

## CHAPTER 6

### RETROVERSIONS OF THE SECONDARY WITNESSES

It is commonplace in critical apparatuses to cite the testimony of secondary and even tertiary versions, and ample justification for presenting the readings in their original language exists. However, before any comparison between the Hebrew and non-Hebrew witnesses is possible, the latter must be retroverted into Hebrew, at least implicitly. Retroversion into Hebrew will be done explicitly in this chapter, not only to demonstrate the methodology, but also because retroversion of a versional reading forces the scholar to deal more directly with the purported development of the text. Many versional readings that appear to presuppose a different Hebrew *Vorlage* turn out to be inconclusive, or even support MT, when one is forced to propose a Hebrew text underlying the version.

#### Developing a Methodology for Retroverting Translations

Though many commentators and editors of both critical and diplomatic texts present readings that are retroversions from translations, few have proposed a methodology for doing retroversions. As a result, many retroverted readings remain questionable, and even retroversions that are probably correct suffer from an insufficient theoretical foundation. A few scholars, however, beginning with Max Margolis, have proposed guidelines for those who would attempt to recover the *Vorlage* behind the present, translated reading.

#### Proposed Methodologies for Retroverting Translations

##### *Max Margolis*

In a 1910 article, Max Margolis discusses the possibility of retroversion from Greek to Hebrew by means of a process which he calls “complete induction.”<sup>1</sup> He begins with a discussion of Paul de Lagarde’s first canon, which states that in order to arrive at the Hebrew reading lying behind the Greek, one must first have a knowledge of the style of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Max Margolis, “Complete Induction for the Identification of the Vocabulary in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament with Its Semitic Equivalents: Its Necessity and the Means of Obtaining It,” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 30 (1910): 301-12. Although he acknowledges the importance of retroverted readings, he is not particularly optimistic that convincing retroversions are obtainable, except in those cases in which “the translator has misread or misinterpreted the original” (p. 303). Cf. his comment on pp. 302-3: “As a matter of fact, in passages wanting in the Hebrew, all attempts at retroversion are unscientific.”

individual translators.<sup>2</sup> As a corollary of this principle, one must also determine the limits of the unit of translation, that is, the material rendered by the same translator.<sup>3</sup> Not only must one know the style of the translators, Margolis says, but one must also be familiar with the style of the individual Hebrew writers.<sup>4</sup>

As a preface to discussing several examples, Margolis lays down one more proposed principle: “In order, however, to discover the total sum of criteria, the student must obviously collect his data from the *whole* of the Greek Old Testament, whereupon he may proceed to distribute them among the various groups of translators thus brought to light.”<sup>5</sup> He proceeds to list several examples in which a Hebrew coordinate clause is rendered by a Greek subordinate clause (e.g., Gen 3:6; 4:1; Num 21:16; Deut 23:13; 1 Kgs 14:18), where plural and generic singulars are interchanged (Gen 4:20; Neh 12:44; Prov 11:10; Sir 4:12), and where finite verbs and participles are interchanged (Exod 20:2; Ruth 4:15; 1 Esdr 5:69).<sup>6</sup>

Margolis’s goal is to replace uninformed conjectures with substantiated lexical and grammatical equivalents, some of which defy intuition. Searching the biblical text for data to inform textual decisions is unquestionably important. However, some doubt must attach itself to Margolis’s contention that his examples are “certain.” For example, he cites Isa 40:6, where δοξα is formally equivalent to דָּוָן, and uses this equivalence to support the legitimacy of ανδρας ενδοξους as a rendering of דָּוָן אֱנָשִׁים in Sir 44:1. However, since δοξα corresponds to דָּוָן only once out of more than 250 occurrences of δοξα, Winton Thomas’s suggestion in BHS that δοξα in Isa 40:6 might reflect a form of דָּוָן must be accorded at least equal consideration, especially in light of the fact that δοξα renders דָּוָן eleven times in the OT, including four times in Isaiah. If דָּוָן is original in Isa 40:6, then the supposed equivalent in Sir 44:1 has no support. In addition to this line of argument, one must also recall that LXX Isaiah is a free translation, so one formal equivalent implies very little.

Despite this questionable example, most of Margolis’s examples of his method do seem probable (and they usually have a wider basis of support). Nevertheless, his contention that the student must collect his data from the *whole* Greek OT, though it may seem obvious, is not always valid. Though data from other parts of the OT is frequently

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 301. Cf. also p. 302: “After an elimination of the irrational element of chance corruptions or of the disfiguring element of conscious alteration . . . , there remains the stupendous task of retroversion for which indeed a knowledge of the style of each individual translator is an all-important prerequisite.”

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., 304.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., 303. Thus, a knowledge of literary criticism is essential. Margolis gives an example based on different Pentateuchal sources.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., 304; italics his.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., 305.

helpful, more weight should be placed on his previous suggestion that the translation technique of *that particular unit of translation* be determined.

After demonstrating his method of complete induction for recovering the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind a LXX reading, Margolis turns to show how the method can also be used to recognize inner-Greek corruptions. He suggests that the reading του ημας συναχθηναι in Isa 28:20 is a corruption of του μη συναχθηναι (= θ'), which in turn reflects the Hebrew מְהַתְּכִנֵּס in place of כְּהַתְּכִנֵּס of MT. The retroversion is supported by the equivalent (του) μη + infinitive = מִן + infinitive (cf. Isa 54:9).<sup>7</sup>

Margolis summarizes his approach by saying that the method of complete induction requires two separate procedures. The first requires the use of a concordance to establish all lexical equivalents of a given word. Related words should generally be dealt with together (e.g., αναγγελειν, απαγγελειν, and αγγελειν). The second procedure is the establishment of a list of grammatical equivalents, for example, the correspondence of the Greek active voice with the qal stem, the aorist with the Hebrew perfect, and so forth. These equivalences must be derived from the text. Margolis stresses the importance of determining grammatical equivalents alongside lexical equivalents if retroversion is to be attempted. He says, "Complete induction, at all events, can be had only by means of the two lines of investigation, the lexical and the grammatical. It is a stupendous work, but it must be done. . . ."<sup>8</sup> It is his emphasis on the necessity of a thorough investigation of the biblical texts, and in particular his recognition of the importance of grammatical equivalents, that most clearly separates Margolis from his predecessors, and from many of his successors.

### *Emanuel Tov*

In *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Emanuel Tov consciously builds on the foundation laid by Margolis for reconstructing the *Vorlage* of the LXX. Tov identifies three steps one must follow when retroverting a reading from Greek to Hebrew: (1) identify those elements in LXX which presumably reflect elements in MT; (2) isolate those readings of LXX which could reflect Hebrew readings different from MT; (3) attempt to identify which Hebrew words the translator had in front of him or had in mind.<sup>9</sup> The first two of these steps are prior to retroversion proper, which occurs in the

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., 308. He is perhaps somewhat overzealous in some of his attempts to see Hebrew readings behind corrupt Greek texts. For example, on p. 309, n. 3, he suggests that αποδρασαι in Jer 44 (37):12 (ms 239) might reflect the Masoretic קָלַחַל, whereas most LXX mss read αγορασαι = קָלַחַל. However, a more plausible explanation would seem to be that ΔΠΟΔΡΑCΔΙ is simply an inner-Greek corruption of ΔΓΟΡΑCΔΙ (a possibility he does note). Similarly, there is no need to search for a Hebrew equivalent for ΠΑΡΟΙΚΙCΔΙ in ms 26, for this reading, too, probably arose from the graphically similar ΔΓΟΡΑCΔΙ (perhaps with the aid of a lacuna in the ms tradition).

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., 311-12.

<sup>9</sup>Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 99. Those readings in LXX and the other translations that are isolated in

third step.

This model is helpful in that it specifies for which words retroversion is to be attempted. The next question is, how exactly does one proceed to identify those words which the translator had in front of him (or in mind)? Tov answers this question by offering a number of guidelines for determining the presumed *Vorlage*. (1) Retroversions are based either on vocabulary equivalences between LXX and MT or (2) on the scholar's intuition. (3) Correct retroversions should be probable from a textual point of view (i.e., "should have developed by known procedures of textual change from the reading of MT or *vice versa*, or else its place in the textual history of MT should be easily definable"), and (4) "they should be plausible from the point of view of the grammar, vocabulary and style of the Hebrew Bible, and in particular of the book in which the reading is found." (5) Finally, some retroversions are supported by identical readings elsewhere.<sup>10</sup> He gives numerous examples of each of these guidelines.

