Relevant Literary, Historical, and Theological Data Present in the Translation</u>[27]

As mentioned above, most literary studies of 1 Samuel are based entirely or at least predominantly on MT, with perhaps an occasional glance toward LXX. However, in his article "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1," Stanley D. Walters does attempt to characterize certain aspects of LXX (specifically, ms B, though he notes other LXX traditions/recensions as well) alongside those of MT. Though the article does not deal at all with chapter 3, the conclusions he reaches about the concerns of the translators of LXX for chapter 1 may also apply to chapter 3. Walters does not attribute all the variations between MT and LXX to the Greek translators; instead, he allows for

---

[25] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 216; Miscall, *1 Samuel*, 25.

[26] Eslinger, *Kingship*, 159; Tsevat, "Abzählungen," 210; Fishbane, "I Samuel 3," 194.

[27] Though not as obvious or prevalent as literary and theological concerns, the translators may have had other concerns which would fall into the broad category of historical data. Such data would include historical references in the text that differ from those of the original (e.g., references to the Greeks and the tower of Babel in Isa 9 and 10 LXX), mention of contemporary customs (or failure to mention outmoded customs), or allusions to the religious beliefs and practices of the translators, the recipients of the translation, or their neighbors. Cf. Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series, no. 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1990), 1-5.

differences in the *Vorlage* of LXX.[28] However, he does see the Greek translators as creative in several ways. In his discussion of δοτος in 1:11, he points out that the word is a *hapax* in LXX and is uncommon even in classical Greek. Since more common equivalents were available, it is apparent that δοτος was chosen because it has the connotation of necessity or obligation, something which must or ought to be given.[29] He subsequently relates the use of κιχρημι and χρησις in 1:28 to δοτος in 1:11, noting that the former words connote something lent rather than given.[30] The relevance of these insights to the text of chapter 3 is that they demonstrate that the translators did not translate their *Vorlage* mechanically with little understanding of the text. Though they might not always have captured all the subtleties of the Hebrew text, and though the result does not resemble classical Greek style, the translation they produced is a literary work in its own right with meaning and internal consistency (at least for the most part) of thought. This observation challenges the textual critic to read LXX more carefully for internal clues that might explain apparent variations from MT. It does not, however, negate LXX as an important witness to the common underlying text.

Since matters of literary, theological, and historical importance to the translators are much more difficult (if not impossible) to quantify than lexical and grammatical matters, it will be helpful before analyzing the variants from a literary standpoint to have some more detail about the literary and theological concerns of the translators, as identified by various scholars. In addition to Walters, other scholars have also addressed the literary and theological concerns of the translators of LXX. Frankel notes that LXX often has double translations for a single Hebrew word, phrase, or verse. However, many of these doublets come from Hebrew sources, including marginal glosses and translations of both *kethib* and *qere* forms. Characteristics of LXX that come primarily from the translators include textual improvements, interpolations from other parts of the OT, rhetorical additions, and transpositions of verses.[31] Unfortunately, Frankel does not always distinguish which characteristics are found in which books (e.g., his examples of rhetorical additions come primarily from Proverbs).

Swete, in his *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, lists several characteristics of the translation. The translators frequently add words to clarify the meaning, interpret difficult words or Hebrew technical terms, occasionally avoid

---

[28]Cf. S. D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna," 394-96. In cases of excess text in either MT or LXX, it is not always clear whether he thinks the variation arose in Greek or was based, at least to an extent, on a divergent Hebrew reading. His desire is primarily to show the relative independence of the two versions of the story found in MT and LXX, not to indicate in every instance whether the difference arose in Hebrew or Greek.

[29]Ibid., 399.

[30]Ibid., 406-7.

[31]Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Fr. Chr. Wilh. Vogel, 1841), 70-85.

anthropomorphism, sometimes follow Jewish halakic or haggadic traditions, employ lexical variety, and exhibit freedom in translating metaphorical phrases and other figures of speech. In addition, the translators also sometimes misunderstand the text or produce a faulty translation as a result of mechanical errors (metathesis, parablepsis, etc.).[32]

Perhaps the most recent work devoted to the translation technique of LXX is that by Staffan Olofsson. In addition to many of items discussed above, Olofsson notes the translators' religious and cultural concerns which often surface in what at first appear to be unusual or inconsistent renderings.[33]

These observations deal mostly with isolated phenomena within the LXX text and do not address inner-LXX matters such as schematization or harmonization. Simon characterizes the text of LXX as smoother and more uniform than MT,[34] but the extent of the translators' tendency toward uniformity in parallel or similar passages requires further investigation.

Final Translation Technique

The description of the translation technique in this section may be described as "final" in the sense that the literary and theological concerns of the translators are added to the description of the translation technique. However, the evaluation of the variants in the next section may require more modifications to the following description, just as the elimination of variants in the preceding chapter led to a better understanding of the translation technique at that stage. In chapter 3, the translators' approach to the text was described in some detail, so it may suffice here to summarize those results. The translators were concerned with literalness in most areas for which Greek is suited to deal with Hebrew categories (excluding gender for non-human referents), with the exception of the Hebrew articles and definiteness, which they did not render with the same degree of consistency as the other categories. The translators show little concern for exact renderings of Hebrew compound words, but they are quite concerned to follow the Hebrew word order. They also appear to have refrained from adding or omitting quantitative elements to a great extent.

The data from the previous section indicates that, while the translators follow their Hebrew *Vorlage* quite closely, generally speaking, they do exhibit a measure of freedom within their self-imposed parameters. In particular, they are free to make lexical choices that seem best suited to the context, and they show a concern for theological and cultural

---

[32] Swete, *Introduction*, 325-30.