Vocabulary equivalences between LXX and MT can be gleaned from a concordance, particularly that of Hatch and Redpath, or from various computerized databases, such as the CATSS database.<sup>11</sup> However, one must use the data with caution, for some of the apparent equivalents are formal equivalents only, that is, the Hebrew and Greek words occupy the corresponding space in MT and LXX, respectively, but the Greek reading may not actually render the word found in MT.<sup>12</sup> In 2 Kgs 17:20, ׀ַעַנְּוּ in MT corresponds to καὶ εσαλευσεν αυτους in LXX. Though HR lists ׀ַעַנְּוּ as an equivalent of σαλευω, the present verse is the only example of this correspondence, and σαλευω also renders the verb עַנְּוּ. Thus, the presumed *Vorlage* of the LXX reading is ׀ַעַנְּוּ; one of the two Hebrew readings probably developed from the other by metathesis.<sup>13</sup> The search for vocabulary equivalences need not be limited to the exact Greek word in question, for some presumed equivalents are based on related Greek words (e.g., compounds) or on words with similar meanings.<sup>14</sup>

The textual critic's intuition cannot be emphasized too strongly, according to Tov,

---

step two are the same as the "significant variants" discussed in this study.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., 101.

<sup>11</sup>For a description of this database, see Robert A. Kraft and Emanuel Tov, eds., *Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies*, vol. 1: *Ruth*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 20 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); Emanuel Tov, *A Computerized Data Base for Septuagint Studies: The Parallel Aligned Text of the Greek and Hebrew Bible*, Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies (CATSS), vol. 2, Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages Supplementary Series, no. 1 (Stellenbosch: Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages, 1986).

<sup>12</sup>See Tov's discussion in *Text-Critical Use*, 101-2; idem, "Background of the Greek-Hebrew Alignment," in Kraft and Tov, *CATSS*, vol. 1, 37-38.

<sup>13</sup>Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 103.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., 106-7.

for the word on which a Greek reading is based may not ever be translated with that particular Greek word (or a related word), and it may not even occur elsewhere in LXX. For example, קדקד in Jer 2:16 MT is formally equivalent to κατεπαίζον in LXX, but the meaning is different. Despite the lack of attestation in LXX, Tov suggests that the LXX reading goes back to a Hebrew reading קדקד, which is semantically similar to κατεπαίζον and graphically similar to קדקד.<sup>15</sup> Intuition is an invaluable tool, but it remains subjective, and it will sometimes happen that the *Vorlage* behind a Greek reading is indeterminate. This problem will be discussed below.

Tov's third guideline states that retroversions should be probable from a textual point of view. Tov lists the interchange of graphically similar letters and metathesis as common scribal phenomena.<sup>16</sup> Elsewhere, he lists factors such as parablepsis, dittography, phonetic similarity, differences in word division, and various intentional changes.<sup>17</sup> For example, the suggested retroversion of a Greek reading should follow the orthography used at the time that the translation was made (see below, pp. 212-16). Furthermore, the textual critic must remember that a retroversion is based not only on the meaning of the Greek text, but also on the graphic form of the Hebrew text. Thus, λυκος εως τωσ οαωσ in Jer 5:6 should not be retroverted as זאב עד הבתים, but rather as זאב עד בית, which is graphically closer to זאב ערבות of MT.<sup>18</sup>

The plausibility of the retroverted reading in terms of grammar, vocabulary, and style reminds the textual critic that most convincing retroversions will usually fit the context of the passage and the stylistic characteristics of the book (or section) in question. However, it is entirely possible that the Hebrew *Vorlage* behind some Greek readings was anomalous. An unusual grammatical form, for example, may reflect a legitimate archaic or dialectical survival in the text, which was changed at some point in the proto-Masoretic tradition. On the other hand, an anomalous reading may simply be an error that crept into the text. However, Tov stresses that “*the correctness of a given retroversion should never be confused with its originality within the history of the biblical text.*”<sup>19</sup> In other words, retroversion is a different step entirely from evaluation. In a further comment on linguistic plausibility, Tov reminds the textual critic that “retroversions should follow the grammar and lexical understanding of the translator rather than the modern scholar's understanding

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 116-17.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 120.

<sup>17</sup> Idem, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 236-84. See also P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *Textual Criticism*, 26-61, and Michael Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 23-88.

<sup>18</sup> Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 121-22.

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., 124 (italics his).

of Hebrew philology.”<sup>20</sup> For example, the LXX reading  $\epsilon\nu\ \mu\epsilon\sigma\omega\ \sigma\kappa\iota\alpha\varsigma\ \theta\alpha\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon$  for MT’s  $\text{בְּגֵיטִים זָלֵמוֹת}$  in Ps 23(22):4 probably reflects the translator’s understanding of  $\text{בְּגֵיטִים}$  as equivalent to the Aramaic  $\text{בְּגֵיטִים}$ , “in the midst” (cf. also Jer 49:19[29:20]).<sup>21</sup>

Finally, some retroversions of LXX have external support from other ancient versions, Qumran mss, and scriptural citations or allusions in other ancient sources (e.g., Josephus, extracanonical books, the Talmud, etc.). Caution must be exercised, however, when one claims that a reading in one version supports that in another, for some parallel readings developed independently of one another. For example, the agreement between LXX and the Samaritan Pentateuch in saying that God completed his work of creation on the *sixth* day, rather than the *seventh* in MT, may be the result of independent contextual harmonization.<sup>22</sup> The textual critic must be especially careful when using data from medieval Hebrew mss to support a reading in LXX, for the history of the development of the Masoretic mss makes it unlikely that such agreements are genetically related. Only in the cases of a few specific mss may there be exceptions to this generalization.<sup>23</sup>

Tov’s guidelines for retroverting the text go well beyond those of Margolis, yet Tov reminds the textual critic of the subjective nature of most retroversions: “No retroversion—with the exception of some personal names—is beyond doubt, but some retroversions are more reliable than others.”<sup>24</sup> Some reliable types of retroversions include those supported by scribal errors in Hebrew, those supported by Hebraisms in LXX, and retroversions of variants which are preferable to the readings of MT.<sup>25</sup> Types of retroversions which are less reliable, or even doubtful, include retroversions of words or phrases in non-literal translation units, retroversions of difficult words (especially *hapax legomena*), additions and omissions of personal names for the sake of clarity, mechanical disturbances of the text (e.g., haplography, dittography, or parablepsis) which could have occurred in either Greek or Hebrew, and harmonizations.<sup>26</sup>

Tov’s discussion of retroversions is helpful and illuminating. Nevertheless, some questions remain. For instance, Tov’s numerous examples deal almost exclusively with what he calls “content words.” He says that the reconstruction of “grammatical words,” that is, prepositions, particles, and conjunctions, and all grammatical categories must be

<sup>20</sup>Ibid., 125.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid.

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 128.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., 130-31. See also Goshen-Gottstein, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts,” 276-84.

<sup>24</sup>Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 131.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 131-35. Of course, retroversions which produce readings preferable to MT cannot be identified until the evaluation stage.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 137-39.

considered less reliable than that of content words.<sup>27</sup> However, though this statement may be accurate to a greater or lesser extent, he makes no effort here to test it. An examination of “grammatical words” and grammatical categories in 1 Samuel 3 lends some support to his position, yet contradicts it in other ways. For example, the deviation factor of Greek verbs, nouns, and adjectives (i.e., “content words”) in the chapter, 0.33, is less than the deviation factor of Greek adverbs, prepositions, and particles (included in Tov’s “grammatical words”), 1.27, thus indicating a greater degree of freedom in rendering adverbs, prepositions, and particles, and, by implication, a lesser likelihood of determining the exact Hebrew reading of the *Vorlage*. However, the deviation factor of the Greek conjunctions (also included among “grammatical words”) is 0.00, so it appears that the translators were in fact concerned to render conjunctions exactly, and therefore the Hebrew conjunctions lying behind the Greek conjunctions can be determined with precision, assuming that the pattern holds up in other chapters. Concerning grammatical categories, the tables in Appendix 3 that reflect the final translation technique indicate that in many cases the deviation factors for the renderings of certain grammatical categories are comparable to, or even less than, that for the rendering of “content words” (i.e., rendering of Hebrew verbs by Greek tense and mood [excluding verbals]: 0.43; rendering of Hebrew stem by Greek voice: 0.30; rendering of person in verbs: 0.00; rendering of number in verbs: 0.12; rendering of the use of Hebrew substantives by Greek case: 0.37 [when grouped as described on pp. 96-97]; rendering of number in pronouns: 0.00; rendering of the use of Hebrew pronouns by Greek case: 0.06 [when grouped as described on pp. 96-97]). It seems, then, that “grammatical words” and grammatical categories may at times be rendered with precision. When they are, they are candidates for retroversion alongside “content words.”

In his discussion of the support of variants among external sources, Tov, speaking of independently arising parallel elements in various witnesses, suggests that the correction of grammatical inconsistencies in the witnesses is relatively common, and such corrections should not be viewed as genetically related.<sup>28</sup> Because he does not elaborate extensively on this suggestion, various questions arise: How exactly is grammatical inconsistency to be defined? Does it only refer to lack of agreement between subject and verb, as is sometimes the case with collective nouns? How widespread is grammatical inconsistency in the OT or in particular books? Under what circumstances should clearly anomalous forms be corrected? The answers to these questions are not straightforward, but more complete answers would lead to more accurate retroversions.

Finally, a couple of other points raised by Tov’s discussion may be mentioned. First, Tov says that retroversions which are supported by Hebraisms in LXX are a type of

<sup>27</sup>Ibid., 111.

<sup>28</sup>Tov, *Text-Critical Use*, 129.

reliable retroversion. Although this statement seems reasonable, can it be supported that translators never introduced syntactical Hebraisms which were not called for by their *Vorlage*?<sup>29</sup> Second, he mentions both the addition and the omission of proper names for the sake of clarity as types of retroversions that are not reliable. While many examples of the addition of names, pronouns, and other elements to a text to enhance its specificity exist, can the same be said for the omission of names?<sup>30</sup> These are questions which warrant investigation.

*John R. Miles*

John R. Miles's revised doctoral dissertation is devoted to the study of retroversion from one language to another.<sup>31</sup> Though he uses retroversion from Ethiopic into Greek as his example, his methodology is equally applicable to other versions and their daughter translations. He seeks a more scientific approach to retroversion, one based less on the textual critic's intuition and more on reliable data.

Our concern is rather with "retroversion" as a more general problem in critical method. Briefly, we submit that if the modern critic can get from translation to original, it can only be because he knows how a given ancient translator got from original to translation; and that since this knowledge can only be acquired when both the original and the translation are available for study, his ability to "retrovert" results less from insight into the translation he is considering, presumably one for which the original is lost, than it results from insight transferred from his work on other translations for which the originals were available.<sup>32</sup>

To obtain data about a particular version's translation technique, he suggests building a "syntacticon," which compares syntactic structures in the source language to that in the target language.<sup>33</sup> In his first chapter, he builds this "syntacticon" inductively, constructing it from a comparison of the Greek and the Ethiopic in Esther 1-8. He acknowledges some of the difficulties inherent in his method, for example, the assumption that the particular Greek and Ethiopic texts he analyzes are actually related to one another as source and translation, when in fact they are not. Nevertheless, he believes that these problems do not significantly alter the outcome of his study. He also notes that his choice

---

<sup>29</sup>The analogy of the gospel of Luke may be instructive here. After the prologue (Lk 1:1-4), which is written in a Greek that approaches classical style, the remainder of the gospel is written in a kind of "Semitic Greek," perhaps based on the style of LXX, though no (complete) Hebrew or Aramaic composition lies behind it. Cf. H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies*, o.s., 44 (1943): 129-38.

<sup>30</sup>Though it requires further substantiation in a wider context, it seems probable that Jerome omitted proper names, pronouns, and other elements that he felt were redundant in the context (e.g., ⲁⲓ in 3:9 and the pronominal suffix ⲓ in 3:11; cf. also the substitution of *eius* for ⲁⲓ in 3:14, apparently to avoid redundancy); see above, pp. 184-86. No tendency to omit elements for stylistic reasons was discerned in any of the other versions in 1 Samuel 3.

<sup>31</sup>John Russiano Miles, *Retroversion and Text Criticism*.

<sup>32</sup>*Ibid.*, 5.

<sup>33</sup>*Ibid.*, 1.



of a fairly literal unit of translation enhances his probability of successful retroversion.<sup>34</sup>

His “syntacticon” is based on the translation patterns not of individual words or grammatical structures but of groups of words that are related syntactically in the sentence. Specifically, he groups his examples according to what he sees as patterns of subordination: verb-to-verb subordination, verb-to-substantive subordination, substantive-to-substantive subordination, and so forth. He mentions briefly coordination of sentences and, more extensively, formulaic language. He describes formulaic language as follows: “Within the translation language, given forms of expression can be bound to given language situations in such a way that when the translator comes upon the situation in the original language, the form of his translation will be determined immediately and without reference to the form of the original.”<sup>35</sup> For example, Ethiopic dates are often rendered according to a set form, regardless of the exact reading of LXX.

Once his “syntacticon” is developed, he first tests its accuracy and usefulness by applying it to the Greek text of Esther 9 and comparing the results with the Ethiopic text. He begins with an exercise in translation rather than retroversion because the initial form of his “syntacticon” is a function that operates on Greek readings and produces Ethiopic readings. In addition, he says, it is more logical to go from Greek to Ethiopic first because that is the historical direction of the translation process. “Retroversion is not a matter of relating the translation to the original, it is a matter of recovering and reversing the relationship which the original once had to the translation.”<sup>36</sup> For example, in his analysis of Esth 9:17, he finds five syntactical structures in the Greek text that are reflected in his “syntacticon.” Comparing the translational guidelines he has gleaned from chapters 1-8 with the extant Ethiopic text, he finds that the guidelines have been followed three times out of the five possibilities.<sup>37</sup> Overall, he discovers that the Ethiopic text conforms to his predicted results in 70% of the cases.<sup>38</sup> He suggests a number of improvements to his initial “syntacticon,” and the result is a complex system of logic tables and decision paths that he admits seem to require a computer to analyze.<sup>39</sup>

Having demonstrated the use of his “syntacticon” as a tool for predicting the Ethiopic text when confronted with the Greek, he next takes the Ethiopic text of Esther 10 and attempts to determine the Greek text behind it. In order to accomplish this retroversion, it is necessary for him first to invert his tables so that one can begin with Ethiopic rather than Greek. After doing so, he uses the transformed tables to predict the

---

<sup>34</sup>Ibid., 6.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid., 69.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., 130-31.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid., 140.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., 149.

<sup>39</sup>Ibid., 155.

retroverted Greek text. He finds that his tables produce the actual Greek text in 88% of the cases for which a syntactic entry exists. After applying his method to 1 Esdras 3 (Greek to Ethiopic) and 4 Baruch 1 (Ethiopic to Greek), he concludes, “the mechanical prediction of translation syntax and the recovery from translation of original syntax would seem on the basis of our study to be possible.”<sup>40</sup>

Miles’s study of the predictability of retroversion is interesting and informative. His work demonstrates the necessity of using hard data, rather than pure intuition, when discussing translation technique and when attempting retroversion. Nevertheless, a number of questions arise from his study. The first concerns his assumption that determining the rules of translation from source to target language guarantees that the process may be inverted, going from target to source language.<sup>41</sup> In fact, the possibility of mechanical retroversion does not logically follow from a determination of rules for translation, since more than one syntactical structure in the source language may be resolved into a single structure in the target language.<sup>42</sup>

More significant is the question of the structure of his “syntacticon.” Not all syntactic relationships in a sentence can be described in terms of subordination, and the mapping of syntactical structures rather than the grammatical characteristics of individual words (i.e., case, gender, number, tense, etc.) begs the question of translation technique. It may be that the Ethiopic translators (or any other translators) looked beyond individual words at groups of words when translating, but it must be shown that they did so.<sup>43</sup> If it can be demonstrated that the translators of a particular unit of translation primarily translated word by word, rather than phrase by phrase, the need for a “syntacticon” such as Miles describes disappears. On the other hand, if the translators show a propensity for translating certain syntactic constructions in a way that violates their normal word by word technique, a more limited “syntacticon” may be helpful.<sup>44</sup>

Noticeably lacking in Miles’s discussion of retroversion is any discussion of lexical choice. It is true that his main focus is on the predictability of syntax; nevertheless, since

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., 200.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., 2.

<sup>42</sup>In mathematical terms, if his “syntacticon” describes a function whose domain is the source language and whose range is the target language, that function may not be invertible because a one-to-one correspondence between discrete structures in the two languages may not exist. He discusses the difficulties that arise from multiple references in the reversed (better: inverted) tables (pp. 158-59), but he does not adequately address what is a potentially complex problem.