[33] Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 1-5.

[34] Simon, "Samuel's Call to Prophecy," 131, n. 10. Cf. also Johann Cook's analysis of Genesis 1, where he finds "a significant harmonizational pattern" in LXX; Johann Cook, "Genesis 1 in the Septuagint as Example of the Problem: Text and Tradition," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 10 (1982): 32.

propriety. They also at times seem to have felt the need for greater consistency than was found in the Hebrew. However, this issue will be discussed more fully in the next section.

<u>Elimination of Variants</u>

Eslinger believes that the differences between 2:11 and 3:1 in MT signify Eli's downgraded position in respect to Samuel by the time of Yahweh's call of Samuel.[35] However, his observation that Eli is no longer called "the priest" in 3:1 does not apply to LXX. In fact, the text of LXX calls into question all of his observations about these verses, for LXX in 2:11 suggests a slightly different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Whether or not there is a *Vorlage* difference in 2:11, the line drawn between לִפְנֵי and אֶת פְּנֵי seems artificial; אֶת פְּנֵי in 2:11 is surely equivalent to לִפְנֵי in 3:1,[36] especially since no וְ separates the mention of Yahweh and Eli (contrary to his statement that Samuel serves both Yahweh *and* the "face of Eli"). The failure of MT to mention הַכֹּהֵן, then, might just be an attempt to avoid exact repetition. The fact that the text of LXX is different in the two verses indicates that the translators were not trying to make the verses identical for the sake of consistency (unlike the translators of P in 3:1), so the addition of "the priest" probably did originate in Hebrew. Thus, the previous evaluation of variant 70 as significant stands.

Of the various analyses of the lamp in the phrase "before the lamp had gone out" in 3:3, those of Merrill, Polzin, and Fishbane, that the lamp is a veiled allusion to David or his dynasty (Merrill and Polzin) or to Eli (Fishbane), have some bearing on variant 9. If the lamp does represent David, then LXX's rendering "before the lamp was made ready" would seem to convey the meaning more clearly than MT's "before the lamp had gone out," since David had not yet assumed office—or even been born—and so was in no danger of "going out." On the other hand, if either Eli (dealing with the situation in Samuel's day) or David's dynasty (dealing with the situation in the days of the original readers of Samuel) is in view, the reading of MT is preferable. Though the first option (David) might favor finding the origin of variant 9 in a Hebrew text, the second (Eli or David's dynasty) does not change the evaluation given in Chapter 3.[37] Therefore,

---

[35]Eslinger, *Kingship*, 145-46. He says,

In 2.11, the lad serves Yahweh and "the face" of Eli, both of which are modified by the accusative particle ʾ*et*. In 3.11, however, Samuel serves only Yahweh, doing so "before" or "in the presence of" (*lipnê*) Eli. The reason for this change is revealed by the final variant: Eli is no longer called "the priest" in 3.11; he is simply called Eli. Samuel no longer serves Eli "with" Yahweh because Eli has lost the rank and title of priest. Already Eli takes a back seat to Samuel in the priestly service.

[36]Cf. BDB, s.v. "פָּנֶה." Fishbane finds in the similarity of vocabulary in 2:11, 18; 3:1 evidence of continuity, rather than contrast; Fishbane, "I Samuel 3," 194-95.

[37]It is also plausible that the translators were influenced by Ex 30:8, which states that the priest was to set up (עלה hiphil) the lamps at the time of the evening sacrifice. It seems likely that the prohibition against letting the lamp of the sanctuary go out (Ex 27:20-21; Lev 24:1-4) did influence the translators, who understood the passage to be referring to the same lamp, rather than other lamps used for

variant 9 remains nonsignificant.

The largest set of variants addressed by the various literary readings of Samuel are those that deal with God's repeated call of Samuel. A perusal of the four calls indicates variations among each of the calls in both MT and LXX. Willis applies his claim of "clearly defined gradations" in the calls only to the descriptions of God's actions and words in these verses. However, when one looks at the actions and words of both Samuel and Eli, they, too, show variation from call to call. Simon does see significance in the variation from call to call of Samuel's and Eli's words and actions: the first time Samuel runs to Eli; the second time he gets up and walks (indicating less enthusiasm; the extra verb "and he arose" also slows the pace of the narrative to stress Samuel's reticence); the third time is "nearly identical to the preceding one." Similarly, Eli's second response adds the vocative "my son," demonstrating that Eli perceived Samuel's lack of haste but understood it.[38] Had Simon analyzed the text of LXX rather than MT, he could have strengthened his argument somewhat, for Samuel's reaction to the third call is not nearly identical to the previous one. Samuel's response to the second call in LXX does not include the statement that he arose, but the additional εκ δευτερου does slow the pace of narrative in support of the replacement of εδραμεν by επορευθη. Only on the third occasion is και ανεστη added, slowing Samuel's pace even more. Eli's command to Samuel to go back and lie down and the description of what Samuel does in response (variants 12, 18, 20) is also repetitive. One could argue that LXX shows a tendency toward schematization in its description of these events—since MT uses שׁוּב twice and הלך three times, while LXX uses αναστρεφω four times and πορευω only once—but it must also be noticed that LXX has κοιμαω in the description of the third call, whereas MT has שׁכב every time. Thus, LXX is no more uniform than MT in these variants. Finally, concerning the number of times "Samuel" appears in each of the four calls, LXX's pattern of two, two, one, zero, respectively, in the four calls is not more uniform than MT's pattern of one, one, one, two (see above, p. 102). The variations among the calls in LXX belie Simon's claim of "the conspicuous tendency of the Septuagint translators   to compare repetitions with one another for the sake of comprehension and clarity," thus producing a "smoother, uniform version."[39] The lack of uniformity among the calls in LXX supports the earlier contention that the variants are probably based on variations in the *Vorlage*.[40]

---

illumination at night. επισκευασθηναι would then have to be translated "was set up" instead of "was made ready."