<sup>43</sup>Cf. the criticism of Anneli Aejmelaeus, review of *Retroversion and Text Criticism: The Predictability of Syntax in an Ancient Translation from Greek to Ethiopic*, by John Russiano Miles, *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 111 (1986), col. 343: “Est ist kaum sinnvoll, syntaktische Erscheinungen nach den Wortklassen zu klassifizieren, die je miteinander verbunden und einander subordiniert erscheinen, nämlich Verb zu Verb, Verb zu Substantiv, Substantiv zu Substantiv usw.”

<sup>44</sup>Thus, Aejmelaeus suggests a map of the translations of various prepositional phrases; *ibid.*

retroversion does require that lexical choices be made, some brief discussion of the subject would be helpful (cf. his discussion on word order, pp. 153-54). Also, his discussion of “omission, mistranslation, paraphrase, and unpredictable translation” (pp. 81-84) does not adequately address the problem of what the textual critic should do when confronted with such material. He says that no one can predict “what does not happen when an accurate mechanical translation is not made. . . .”<sup>45</sup> However, if one can demonstrate that omission is caused by parablepsis, for example, one can predict at least certain aspects of the *Vorlage*. Moreover, both Margolis and Tov point out that certain mistranslations do point to specific readings in the *Vorlage*, especially if the word apparently read is graphically similar to the presumed original.

In conclusion, Miles’s methodology for retroverting a translation by using tables that map the correspondence of syntactic structures in the source and target languages supports the need to have hard data before deciding upon a particular retroverted reading. However, it may be doubted whether retroversion can really be as mechanical as he claims, especially in the light of varied renderings of identical or similar syntactic structures.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, he has not demonstrated that such a complex approach to translation, operating on the level of syntactic structures rather than on the level of individual words, is reflected in the Ethiopic translation, much less in the translations used in this analysis. Thus, his method has limited application in the present study.

### *Other Suggestions*

In addition to these more extensive studies of retroversion, shorter observations on various aspects of retroversion have been made. Isac Leo Seeligmann, in an article discussing contemporary Septuagint research, discusses the relationship between the Hebrew and Greek texts of the OT. He stresses the importance of first establishing the text of LXX itself and of determining the translation technique of the particular book in question.<sup>47</sup> In agreement with Margolis and Tov, he observes that Hebraisms and errors in translation often allow the reconstruction of the original reading.<sup>48</sup> Finally, Seeligmann

<sup>45</sup> Miles, *Retroversion*, 83.

<sup>46</sup> Cf. the comment of Aejmelaeus, review, col. 344: “Davon ist die Rez. [i.e., Aejmelaeus] jedoch immer stärker überzeugt, daß übersetzungstechnische Studien und Rückübersetzung nicht mechanisch nach gegebenen Regeln zu betreiben sind.” In another context, F. E. Deist says, “[these characteristics of P] sound a warning to the retroverter not to go about his work in a mechanical way, but to take the character of the whole into account so as to make wise decisions on whether a particular reading does in fact constitute a variant reading or not”; Ferdinand E. Deist, *Witnesses to the Old Testament, The Literature of the Old Testament*, vol. 5 (Pretoria: NG Kerkboekhandel, 1988), 179.

<sup>47</sup> Isac Leo Seeligmann, “Problemen en perspectieven in het moderne Septuaginta-onderzoek,” *Jaarbericht ex oriente lux* 7 (1940), 382.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 377; cf. also p. 382. This assertion has been noted and discussed briefly above (pp. 207-8).

says that the correspondence of a LXX variant with another unrelated witness suggests a variant Hebrew *Vorlage*.<sup>49</sup> If true, this observation is applicable not only insofar as it identifies a variant to be retroverted, but it also needs to be considered at the stage of evaluation and when creating the critical apparatus (but see above, pp. 199-200).

F. E. Deist does not deal with retroversion in a systematic way, but he does offer several tips on retroversions for the various versions. He bases his remarks on retroverting LXX on Tov's *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, so that information will not be repeated. For T, Deist says, one must bear in mind that the translators produced targums for liturgical purposes, sometimes adapting their text to fit the liturgical circumstance;<sup>50</sup> different targums utilize different translation techniques; and targums frequently make use of various types of interpretation imbedded in the text: *peshat*, *halakah*, *midrash*, and *haggadah*.<sup>51</sup> Speaking of P, Deist points out that the translators frequently translate Hebrew synonyms with a single Syriac word, though occasionally the reverse occurs; they often concretize Hebrew metaphors; they sometimes vocalize or divide words differently than MT; they render difficult Hebrew words inconsistently; and they sometimes translate proper names.<sup>52</sup> When attempting to retrovert a reading in V, one must be aware of Jerome's stylistic tendencies (e.g., preference for "eloquent" or vivid readings and a somewhat negative attitude toward women and childbearing) and his occasional use of different vocalization, word division, or sentence division.<sup>53</sup>

Before detailing the conclusions about retroversion that have been garnered from the preceding discussion and from work with the text itself, the question of the orthography of the reconstructed texts and of Hebrew mss no longer extant requires discussion.

### Orthography

Though the mss of MT were produced in the Middle Ages, they reflect a much older text, both in content and in orthography. However, probably no scholar would claim that the spelling now found in MT (with all its variety in individual mss) is an accurate reflection in all its particulars of the orthographic practices in vogue at the time when the various biblical books were composed, in the case of Samuel, probably sometime in the sixth century B.C.E. At most, MT reflects an orthography current in perhaps the third or fourth centuries B.C.E.<sup>54</sup> If MT reflects an orthography later than that employed when

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., 383.

<sup>50</sup>Cf. the discussion of Christian lectionaries, which were also used for liturgical purposes; Aland and Aland, *Text of NT*, 166.

<sup>51</sup>Deist, *Witnesses*, 133.

<sup>52</sup>Ibid., 178-79.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid., 189-91.

<sup>54</sup>Frank Moore Cross and David Noel Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the*

Samuel was written, should it be modified to reflect earlier orthographic practices? Furthermore, what kind of orthography should reconstructions based on other versions reflect? These questions must be answered before a reconstruction of an earlier form of the text is attempted.

In 1952, Cross and Freedman attempted to trace Hebrew orthographic practices as reflected in extant inscriptions and other extrabiblical material, most of which were preexilic. Basing their work on earlier studies by Albright, they discerned a development in Hebrew orthographic practices, as follows: (1) prior to the tenth century, Hebrew writing was purely consonantal (phonetic consonantism); (2) beginning in the ninth century, Hebrew scribes began using *yod*, *waw*, and *he* as *matres lectionis* to represent word-final vowels, probably borrowing the practice of their Aramaean neighbors; (3) by the sixth century, vowel letters were used sporadically as internal *matres lectionis* in Hebrew texts; (4) after the sixth century, the use of internal *matres lectionis* increased greatly.<sup>55</sup> In the light of subsequent epigraphic discoveries, they later modified their portrayal, allowing that rare instances of internal *matres lectionis* began as early as the eighth century.<sup>56</sup>

Cross and Freedman's characterization of the development of Hebrew orthographic practices serves as a starting point, or at least a backdrop, for many recent discussions on orthography. In addition to those studies that accept Cross and Freedman's characterization with little or no significant modification, but only further refinement,<sup>57</sup> some have criticized their conclusions to a greater or lesser extent.<sup>58</sup> Probably the most important of these critiques has been that of Ziony Zevit, who concludes on the basis of

---

*Epigraphic Evidence*, American Oriental Series, no. 36 (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1952), 69-70. Cf. also Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, "Another Look at 4QSam<sup>b</sup>," *Revue de Qumran* 14 (1989): 22: ". . . we can infer that the Massoretic system and set of spelling rules were firmly in place in all principles and particulars by the third century BCE."

<sup>55</sup> Cross and Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography*, 45-60.

<sup>56</sup> Idem, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series, no. 21 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1975), 182.

<sup>57</sup> E.g., Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible: Dahood Memorial Lecture*, *Biblica et Orientalia*, no. 41 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 31-65, esp. 65: "Between the extremes of Bange and Zevit, the Cross-Freedman schema remains the best working hypothesis"; Freedman, Mathews, and Hanson, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 51-53. Cf. now also David Noel Freedman, A. Dean Forbes, and Francis I. Andersen, eds., *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Orthography*, *Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego*, vol. 2 (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992).

<sup>58</sup> E.g., Donald Watson Goodwin, *Text-Restoration Methods in Contemporary U.S.A. Biblical Scholarship*, *Pubblicazioni del Seminario di Semitistica, Ricerche*, no. 5 (Naples: Istituto Orientale di Napoli, 1969); L. A. Bange, *A Study in the Use of Vowel-Letters in Alphabetic Consonantal Writing* (Munich: UNI-DRUCK, 1971); Ziony Zevit, *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*, *American Schools of Oriental Research Monograph Series*, no. 2 (Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1980).

extensive epigraphic evidence that the use of internal *matres lectionis* was much more prevalent in preexilic times than Cross and Freedman would allow.<sup>59</sup> Though all of his conclusions have not been unanimously accepted,<sup>60</sup> his reviewers have consistently praised his work as an important study, and some have agreed with Zevit that the system of Cross and Freedman is in need of reevaluation in the light of new discoveries.<sup>61</sup>

The issue of the development of Hebrew orthography applies most significantly to the task of reconstructing earlier forms of the text of a biblical book when one considers whether or not it is possible to reconstruct accurately the orthography of the period in question. Cross and Freedman quite confidently reconstruct the texts of early Israelite poems, using purely consonantal orthography to do so.<sup>62</sup> However, many scholars view the reconstruction of the original orthography of a passage in a biblical book as problematic,<sup>63</sup> and the relatively late date of the final editing of Samuel<sup>64</sup> (sixth century B.C.E., a period of transition in the orthographic practices even according to the calculations of Cross and Freedman) makes certainty in the reconstruction of the orthography of this book impossible. Another factor that complicates the search for the original orthography is the use of variable spellings of the same word in MT,<sup>65</sup> a trait now

<sup>59</sup> Cf. Zevit, *Matres Lectionis*, 35: "From the 7th century on, Judean scribes had available to them a system of *matres lectionis* which they could use, if they wished, to indicate long vowels both in word final and medial positions. Judging from scribal practice as exemplified in the inscriptions and letters of this period, composition with *m.l.* was the norm rather than the exception. It can therefore be assumed that *m.l.* were employed in compositions originating during this period: Deuteronomy, the Deuteronomic history, Isaiah 1-39, Micah, Jeremiah, Habakkuk, etc."

<sup>60</sup> See especially Joseph Naveh, review of *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*, by Ziony Zevit, in *Israel Exploration Journal* 33 (1983): 139-40; Dennis Pardee, review of *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*, by Ziony Zevit, in *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 503-4.

<sup>61</sup> See especially James Barr, review of *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*, by Ziony Zevit, in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 104 (1984): 374: "It does indeed deeply damage the position taken by Cross and Freedman."

<sup>62</sup> Cross and Freedman, *Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. Cf. also William F. Albright, "The Oracles of Balaam," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 63 (1944): 207-33; idem, "The Psalm of Habakkuk," in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson*, ed. H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), 1-18.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 223: "The biblical books that were composed in an early period, and in particular the ancient poetry, were probably written in a very defective orthography, but this assumption does not provide a solid basis for the reconstruction of that orthography."

<sup>64</sup> Further editorial modifications of Samuel apparently continued even after the text reached its final form in most respects in the sixth century. See Tov, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18," 97-130; idem, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 334-36, 346-47; and discussion below, pp. 237-40.

<sup>65</sup> Francis I. Andersen and A. Dean Forbes, "Orthography and Text Transmission: Computer-Assisted Investigation of Textual Transmission through the Study of Orthography in the Hebrew Bible," *Text: Transactions of the Society for Textual Scholarship* 2 (1985): 25-53; eidem, *Spelling in the Hebrew Bible*; Barr, *Variable Spellings*. Andersen and Forbes purport to find patterns of defective and plene spelling in the various books, with patterns of defective spelling more prominent in the books whose text was standardized earlier, notably the Primary History and the three major prophets (*Spelling in the Hebrew Bible*, 317). Barr denies that such patterns prove the earlier composition or standardization of the text (cf.

observed in other ancient Near Eastern literature as well.<sup>66</sup>

Perhaps the most pertinent orthographic issue, at least in 1 Samuel 3, involves the spelling of the sound  $\bar{o}$  at the time the book was written, and especially as it relates to the third masculine singular pronominal suffix attached to masculine singular and plural nouns. Though Zevit believes that a few instances of *waw* as final *mater lectionis* for  $\bar{o}$  exist (examples 41, 53, 99[?], 109), Anson Rainey finds Zevit's discussion weakest at this point.<sup>67</sup> Andersen and Freedman offer an extended discussion of the orthographic representation of the third masculine singular pronominal suffix. They say that the replacement of the preexilic suffixes *-h* and *-w* on masculine singular and plural nouns by *-w* and *-yw*, respectively, probably occurred simultaneously sometime during the fifth century, as evidenced by the rather frequent appearance of the older suffixes in Samuel and Ezekiel but their rarity in Chronicles.<sup>68</sup> More than one hundred instances of the older suffix *-w* with a plural noun are preserved in the *kethib-qere* notations. Since many of them occur in Samuel, including two in 1 Samuel 3 (vv. 2, 18), the older orthography of this suffix will be preferred throughout the reconstruction. Similarly, the shorter reading of forms like  $\text{אלך}$  and  $\text{עלך}$  will be preferred to the more common Masoretic forms  $\text{אלך}$  and  $\text{עלך}$ , and the *yod* before pronominal suffixes in masculine plural nouns will be omitted as a later form.<sup>69</sup>

In light of the previous discussion, the following procedure regarding orthography will be adopted in the present study. Whenever the *reading* of MT (not its orthography) is determined to be original, its orthography will not be modified, with the exception of the third masculine singular suffix and certain preposition-pronoun combinations, as discussed in the preceding paragraph. When a reading reconstructed from one or more of the versions is preferred to MT, the orthography of the reconstruction will agree with the

---

p. 38), claiming instead that a single Masoretic orthography exists for the entire Bible (p. 204). The position of Andersen and Forbes is strengthened to some extent by a comparison of 4QSam<sup>b</sup> with MT: though sharing many of the plene readings of MT, 4QSam<sup>b</sup> is consistently defective in its renderings of  $\bar{o}$ , thus indicating the preservation of one aspect of an older orthographic system (Andersen and Freedman, "Another Look at 4QSam<sup>b</sup>," 28).

<sup>66</sup>A. R. Millard, "Variable Spelling in Hebrew and Other Ancient Texts," *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s., 42 (1991): 106-15.

<sup>67</sup>Anson F. Rainey, review of *Matres Lectionis in Ancient Hebrew Epigraphs*, by Ziony Zevit, in *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 632.

<sup>68</sup>Andersen and Freedman, "Another Look at 4QSam<sup>b</sup>," 23-27. However, the singular form with *-w* may have occurred by the sixth century in Hebrew, at least occasionally, as in *lw* in an inscription from Khirbet Beit Lei; see Zevit, *Matres Lectionis*, 30-31. G. I. Davies, though mentioning *lw* as a possible reading, prefers an alternative reading of the inscription: G. I. Davies, *Ancient Hebrew Inscriptions: Corpus and Concordance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 89.

<sup>69</sup>Cf. Zevit, *Matres Lectionis*, 27-28, where he notes that  $\text{אלך}$  appears in a sixth century ostracoon from Arad. See also Freedman, Mathews, and Hanson, *The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*, 80, where two occurrences of  $\text{אלך}$  are noted in 11QpaleoLev (15:2; 17:2). Several of these shorter forms occur in MT of Samuel.

orthography of other instances of the word in MT, if they exist. An exception to this rule will be made if it can be determined that a particular spelling of the Hebrew *Vorlage* led to readings found elsewhere in the text-traditions. It is true that the procedure adopted may result in a somewhat mixed orthography, but that is also the nature of all the extant Hebrew witnesses, including MT.<sup>70</sup>

Finally, the role of orthography in textual evaluation requires some mention. If older portions of the Bible were composed using a greater concentration of preexilic orthographic practices (especially defective spelling), can the presence of an older orthographic form be used as evidence of the antiquity of a given reading? Andersen and Freedman suggest that it can, noting that the reading  $\text{הָרַרְרָה}$  in 1 Sam 16:4 (4QSam<sup>b</sup>, in agreement with LXX), were it added by postexilic scribes, would probably be spelled  $\text{הָרַרְרָה}$ .<sup>71</sup> However, even if earlier spelling practices, such as defective spelling, did predominate in portions of the Bible that were composed earlier, scribal copying has tended to replace most of these older readings, albeit somewhat inconsistently. The existence of defective readings even in patently late books (e.g., Dan 11:38; Esth 8:16; Neh 11:1) suggests the doubtfulness, if not impossibility, of equating archaic orthography with early readings. Such arguments, if they are advanced, must be made with due reservation.