[38] Simon, "Samuel's Call to Prophecy," 126-27.

[39] Ibid., 131, n. 10.

[40] The first and second accounts of Eli's response are identical in LXX, since it omits "my son" in the second account (LXX adds σε on both occasions). However, LXX does add τεκνον to the third account, where it is missing in MT. It is hard to see that LXX is any more uniform in these verses than MT is, especially in light of the "nearly identical" second and third responses of Samuel. The floating "again" of

The plurals in variants 24 and 25 should also be considered in the context of a discussion of repetition and schematization. The difference in sentence structure between MT and LXX has already been noted in the discussion of these variants. On the other hand, the plural in variant 24 could be explained as a schematization by the translators regarding the words λογος and ρημα, since they are translated as plurals in three similar contexts (3:17, 18, 19; cf. also the plural παντα in 3:12). Several of these could be explained as the result of the LXX rendering of כל with the plural παντα,[41] but not λογων in 3:17 (variant 43). The LXX translators do not show a consistent tendency toward schematization in the chapter, but it does appear that they preferred to render Hebrew collective singulars with Greek plurals, especially where λογος and ρημα are involved. Thus, a deeper look at the whole chapter suggests that variants 24 and 25 should not be considered significant after all.

The other instances of repetition in the chapter probably do not affect earlier analyses of the variants. Whether טרם occurs once (LXX) or twice (MT) in verse 7, its earlier appearance in verse 3 could still be called a conditioning factor. Willis's statement that "my son" serves as a connective in the narrative is interesting, because he appears to assume the originality of both בני in verse 6 (variant 83) and τεκνον in verse 9 (variant 89), in addition to its appearance in verse 16 (in both MT and LXX); neither version has three occurrences of the word/phrase. Thus, he apparently supports the analysis of variant 89 as significant. Neither Willis's nor Eslinger's observations affect the evaluations of the variants already given.

Polzin's explanation of the reason Samuel neglected to mention Yahweh when he finally answered his call is interesting, but not convincing. Better is Simon's comparison with Eli's aversion to mentioning Yahweh's name in verse 17, but better yet may be Schulz's observation that repeated events regularly employ variation.[42] Either way, LXX is identical to MT with regard to Samuel's response. If Simon is right about Eli's aversion to saying Yahweh's name (or if the narrator for some other reason wanted to avoid it) the passive voice of the participles in LXX (variants 42 and 45) removes the reader even further from reference to Yahweh, so the earlier evaluation of these variants does not change.

Garsiel's observation that the verb ידע is repeated several times in chapters 2 and 3 is instructive, and his arguments must be considered when attempting to determine the original text of 3:13 (variants 94 and 95). However, the overall difficulty of the verse in both MT and LXX suggests a common disruption in Hebrew behind both versions, so

---

MT (variant 79) is probably independent of εκ δευτερου (variant 82), and its originality in verse 6 (or lack thereof) is not affected by the above discussion.

[41] See above, pp. 93-94.

[42] Schulz, "Narrative Art," 148.

these variants should continue to be considered significant.

Bar-Efrat emphasizes the importance of flashbacks in biblical narrative, and 3:13-14 seems to be such a flashback, referring to 2:27-36.[43] Polzin's observation that present or future tense verbs abound in 3:11-14 does not account for דברתי in verse 12 in a phrase that refers back to the same verses in chapter 2. Thus, variant 30 continues to be significant.

In his discussion of characterization, Bar-Efrat notes that MT in 3:15 implies that the vision Samuel received the night before did not distract him from his duties or cause him to become conceited. The reading of LXX, reflected in variant 96, strengthens this picture of Samuel's character, for not only does he open the doors of the house of the Lord the next morning, but he arises early to do so. The phrase "and he arose early " is common in the OT, and it indicates that the person concerned hastened to undertake a certain task.[44] Bourke's division of 1 Samuel 1-3 into scenes would likewise be strengthened if the phrase "and he arose early" is accepted, for he identifies the beginning or end of these scenes on the basis of "conventional phrases of introduction and conclusion," one of which is "and they arose early" (1:19, scene two).[45] This evidence strengthens the evaluation of variant 96 as significant.

Bar-Efrat's comments about the significance of an "envelope" in verse 17 (MT) is a helpful explanation of the phenomenon and deserves careful consideration. However, as already noted, he also discusses variation in repetition as a narrative tool. If words related to hearing are common in verses 11-14 by design, as Miscall believes, examining the text of LXX would reveal another occurrence in verse 17 (variants 100 and 101). These contrasting observations suggest that no conclusive statements concerning the variants in verse 17 can be based on literary analysis alone.

Finally, the discussions of Eslinger, Tsevat , and Fishbane on verse 21 need some comment. If one analysis of the "tag" בדבר יהוה suggests that it is "foregrounded" because it stands outside the parallelism of the verse, another analysis might suggest it was secondary for the same reason. The repetition of "in Shiloh" may indeed be emphatic, but the variation in spelling in MT is puzzling and suggests a Hebrew rather than Greek origin for the variant.[46] Tsevat's observation that דבר singular appears seven times in the chapter does not hold in LXX, since variant 104 omits a phrase that contains the word. However, once this reference is omitted, one could argue that 4:1a belongs to the unit

---

[43] So R. W. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 30; cf. Edmund Kalt and Willibald Lauck, eds., *Herders Bibelkommentar: Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben erklärt*, vol. 3/1, *Die Samuelbücher*, by Peter Ketter (Fribourg: Herder & Co., 1940), 28.