### Conclusions concerning Methodology

It must be admitted that retroverting a translation is a subjective venture in most cases (with the general exception of proper nouns). However, as Tov points out, certain categories of retroversions are reasonably reliable, namely, those supported by identifiable scribal errors in Hebrew, those supported by Hebraisms, and those that result in readings that are preferable to MT. Concordances and lexicons will serve as useful tools in the process of retroversion, as will the lists of lexical equivalents between the target languages and the Hebrew in 1 Samuel 3 for each of the secondary versions, found in Appendix 3.<sup>72</sup> When the reconstruction requires grammatical structures not present in MT, the grammatical tables in Appendix 3 will be used for reference.<sup>73</sup>

It will sometimes occur that the *Vorlage* of a version is uncertain, either because no equivalent that can be easily explained as a deviation from MT or one of the other versions exists, or because more than one possible reading exists. In the latter case (e.g., the

---

<sup>70</sup>This statement is true regardless of the position one adopts concerning the possibility of recovering an earlier orthography of portions of MT. Thus, Cross and Freedman say, “The Hebrew Bible which tradition has delivered to us is in reality a palimpsest; underlying the visible text, the varied spelling customs of older ages have been recorded” (Cross and Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography*, 1); cf. Barr’s “zone of variable spellings” (Barr, *Variable Spellings*, 204-5).

<sup>71</sup> Andersen and Freedman, “Another Look at 4QSam<sup>b</sup>,” 8.

<sup>72</sup> See below, \*\*\*-\*\*\* (LXX), \*\*\*-\*\*\* (P), \*\*\*-\*\*\* (T), \*\*\*-\*\*\* (V).

<sup>73</sup> See below, \*\*\*-\*\*\* (LXX), \*\*\*-\*\*\* (P), \*\*\*-\*\*\* (T), \*\*\*-\*\*\* (V).



decision of whether to render σοι with אַלְךָ, לְךָ, or דָּ-), the use in the chapter (as indicated in the lexical and grammatical tables) and the rest of the book is an important guideline, but it must be acknowledged that at times a subjective, almost arbitrary, decision must be made when the data does not favor one reading over the others. In the case where no good Hebrew equivalent seems to exist for a versional reading, one that reflects as much as possible both the versional evidence and the possibility of a scribal error in Hebrew will be attempted. In some cases, it may be preferable simply to admit that no single reconstruction is compelling, and to offer more than one. In other cases, it may be best to retain the reading of MT and simply note the versional variant.

### Retroversions of the Secondary and Partial Secondary Witnesses

In the retroversions that follow, MT is taken as the starting point for reconstructing whole verses, and deviations from MT based on the version in question are indicated by text in a larger type. If the reconstructed Hebrew text omits one or more items found in MT, the symbol «» (European quotation marks) will appear in place of the omitted item(s). The texts of the versions on which the following reconstructions are based can be found for the most part in the standard editions of those versions, though modifications of T and the fully reconstructed texts of LXX, LXX<sup>L</sup>, and LXX<sup>O</sup> appear in Appendix 1.<sup>74</sup> Individual comments and references to earlier discussions are given for each of the readings. The symbol '<' in the following paragraphs is used to denote the Hebrew reading retroverted from a versional reading.

#### Septuagint

(3:1) והנער שמואל משרת את יהוה לפני עלי הכהן ודבר יהוה היה יקר  
בימים ההם אין חזון פִּרְיָן

The deviations from MT in this verse are LXX variants 70 (הכהן < του ιερεως, see above, pp. 100-101) and 3 (פִּרְיָן < ην διαστειλουσα, see above, pp. 92-93). Variant 70 is a quantitative variant, not represented in MT. Although כהן does not occur in 1 Samuel 3 MT, in the 700+ cases of ιερεως that also appear in MT, all of them render כהן, so this retroversion is certain.

The other variant, variant 3, is a variant in consistency. It appears that the translators read פִּרְיָן (which could conceivably be a qal passive participle, but which they took as a qal active participle) rather than נִפְרָן. Since their rendering reflects an active rather than a passive meaning, it is doubtful that διαστειλουσα was intended to render a niph'al verb with a passive meaning.

<sup>74</sup>See above, pp. 36-37, for complete details.

(3:2) ויהי ביום ההוא ועלי שכב במקמו ועינו החלו כבוד ולא יוכל לראות

This verse contains LXX variants 6 (כבוד < βαρυνεσθαι, see above, pp. 86-87) and 71 (-1 < και, see above, p. 101). βαρυνω and related Greek words are usually used in LXX to render Hebrew words related to כבוד; only in the present case does a form of βαρυνω correspond to כהה in MT. Though the use of βαρυνωπεω in Gen 48:10 (rendering כבוד) could have suggested the unique rendering, the possibility of graphic confusion makes it probable that the translators were seeking to render a form of כבוד.<sup>75</sup>

Although conjunctions are rather easily added or omitted in all witnesses, the concern of the translators of LXX for fidelity to their text in most instances and the fact that the additional conjunction appears in many Masoretic mss and in T makes it likely that the *Vorlage* of LXX contained a conjunction. The absolute consistency with which the translators of LXX render conjunctions, as well as the context, makes it certain that that conjunction was -1.

(3:3) ונר אל הים טרם יכבה ושמואל שכב בהיכל «אשר שם ארון אל הים

This verse contains LXX variant 72 («» < omission of יהוה, see above, pp. 100-101). The translators apparently did not find יהוה in their *Vorlage*.

(3:4) ויקרא יהוה «שמואל שמואל ויאמר הנני

Verse 4 contains two LXX variants, 74 («» < omission of אל, see above, p. 102) and 75 (שמואל < Σαμουηλ, see above, p. 102). Though the omission of אל would not normally be considered significant, in the present verse it is possible that אל in MT is actually the remnant of an original שמואל, as LXX seems to imply.<sup>76</sup>

(3:5) וירץ אל עלי ויאמר הנני כי קראת לי ויאמר לא קראתי אלך שוב שכב וישב וישכב

This verse exhibits two deviations from MT, LXX variants 76 (אלך < σε, see above, pp. 100-101) and 12 (ישב < ανεστρεψεν, see above, p. 87). In the first case, the retroversion אלך could probably just as easily be לך (cf. קראת לי in 3:5, 6, 8), but the occurrence of יקרא אלך in the immediate context (3:9) suggests that the longer form may also have appeared in the *Vorlage*.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>75</sup>Cf. also the reading of P,  $\text{ܟܒܘܕܐܝܢܐ}$ ,  $\text{ܟܒܘܕܐܝܢܐ}$ . Since  $\text{ܟܒܘܕܐܝܢܐ}$  is a common rendering of כבוד, it is possible that the translators read כבוד or something similar here. However, the occurrence of  $\text{ܟܒܘܕܐܝܢܐ}$  in 4:15 as a rendering of קמה (MT) precludes considering the variant in 3:2 significant, since  $\text{ܟܒܘܕܐܝܢܐ}$  seems to be a common Syriac idiom for speaking of blindness.

<sup>76</sup>Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 16; Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 52; S. R. Driver, *Notes on the Books of Samuel*, 42.

<sup>77</sup>In Samuel and Kings, cf. also 1 Kgs 8:43, 52. The only occurrence of לך with קרא in these books is 1 Sam 28:15, but it is possible that the preceding seghol influenced the choice of prepositions

Concerning variant 12, ἀναστρεφω is the regular rendering of שׁוּב in Kingdoms and throughout the OT, rendering it some forty times in Kingdoms alone. In addition, if the *Vorlage* of LXX indeed differs from MT, the occurrences of שׁוּב and שׁוּבַב together in 3:5, 6 makes the present retroversion certain.