[44] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 79. On the phrase in Gen 22:3, cf. ibid., 80.

[45] Bourke, "Samuel and the Ark," 81.

[46] Tsevat, following Tur-Sinai, suggests reading the word as בשאלו, "whenever he consulted" the word of Yahweh; Tsevat, "Abzählungen," 210, n. 10.

containing chapter 3, and the seventh דבר would appear.[47] In fact, since דבר in 4:1a refers to the (prophetic) word of Samuel, one could further argue that the word of Yahweh has become identified with the word of Samuel; that is, Samuel has been confirmed as a prophet by the narrator as well as by all Israel. It seems, then, that the contention that this particular group of seven is significant is questionable.[48] Fishbane's micro-chiasm in verses 1 and 21 begins with *Samuel*, but, as he sees it, it ends with the phrase "because YHWH was revealed to *Samuel* at Shiloh through the oracle of YHWH."[49] The final phrase "through the oracle of YHWH" could be seen as an intrusion into the chiasm. However, if the phrase is omitted with LXX (variant 104), then the end of the chiasm matches the beginning more exactly.[50] Thus, literary analysis does not necessitate change in the evaluations of the variants given earlier.

The only variants affected by the application of literary principles are variants 24 and 25, which are no longer considered significant. The elimination of these variants will change tables 10 and 15 slightly, as follows:

Table	Changes
10	deviation factor: 1.78
15	deviation factor: 0.06

The final translation technique as described in the previous section remains accurate, except that the translators' concern for consistency between parallel and similar passages, resulting in harmonization and patterns of schematization, seems to have been overstated by Simon, at least as far as 1 Samuel 3 is concerned.

Peshitta

Relevant Literary, Historical, and Theological Data Present in the Translation

Though fewer studies exist of P than of LXX, several characterizations of P are available to the textual critic, in addition to those of Deist and Schwartz, cited in Chapter 3. Driver says that the translation, though not strictly literal, "represents fairly the general

---

[47] Ibid. Tsevat is forced to argue that 4:1a does not belong to the unit containing chapter 3 in order to maintain his group with seven elements.

[48] The issue of whether patterns of repetition that do not seem to be emphasized in the text can be used to demonstrate the cohesion of a unit of text is problematic, since it is easy to find such patterns, particularly if one also looks at numbers like ten, twelve, and forty, as Tsevat suggests. Thus, e.g., אמר appears fourteen times (= 2 x 7) in the chapter; also, if the omissions in P variants 122 and 124 are considered to be the result of parablepsis and graphic confusion, as discussed in Chapter 3, then the word ܡܪܝܐ ("Lord"), an unquestionably important word, appears twenty-one times (= 3 x 7) in the chapter.

[49] Fishbane, "I Samuel 3," 194 (italics his).

[50] Even if part of variant 105 is original, the chiasm can be maintained. If the first part of the variant (και 1°   ακρων 2°) is omitted as a doublet of verse 20, the remainder of the verse could be considered original, but connected with the narrative of chapter 4, the loss of the ark, rather than with chapter 3.

sense of the original."[51] P has a "Jewish element," particularly evident in its use of the preposition מִן in a manner similar to that of T. It frequently adds short explicatives to the text, and it occasionally gives paraphrases.[52]

In his study of P in the Pentateuch, Cook finds that the influence of LXX on P has been overestimated in the past, though some possibility of contact remains. Moreover, most of the connections between P and T can be attributed to a common Jewish exegetical background rather than direct influence.[53] As far as original elements in P are concerned, the translators were concerned to produce a coherent text, so they sometimes specified subjects or objects or added other obviously lacking material. They also occasionally harmonized one passage with another, but in general they can be characterized as following their *Vorlage* carefully.[54]

The comments concerning the translators' tendency to add epexegetical elements has been confirmed for 1 Samuel 3 as well by the previous analysis. A comparison of 2:11 with 3:1 (variant 52) also shows some tendency toward harmonization. Bar-Efrat discusses sound and rhythm as stylistic devices in MT,[55] and the same applies in P. For example, 3:1-2 uses the similar-sounding words ܝܩܝܪ ("rare") and ܝܩܝܪ ("heavy"), and 3:2-3 have ܕܥܟ ("was extinguished") and ܕܡܟ ("lying," twice) in the same context. These observations suggest that another aspect of the translation is an aesthetic sensitivity.

Final Translation Technique

The conclusions reached in Chapter 3 concerning the translation technique of P may be summarized as follows. The translators were generally faithful to their *Vorlage* in rendering most lexical and grammatical categories, though they show some tendency toward more idiomatic Syriac readings in regard to the use of the emphatic state (though not as much as might be anticipated). Although P shows a greater concern for rendering Hebrew compounds exactly than does LXX, only about three out of four are so rendered. Like LXX, P follows the word order of the Hebrew meticulously. Finally, the differences in quantitative representation demonstrate that clarity in the translation was more of a factor than absolute fidelity to the *Vorlage*. The translators use the Syriac relative particle and constructions with the anticipatory pronoun freely.

The preceding section indicates that the translators of P were concerned with readability and clarity as much as with accuracy. The tendencies to add explanatory material, to harmonize, and to produce an aesthetically pleasing translation are evidence of

---

[51] S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, lxxii.

[52] Ibid., lxxi-lxxvi.

[53] Johann Cook, "Composition of the Peshiṭta, 153-64.

[54] Ibid., 153, 167-68.

[55] Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 200.

their concern. They also share certain theological concerns with other translations, especially T. In particular, they often use the preposition מִן in a manner similar to T, and they occasionally display other theological concerns in common with Jewish rabbinic circles.

Elimination of Variants

Eslinger's observations about the variations in 3:1 as compared with 2:11 do not apply to P, since the two verses are identical. In fact, as noted above, the translators of P sometimes engaged in harmonization of similar passages. The evaluation of variants 2 and 52 as nonsignificant stands, despite the addition of του ιερεως in LXX.

The repeated calls of Samuel verses 4-10 produce some variants in P (variants 10, 11, 49, 71), though not as many as in LXX. P generally agrees with MT in these verse, in particular, in the number of times "Samuel" appears in each call. However, P does show some variation, much of which, unlike the case of LXX, is definitely in the direction of harmonization or consistency of expression. For example, whereas MT uses both שׁוּב and הלך when describing Eli's orders and Samuel's reactions, P consistently uses ܐܙܠ, and while LXX uses both καθευδω and κοιμαω, P uses only ܗܡܟ. These findings confirm that variants 10, 11, and 71 are nonsignificant. They say nothing about variant 49, a variation in word order, though, so that variant continues to be significant.

The tendency toward consistency among similar passages noted in 3:1 and in the calls of Samuel also affects the evaluation of variant 84. The explanations of Simon and Polzin do not apply to P, since Samuel does say exactly what Eli told him to: "Speak, Lord, for your servant is listening." This variant, then, is another example of the tendency of the translators toward consistency of expression in parallel passages, and it remains nonsignificant.

Both Driver and Cook have pointed out the tendency of P to make explicit what is implicit in the text, particularly in regard to specifying the subject or the object of a sentence. This tendency is evident in variants 108 and 111 (where again the explanations of Simon and Polzin do not apply to P) and in variants 77, 106, 110, and 115. All of these variants remain nonsignificant.

Bar-Efrat's comments about the use of an "envelope" as a stylistic device raises the issue of the use of the plural ܦܬܓܡܐ at the end of 3:17 (variant 31), whereas the singular appears at the beginning of the verse. The only difference between the singular and the plural in the text of most mss (which have diacritical points, but no vowels) is the two dots that indicate the plural, called *seyāmē* This and other diacritical marks appear in most mss, but their use is not consistent. In fact, one group of mss, 12a1*fam* (see above, p. 53), does not have *seyāmē* here. On the other hand, the use of a plural at the end of the verse may be related to the ܟܠ preceding it. In either case, the evidence suggests that the

variant arose in Syriac, either as a result of textual disruption (misplaced *seyāmē*) or out of a concern for clarity (association with ܠܐ), so the evaluation of the variant as nonsignificant does not change.

A literary analysis of P does not change the evaluation of any of the variants, so the final translation technique given above remains valid.

Targum

Relevant Literary, Historical, and Theological Data Present in the Translation

The difficulty of characterizing T as literal or non-literal has been discussed above, but it will be helpful at this point to remember that T is a mixture of literal and midrashic renderings. In addition to the descriptions of Díez Macho and Le Déaut already given in Chapter 3, those of other scholars may be noted. Metzger lists three characteristics of the various targums: "(a) a tendency to avoid direct reference to the ineffable name of God, frequently by the use of the word *Mēmra* ("the Word"); (b) in passages referring to God, anthropomorphisms and anthropopathisms are usually avoided and the narrative is recast; (c) some of the Targums include longer or shorter stories (similar to the Midrashim) that serve to illustrate the scripture text."[56]

Sperber believes that the present form of the official targums (Onkelos and Jonathan) is the result of a combination of the work of two schools: one concerned with a basically literal translation (though deviating from a strict rendering for the sake of clarity or to give an explicit rabbinic interpretation) and the other inclined to render the text freely, even paraphrastically, and to insert midrash and haggadic material at will.[57] Of importance for the present study is that 1 Samuel 3, as a narrative passage, falls in the first category.

Levine also discusses the characteristics of the targums. The translators were concerned with literal interpretations, though not necessarily literal renderings. Thus, both halakic and haggadic material incorporated in the targums are designed to elucidate the literal (or accepted) meaning of the passage (often through application in halakic passages). He lists some of the theological motives that result in deviation from a literal rendering, including reverence for God, incorporation of recent interpretations (e.g., the afterlife), and desire to insert exemplaristic legends to illustrate a point.[58]

The previous discussion of the variants in Chapter 3 has also identified several aspects of T's theological concerns. Among the theological concerns of the translators are the following: avoiding the impression that God comes in direct contact (either ocular or aural) with humans, reverence for God (often called anti-anthropomorphisms), preserving

---

[56] Metzger, "Versions, Ancient," 750.

[57] Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:3.

[58] Levine, *Aramaic Version*, 37-42.

the sovereignty of God, and avoiding situations that would violate the halakic traditions (especially those preserved in the Mishna). Some of the literary characteristics of the translation (which may also have some theological motivation) are the consistent rendering of both יהוה and אלהים by ויי and the tendency to render singular words for sin by plurals. The translators also frequently clarified obscure words or phrases,[59] and they often used constructions containing the relative particle, which has no equivalent in biblical Hebrew.

Final Translation Technique

Generally speaking, T shows a greater degree of consistency in rendering both lexical and grammatical categories than do the other versions. The translators were concerned to render literally Hebrew compounds as well as word order. When the variants related to T's theological concerns and those that deal with expressions using the relative particle are eliminated from the quantitative variants, T's rendering of the Hebrew is quite literal. The large number of theological renderings, though, must not be forgotten in a description of the translation technique.