(3:6) וַיִּסַּף יְהוּדָה וַיִּקְרָא «» שְׁמוֹאֵל שְׁמוֹאֵל «» וַיִּלְךְ אֵל עָלַי שְׁנִיִּת  
וַיֹּאמֶר הֲנִנִּי כִּי קִרְאתָ לִּי וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא קִרְאתִי אֵלַי «» שׁוּבַב שׁוּבַב

Several differences from MT occur in the reconstructed *Vorlage* of LXX in verse 6: LXX variant 78 (-1 2° < καί, see above, pp. 101-102), variant 13 ([ו]יקרא) < ἐκαλεσεν, see above, pp. 90-91), variant 79 («» 1° < omission of עוֹד, see above, pp. 100-101), variant 80 (שְׁמוֹאֵל 2° < Σαμουηλ, see above, p. 102), variant 81 («» 2° < omission of וַיִּקָּם שְׁמוֹאֵל, see above, p. 103), variant 82 (שְׁנִיִּת < ἐκ δευτερου, see above, pp. 100-101), variant 84 (אֵלַי < σε, see above, pp. 102-3), and variant 83 («» 3° < omission of בְּנִי, see above, pp. 102-3). Variants 78 and 13 may be considered together. As mentioned above, the consistency of the translators in rendering conjunctions, as well as the context and the paucity of conjunctions in Hebrew, makes the retroversion of the conjunction certain in variant 78. The idiom (reading right to left) “imperfect + וַיִּסַּף” is a Hebraism found elsewhere in the OT, including 1 Sam 19:21,<sup>78</sup> so its retroversion is also reasonably certain.

The three omissions in the verse require little comment in the area of retroversion, since all of them are “content words” or phrases. They are not generally omitted by literal translators if present in the *Vorlage*, unless by mistake (e.g., parablepsis), as may be the case in variant 81.<sup>79</sup> Similarly, the retroversion of the proper name in variant 80 is obvious. For a brief discussion of the retroversion of σε in variant 84, see the discussion of variant 76 in verse 5.

The only variant in this verse that provides any difficulty at all in retroverting is variant 82, where שְׁנִיִּת renders ἐκ δευτερου.<sup>80</sup> It is true that δευτερος renders a number of different Hebrew words, but the constructions ἐκ δευτερου and το δευτερον always render some form of the Hebrew שְׁנִיִּת, so this retroversion is also fairly certain.

here.

<sup>78</sup>Cf. BDB, s.v. “וַיִּסַּף.”

<sup>79</sup>Since it cannot be determined in many cases whether parablepsis occurred in the *Vorlage*, at the point of translation, or early in the transmission of the translated text, it seems best to operate as though the error were in the *Vorlage*. If parablepsis is confirmed in the evaluation phase as a contributing factor to the disturbance, the reading will be regarded as secondary at that point.

<sup>80</sup>For a discussion of the reading ἐκ δευτερου vs. το δευτερον of B, see above, pp. 44-45.

(3:7) וּשְׂמוּאֵל טָרַם יָדַע אֶת אֱלֹהִים וְ«יִגְלַה אֵלָיו דְּבַר יְהוָה

The variants in this verse are LXX variants 15 (אלהים < θεος, see above, pp. 87-88) and 86 («» < omission of טָרַם, see above, p. 104). Concerning variant 15, although יהוה and אלהים are equivalent in the sense that both refer to the God of the Israelites, the translators of LXX generally make a distinction in their rendering of the two names, using θεος for אלהים and κυριος for יהוה. The tendency in at least some scribal circles to replace אלהים with יהוה on a more or less regular basis (cf. Pss 14 and 53) suggests that the exchange may have occurred in Hebrew rather than at the point of translation, especially since the translators render all fifteen other occurrences of יהוה in the chapter by κυριος. The retroversion of variant 86 is straightforward since it involves an omission.

(3:9) וַיֹּאמֶר «» שׁוּב שָׁכַב בְּנֵי וְהִיָּה אִם יִקְרָא אֵלַיְךָ וְאָמַרְתָּ דְּבַר יְהוָה כִּי שָׁמַע עֲבָדְךָ וַיִּלֶּךְ שְׂמוּאֵל וַיִּשְׁכַּב בַּמְּקוֹמוֹ

The following LXX variants appear in verse 9: variant 87 («» < omission of עלי לשמואל, see above, pp. 100-101), variant 18 (שוב < αναστρεφε, see above, p. 87), and variant 89 (בני < τεκνον, see above, pp. 100-101). Like previous omissions, that in variant 87 requires no comment as far as retroversion is concerned. Variant 18, like variant 12 in verse 5, can only be a rendering of the root שׁוּב, if indeed the variation from MT was present in the *Vorlage*.

A wooden retroversion of τεκνον (variant 89) would be בן, but the appearance of the equivalent τεκνον < בני in 3:16, the reading בני in 3:6 MT, and many other similar readings involving the vocative (1 Sam 2:24; 4:16; 24:17; 26:17, 21, 25, and numerous instances throughout the OT) demonstrate the certainty of the retroversion.

(3:10) וַיֹּבֵֹא יְהוָה וַיִּתְּצֵב וַיִּקְרָא לוֹ כַּפְעַם בַּפְעַם «» וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂמוּאֵל דְּבַר כִּי שָׁמַע עֲבָדְךָ

The deviations from MT in verse 10 are LXX variants 90 (לו < αυτον, see above, pp. 100-101) and 91 («» < omission of שְׂמוּאֵל שְׂמוּאֵל, see above, p. 102). As is the case with variants 76 and 84, either לו or אלו are possible retroversions, and both forms appear in the chapter. However, a survey of the usage of לו and אלו with the verb קרא in Samuel and Kings shows that לו appears in 2 Sam 9:2; 11:13; 1 Kgs 12:3; 2 Kgs 18:4; only in 2 Sam 15:2 does אלו follow קרא, and in this case an intervening word occurs between the verb and the prepositional phrase. Thus, the shorter form has been chosen for the retroversion. The retroversion of the omission of שְׂמוּאֵל שְׂמוּאֵל in variant 91 requires no comment.

(3:11) ויאמר יהוה אל שמואל הנה אנכי עשה דברי בישראל « כל שמעו  
תצל ינה שתי אזניו

Two variants from MT occur in verse 11: LXX variants 92 (ⲓ - < μου, see above, pp. 100-101) and 93 («» < omission of אשר, see above, p. 104). In variant 92, LXX has an additional personal pronoun in the genitive case, which can only be retroverted with a pronominal suffix. The omission in variant 93, though involving a “grammatical word” rather than a “content word,” seems to have been based on the absence of any conjunction in the *Vorlage*, since the translators regularly render אשר with either a relative pronoun or an article (substituting for the relative pronoun).

(3:12) ביום ההוא אקים על עלי את כל אשר דברתי בביתו החל וכלה

The retroverted version of verse 12 has two variants from MT, LXX variant 26 (ⲉⲗ < εϰⲓ, see above, p. 88) and variant 27 (-ⲃ < εϰⲓ, see above, p. 88). Since the translators normally render אל in one of two ways, either by πρὸς or with only a case ending (usually dative), the renderings in both cases are suspicious. In variant 26, the reading of LXX suggests that the translators rendered על rather than אל, two words that are frequently interchanged in Samuel.<sup>81</sup> Although variation between אל and על in Hebrew mss and their similar usage in Samuel are valid text-critical issues, the question at the point of retroversion is not whether or not the words were interchangeable in the mind of the author, but rather how the translators rendered them. The distribution in 1 Samuel 3 suggests that εϰⲓ is not used to render אל, whereas it frequently renders על, and the graphic and aural similarity between the two prepositions strengthens the retroversion.

On the surface, εϰⲓ in variant 27 seems to be a perfectly good translation of אל; however, the translators of Samuel do not seem to have equated the two. On the other hand, εϰⲓ frequently renders -ⲃ, -ⲗ, and ⲓⲉ- (*he locale*); either of these first two is a possible retroversion in the present case. In 1 Sam 19:3, 4; and 25:39, דבר is used with -ⲃ when describing a conversation about someone else, but in each case LXX renders the preposition with περι. Every instance of דבר with -ⲗ is rendered with πρὸς, περι, or some other preposition, or simply the dative case; nowhere in the OT does εϰⲓ render ל after דבר. Furthermore, -ⲗ is used primarily to refer to direct address, not in reference to a third party. The only other example of εϰⲓ with λαλεω in LXX is in 2 Kgdms 13:20, where Absalom tells his sister, “μη θης την καρδιαν σου του λαλησαι εις το ρημα τουτο.”<sup>82</sup> Unfortunately, no Hebrew equivalent for εϰⲓ το ρημα occurs in MT.

<sup>81</sup> Sperber, *Bible in Aramaic*, 4b:111, gives several examples of the indiscriminate use of אל and על in MT.

<sup>82</sup> Another instance of λαλεω with εϰⲓ occurs in Esth 4:8, but εϰⲓ is used in a way semantically dissimilar to the one in 1 Sam 3:12 (in a terminal accusative phrase), so it is irrelevant.

However, the third party connotation associated with the preposition confirms the same connotation in 1 Sam 3:12, and this connotation in turn suggests that a ב may have slipped out of the *Vorlage* of LXX by haplography. Thus, בביתו seems to be the best possible retroversion, though one cannot rule out other possibilities, including corruption in the Greek text.