Since the text of T is so close to that of its *Vorlage* (with the exception of the renderings based on theological concerns), little can be said about the literary concerns of the translators. The only purely stylistic difference between T and its *Vorlage* appears to be its preference for constructions that use the relative particle, though this use is not consistent. As already noted, the preference for the divine name ויי and the tendency to use plural forms of words for sin may have some theological reasoning behind them. The theological concerns of the translators are manifold, but many have already been spelled out, especially those that are relevant to 1 Samuel 3. Most deal in some way with a concern to stress the distance between God and humankind and thus preserve the reverence that people should have for God. One specific aspect that has not yet been mentioned in this context is the tendency to use the preposition קדם instead of ית before ויי or, less frequently, before references to people.[60]

Elimination of Variants

Because of the nature of T, theological concerns were dealt with in Chapter 3 for two reasons: (1) in order to avoid a totally erroneous picture of T's translation technique because theological renderings were not properly accounted for, and (2) because, like some of the stylistic concerns in the other versions, the theological concerns of the translators of T are generally easy to identify. Thus, no theological renderings remain to be

---

[59]The comment by Churgin bears repeating: T is concerned "to render intelligible to the fullest possible degree that which is obscure"; Churgin, *Targum Jonathan*, 78.

[60]M. L. Klein, "The Preposition קדם," 502-7.

considered, and since T possesses few stylistic characteristics of its own, few variants need to be reconsidered from a literary or theological point of view.

In fact, only four significant variants have been identified in T, fewer than in any other version. Of the variants in T mentioned earlier in this chapter as possibly affected by one of the literary approaches to the text, the only significant one is variant 24. The context for the discussion of this variant is the observations of Bar-Efrat and Polzin on verses 11-14. As already noted in relation to LXX, the analysis of Polzin is not particularly convincing. Furthermore, T's concern with rendering verbs literally and its lack of much of a distinct literary style (apart from theological concerns) would seem to override any such analyses. Thus, the variant remains significant.

The other variants mentioned above are accounted for by the translation technique of T. Concerning variants 1 and 2, it is characteristic of T that it uses the preposition קְדָם before יוי, and this usage is exactly the opposite of the point Eslinger is making for MT. However, the rendering of לִפְנֵי by בחיי may in fact support an understanding of T similar to the way in which Eslinger understands MT. As noted in the discussion of these variants in Chapter 3, it is possible that the translators specifically avoided קְדָם before עֲלִי (unlike P) in order to emphasize that Samuel was primarily the Lord's, rather than Eli's, servant (cf. also 2:11 T).

Eli's failure to mention the name of God in verse 17 in MT is dealt with in different ways by the versions: LXX and V change the active verbs to passives, P inserts the name of God, and T renders אֱלֹהִים by יוי. Because of T's consistent rendering of אֱלֹהִים, any impression that may have been in the *Vorlage* that Eli was averse to speaking the name of God is annulled.

None of the evaluations of the variants in T is changed by literary analysis or further investigation from a theological viewpoint, so the translation technique described above as final stands.

<div align="center">Vulgate</div>

Relevant Literary, Historical, and Theological Data Present in the Translation

The situation with V is different from that of any of the other translations, for the translator is not only a single individual about whom much is known, but he himself commented on his approach to translation. One such quotation has already been mentioned, namely, his concern to render "with complete fidelity what stands in the Hebrew," though not slavishly.[61] Another quotation, cited by Brock, explains his reason for choosing a literal style of translation, when the common practice of translators of his day was to render freely. He says, "in scripture, even the order of the words is a

---

[61] Jerome, *Epistle to Sunnia and Fretela*, cited in Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, 124

mystery."[62]

In addition to Pfeiffer and Brock, other scholars have also pointed out characteristics of V. Metzger notes that since Jerome consulted from time to time with Jewish rabbis, certain common renderings exist between V and T. Vööbus says that Jerome's translation was not homogeneous, since he consulted the various Greek versions. The influence of the Old Latin (to a large extent) and of rabbinic exegesis (to a small extent) is also evident. However, he was by and large an original translator in the historical books.[63]

Plater and White have a somewhat more extensive discussion of the characteristics of V. They describe the version as "at once correct and natural, accurate and idiomatic."[64] This description emphasizes both Jerome's conservative attitude toward the text and his skillful use of the Latin language. V frequently translates the same Hebrew word by different Latin equivalents, and it often renders place-names etymologically. Jerome is particularly graphic in his renderings of the natural features of the land (rivers, mountains, deserts, etc.). He was occasionally obliged to use nonclassical words or even to coin words (based on Hebrew or Greek) for concepts not usually expressed in Latin.[65]

Roberts's evaluation of V is somewhat more tempered than that of Plater and White. He says that when translating the OT, Jerome imitated the Latin of the NT, which was already familiar to many Christians. In addition to using vocabulary common in the NT, Jerome also imitated the style of the NT and some of the secondary Greek versions (especially Symmachus) by introducing subordinate constructions where the Hebrew had its ubiquitous coordinate constructions.[66] His dependence at one time on Old Latin, at another on LXX, at still another on Symmachus or Aquila or Theodotion, and even occasionally on the targums leads Roberts to say, "Our conclusion, then, regarding the nature of Jerome's translation is that when due allowance is made for all external influences, it must be admitted that his method was neither straightforward nor consistent."[67]

While this judgment may hold true for V as a whole, it does not adequately describe Jerome's approach in 1 Samuel 3. Pfeiffer says that in the historical books, Jerome showed his greatest skill and originality as a translator, largely because the passages were

---

[62] Sebastian P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation in Antiquity," in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations*, ed. Sidney Jellicoe, Library of Biblical Studies, ed. Harry M. Orlinsky (New York: Ktav, 1974), 556. In particular, this statement demonstrates his concern for following the Hebrew word order, already noticed in the statistical evaluation in Chapter 3.

[63] Metzger, "Versions, Ancient," 753; *ISBE*, 1988 ed., s.v. "Versions," by A. Vööbus, 972.

[64] Plater and White, *Grammar*, 7.

[65] Ibid., 6-10.

[66] B. J. Roberts, *OT Text and Versions*, 254-58.

[67] Ibid., 258.

easy to understand and because they contained few passages that might shock his Christian readers.[68] A perusal of tables 51-53 indicates that one aspect of Jerome's style was his free use of a wide range of vocabulary, particularly conjunctions. Part of the reason he used so many different conjunctions was his tendency, mentioned above, to change the structure of the sentence from compound (paratactic) to complex (hypotactic). In the area of sentence structure V deviates far more from the Hebrew than any of the other secondary versions. Following these observations, the final translation technique of V may be described.

Final Translation Technique

In the previous chapter, analysis of V indicated that Jerome was concerned for accuracy rather than consistency in the strictest sense. He would vary the lexical choice if he felt a different word would convey the meaning better in Latin, and he frequently used words of one class to render words of another, particularly if the Hebrew contained verbals. Jerome has sometimes been criticized for excessive reliance on such a wide variety of other versions, but rather than a detriment, Jerome's method may have proved a benefit, since he was able to take advantage of the wisdom of earlier translators with regard to the rendering of difficult passages. In fact, V is probably closer to the idiom of the readers than any other secondary version, with the possible exception of P (which, after all, was a Semitic language), and also most of the tertiary versions. In addition to variety in lexical rendering and word class, Jerome was also liberal in the addition or omission of conjunctions (as well as using subordinate for coordinate conjunctions), and he showed little interest in the strict rendering of Hebrew compounds. Despite taking these freedoms in his translation, he was generally quite consistent in rendering those grammatical categories which Latin could reasonably be expected to render accurately. Above all, he was faithful in following the word order of the Hebrew, the one area in which his version differs significantly from the spoken language.

The previous section has discussed Jerome's literary concerns for his translation. The important point to remember is that he was more concerned with rendering the meaning than with rendering the literal words of his text. He does not show the same interest as the translators of P in producing an aesthetically beautiful translation, but he is interested in at least producing an acceptable style, as far as the Hebrew word order will allow.

Elimination of Variants

The first set of variants to be addressed is those that involve repetition (variants 84, 92, 97, 99, 104, 107, 108, 113, 118). Strictly speaking, only variants 92, 107, and 108 in this list deal with repetition, but their resolution will affect the other variants. The

---

[68] Pfeiffer, *Introduction*, 124.

conclusion reached in Chapter 3 was that all three of these variants were significant, since the translation technique of V showed no concern for eliminating redundancy, but the caveat was added, "as determined to this point." In order to clarify matters, two variants which are clearly nonsignificant need to be reexamined. Variant 104, the omission of לחם in verse 13, is indeed in the midst of a difficult text, but Jerome could have chosen to render the phrase in some way, perhaps by the intensive pronoun *ipsos*. In Hebrew (if the *tiqqun sopherim* is not followed) לחם is necessary to the text, for it identifies the object of Eli's sons' blasphemy (or curse), namely, themselves.[69] However, when Jerome restructures the clause, לחם becomes redundant and is omitted. Similarly, אני in variant 99 becomes redundant when Jerome restructures the text and is omitted, even though he could easily have inserted the personal pronoun *ego* without changing the meaning. The point in both these cases is that Jerome was more concerned with good Latin style than with rendering every single element of his Hebrew text, especially since both items omitted are still clearly implied in V.

With this new insight into Jerome's method, variant 92 can be reexamined. V omits the subject *Heli* but retains the object *ad Samuhel*. The comparison with LXX, which omits both עלי and לשמואל, remains instructive, but from a different perspective. Whereas LXX omits any reference to Samuel, Eli remains the implicit subject, since he was just mentioned as the subject of the previous independent clause. Awareness of Jerome's concern for avoiding redundancy as long as no content is lost—revealed in the foregoing discussion of variants 104 and 99—sheds new light on the present reading. Contrary to the initial impression, Jerome does not really omit the subject *Heli* at all, but rather subsumes it in the verbal ending of *ait.* Thus, V, rather than standing halfway between MT and LXX, agrees with MT completely: the subject of the verb is still crystal clear, since Eli was just mentioned, but the word *Heli* has been omitted because it seemed redundant to Jerome. Therefore, variant 92 should no longer be considered significant.

Variants 107 and 108 can also be reexamined in the light of a better understanding of Jerome's approach to translation. As stated in Chapter 3, these variants are substitutional variants, that is, they are basically equivalent to one another. It was stated in the initial discussion of these variants that no evidence for a concern to avoid redundancy had yet been discerned. Matters are different now, however, and it is probable that the appearance of the phrase *domui Heli* earlier in the verse led Jerome to choose another, equivalent, rendering at the end of the verse. Thus, variants 107 and 108 are no longer to be considered significant.

In the discussion of variant 97, it was noted that V does not omit pronouns without a good reason. While this statement remains true, the newly identified aversion to

---

[69] Admittedly, the reading does not make much sense, but the omission of לחם would not clarify the meaning.

redundancy seems likely to have supplied Jerome with a reason. The pronominal suffix ו in MT refers to the content of the message God gave to Samuel. While אשר is a subordinate conjunction that introduces a relative clause, the fact that it is undeclinable requires further specificity concerning its antecedent, so the pronominal suffix is added to the participle to clarify that the clause is apposite to דבר.[70] In V, however, *quod* already specifies *verbum* as its antecedent, since it is a neuter singular relative pronoun. Thus, ו is omitted as a redundant element already specified in the relative pronoun, and variant 97 is no longer significant.

Whereas the deletion or change of redundant elements has been demonstrated to be a concern of Jerome, the question remains whether he felt free to add clarifying elements to the text, and if so, under what circumstances. A survey of the quantitative variants reveals several additional elements present in V, even when conjunctions are omitted. In particular, the adverbs *adhuc*, *deinceps*, *indigne*, and *usque* (variants 88, 95, 103, and 109), the verb *erat* (variant 76), the participle *respondens* (in both variants 78 and 112), the demonstrative pronoun *ille* (variant 118), and the personal pronouns *te*, *eum*, and *te* (variants 84, 113, and 116) are all present in V without any corresponding word in MT. Taking these words all together, it seems that V does indeed tend to add clarifying words when necessary or desirable. Though most of these have already been dismissed as nonsignificant, variants 84, 88, and 113 have been considered significant. In light of the fact that the additions in V include conjunctions (not listed), adverbs, verbs (and verbals), and pronouns, any excess text in V must now, upon further reflection, be viewed with even more suspicion. Thus, though variant 84 does share a common reading with LXX, the additional *te* could just as well be a clarifying addition implied by the context, perhaps influenced by Jerome's knowledge of LXX. Variant 84, then, should no longer be considered significant. Variant 113 could have been added to specify the object of the verb, and Jerome might have felt it particularly appropriate following the verb *interrogavit*. Since this variant was a borderline case to begin with, the additional data on Jerome's translation technique is enough to change its evaluation to nonsignificant. Finally, the additional *adhuc* in variant 88 could have been an explanatory addition; since the construction *adiecit vocare* was not idiomatic Latin, the word presumably would not have been considered redundant (cf. *deinceps* in variant 95). It is, of course, possible that one or more of these readings were based on a variant Hebrew *Vorlage*, but an approach based on determining the translation technique does not give any basis for determining which, if any, they were. Since the whole object of this approach is to use the translation technique as a guide in place of uninformed intuition, all these variants (84, 88, and 113) should be considered nonsignificant.

---

[70]Cf. S. R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1892), 265-67.

The only remaining significant variant is in the category of consistency, specifically, grammatical consistency. The evaluation of variant 28, which reads a past tense, whereas MT implies a future, is affected by the literary approaches described above. As already mentioned, Bar-Efrat's observations on the importance of flashbacks in the narrative are preferable to the arguments of Polzin, and the support of LXX and (especially) T affirm the recognition of the variant as significant. Similarly, the evaluation of nonsignificant variants 39 and 40 does not change as a result of literary analysis, for it is likely that Jerome understood his Hebrew *Vorlage* as reading a pual in variant 40, and the plural in variant 39 can be explained as a reference to the collective idea behind the Hebrew singular. It is probable that Jerome was influenced by his acquaintance with LXX in his renderings.

The list of significant variants for V has changed as a result of a better understanding of Jerome's approach to translating, as revealed in the text. Since all the changes occurred in quantitative variants, no changes to the grammatical tables need to be made, but the percentage of agreement in quantitative representation returns to the original figure of 86.6%. The new material discovered about the translation technique may now be summarized. In addition to the description given above in the section dealing with the final translation technique, it should be recognized that V is characterized by a certain type of omission of Hebrew material, namely, omission of redundant words. Furthermore, V does apparently add explanatory material of many types, not just conjunctions and adverbs, as suspected earlier. In spite of its great number of variants, the *Vorlage* of V seemingly lay closer to MT than that of any other secondary version, even T.

Evaluation of Partial Secondary Witnesses

Since no significant variants were identified in any of the minor Greek versions, only the two recensions will be examined.

The Lucianic Recension

The characteristics of the Lucianic recension described by Driver (see above, p. 162), along with those noted in the analysis of the chapter, may stand as the final translation technique of the Lucianic recension, to the extent that one can actually speak of a translation technique. A survey of the variants identified as probably significant reveals one variant that, upon further reflection, should probably be considered nonsignificant. Variant 13 is an attempt to make the third call of Samuel resemble the first two and the fourth, a characteristic of LXX[L] but not, as discussed above, of MT or LXX. Thus, variant 13 should be eliminated. The other variants listed in Chapter 3 remain significant.

The Hexaplaric Recension

All of the variants for LXX^O listed in Chapter 3 as significant remain so. None of the literary approaches described above seems to have any bearing on the discussion of the text of this partial secondary witness.

Other Possible Hebrew Readings

All of the significant readings identified above should still be considered significant.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it should be noted that the purpose of this chapter is not to evaluate the relative merits of the various literary approaches of 1 Samuel 3, though some weighing of conflicting interpretations is inevitable. On the contrary, the examination of the literary nuances present in the text of the different versions can be a helpful tool in making textual judgments, especially in borderline cases, just as it is a helpful tool in exegesis. Of course, for a literary approach to be valid, it must fit the text and not be imposed on it from the outside, unless one just wants to hear one's own voice in the text. Nevertheless, it is clear that different approaches yield different insights, and apparently conflicting analyses may be the result of ambiguities present in the text.[71] Therefore, textual critics need to be aware of and engage in analysis of each of the texts before them from a literary point of view, even if the ultimate goal is the reconstruction of a single text lying behind the extant witnesses.

---

[71] Cf. Fishbane's term "bivalent image" mentioned above. Similarly, James Sanders speaks of the "mutivalency" of the biblical text; James Sanders, *Canon and Community: A Guide to Canonical Criticism*, Guides to Biblical Scholarship, Old Testament Series (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 22-23. David Robertson also discusses the tensions and ambiguities present in the biblical text; D. Robertson, *The OT and the Literary Critic*, 7.