(3:13) ואגד לו כי שפט אני את ביתו עד עולם בעונת בנו «» כי מקללים  
אלהים בניו ולא כהה במ

Verse 13 contains several sets of variants from MT: LXX variant 30 (אגד < [אג] < [αγ] ἀνηγγελα, see above, p. 92), variant 32 (עונת < εὐνοιας, see above, pp. 94-95), variant 33 (אלהים < θεον, see above, pp. 88-89), variant 94 («» < omission of אשר ידע, see above, p. 103), and variant 95 (בנו < υἱου σου, see above, p. 103). The first of these variants, variant 30, involves a difference in time: MT reads והגדתי (apparently a *waw* consecutive with a perfect verb, and thus a reference to the future), whereas LXX has ἀνηγγελα (a perfect, and clearly a reference to past time). The two other occurrences of *waw* consecutive with perfect in the chapter are rendered by Greek future tenses. Although three cases are not sufficient to establish a definite trend, the connotation of future time usually associated with the *waw* consecutive plus perfect and the support of other versions (T and V) makes it likely that the *Vorlage* of LXX contained some other construction, one referring to a past revelation to the house of Eli (1 Sam 2:27-36). The most obvious construction is a *waw* consecutive with an imperfect verb, the most common verbal form in Hebrew narrative. Although the graphic similarity of the two forms is not great, no other solution seems more likely.<sup>83</sup>

Variant 32 has a plural in LXX where MT has a singular (cf. also T, but see above, p. 139), so retroversion is straightforward. Variants 94 and 95 may be considered together, since they are substitutional variants of one another. Though the origins of these two readings may be related, it is impossible at this point to determine with confidence what that relationship is, since there is little if any graphic or aural similarity. Despite the difficulties surrounding the question of the origin of the readings, their retroversion is a simple matter. The omission in variant 94 requires no comment, and the retroversion of υἱου σου is obvious.

The final variant in verse 13 involves the reading θεον for ל הים in variant 33. The Masoretic notes indicate that ל הים is a scribal correction, an attempt to avoid the combination מקללים אלהים. The retroversion is supported by both the *tiqqun sopherim* and the graphic similarity of ל הים and אלהים.

<sup>83</sup> Some graphic similarity between ה and ש does exist in certain forms of the Egyptian cursive script, and this similarity may have contributed to the confusion; cf. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, Table of Alphabets following p. xvi, col. 13.

(3:14) **וְלֹא כֵן** נשבעתי לבית עלי אם יתכפר עון בית עלי בזבח ובמנחה עד  
עולם

LXX variant 34 (**וְלֹא כֵן** < καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως, see above, p. 89), is the only significant variant in verse 14, and it involves a difference in word division and the presence or absence of a *mater lectionis*. οὕτως is the most common rendering of **כֵן** in LXX, and the graphic similarity of **לכֵן** and **לֹא כֵן** makes the retroversion certain.

(3:15) **וַיִּשְׁכַּב שְׂמוּאֵל עַד הַבֹּקֶר וַיִּשְׁכַּם בַּבֹּקֶר** ויפתח את דלתות בית יהוה  
ושמואל ירא מהגיד את המראה אל עלי

The only LXX variant in 3:15 is variant 96 (**וַיִּשְׁכַּם בַּבֹּקֶר** < καὶ ὠρθρίσεν το πρωί, see above, p. 103). ὠρθρίζω is the regular rendering of **שָׁכַם** in LXX, and **בַּבֹּקֶר** is the most common (and in 1 Kingdoms the exclusive) rendering of the independent το πρωί. The latter reading is supported by the probability that the shorter text is the result of parablepsis from **הַבֹּקֶר** to **בַּבֹּקֶר**. The reading **וַיִּשְׁכַּם** is also graphically similar to **וַיִּשְׁכַּב** earlier in the verse, and this similarity may also have contributed to the parablepsis.

(3:16) «**» וַיֹּאמֶר עָלֵי אֵל שְׂמוּאֵל שְׂמוּאֵל בְּנֵי וַיֹּאמֶר הַנְּנִי**

This verse contains three sets of variants: LXX variants 40 (**אֵל** < πρὸς, see above, p. 88), 67 (position of **וַיֹּאמֶר** < position of καὶ εἶπεν, see above, pp. 99-100), and 98 («**»** < omission of **וַיִּקְרָא**, see above, pp. 103-4). The first variant may be disposed of quickly. Whereas **אֵת** is never rendered by any Greek equivalent in 1 Samuel 3 (the present case excluded), πρὸς is one of the two standard renderings of **אֵל** (the other being no Greek equivalent except case endings). Furthermore, the verb **וַיִּקְרָא** is frequently followed by **אֵל** before the object. Thus, it is probable that πρὸς here represents **אֵל** rather than **אֵת**.

The other two sets of variants need to be considered together. MT reads **וַיִּקְרָא** **וַיֹּאמֶר הַנְּנִי** **עָלֵי אֵת שְׂמוּאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר שְׂמוּאֵל בְּנֵי וַיֹּאמֶר הַנְּנִי**, whereas LXX reads καὶ εἶπεν Ἠλεὶ πρὸς Σαμουηλ Σαμουηλ τεκνον· καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδου ἐγώ. Apparently some sort of disturbance has occurred in the text, since **וַיִּקְרָא** (which is regularly rendered by καὶ ἐκάλεσεν) is not represented, and καὶ εἶπεν (normally equivalent to **וַיֹּאמֶר**) comes at the beginning of the verse, the place occupied in MT by **וַיִּקְרָא**. Since καὶ εἶπεν is the normal rendering of **וַיֹּאמֶר**, occurring later in the same verse, and since εἶπον rarely renders **וַיִּקְרָא** elsewhere (only in Gen 45:1; 1 Kgs 13:21; Zech 7:13; Isa 32:5; 44:5 [ms A]), out of almost 4000 occurrences of εἶπον, it is almost certain that **וַיֹּאמֶר** was present in the *Vorlage* of LXX. Thus, even though the precise mechanism by which the two diverse readings emerged from an earlier text are unclear, the retroversion given above is sound.

(3:17) ויאמר מה הדבר אשר דבר אליך אל נא תכחד ממני כה יעשה לך אלהים  
וכה יוסיף אם תכחד ממני דבר מכל הדבר אשר דבר « באזנך

Verse 17 contains two variants, LXX variant 100 («» < omission of **אל** יך, see above, p. 103) and variant 101 (**באזנך** < εἰ τοῖς ὠσὶν σου, see above, p. 103). Since these variants are substitutional variants of one another, they may be considered together. It is likely that the rather cumbersome Greek phrase εἰ τοῖς ὠσὶν σου is related to the **אל** יך of MT, so the retroversion is plausible from that perspective. Once this relationship is observed, retroversion is straightforward.

(3:18) ויגד « שמואל את כל הדברים ולא כחד ממנו ויאמר **על** י יהוה הוא  
הטוב בעיניו יעשה

The two variants in the present verse are LXX variants 102 («» < omission of **ל**ו, see above, pp. 100-101) and 103 (**על** י < Ηλεῖ, see above, pp. 100-101). Since these two variants are of the sort that are certain retroversions (i.e., an omission and a proper noun), no more need be said.

(3:19) ויגדל שמואל ויהי יהוה עמו ולא הפיל מכל דבריו ארצה

The variant in verse 19, LXX variant 68 (**ויהי יהוה**) < [καὶ] ἦν κυριος, see above, p. 100) involves a difference in word order, for MT reads **ויהוה היה**. It is easy to see the graphic similarity between the readings found in MT and in the retroversion, and the confusion would have been heightened if the *Vorlage* of LXX used an abbreviation for **יהוה** such as **י** or **י**. The switch from perfect in MT to imperfect in the retroversion is the result of the *waw* consecutive.

(3:21) ויסף יהוה להראה בשלה כי נגלה יהוה אל שמואל « ויאמן  
שמואל נביא להיות ליהוה לכל ישראל מקצה הארץ ועד קצה ועלי זקן מאד ובניו הלוח הלכו ורע דרכם  
לפני יהוה

Verse 21 has only two variants, but both involve multiple words: LXX variant 104 («» < omission of **יהוה** בדבר יהוה בשלו, see above, p. 105) and variant 105 (**ויאמן שמואל נביא להיות ליהוה לכל ישראל מקצה הארץ ועד קצה ועלי**) < καὶ ἐπιστευθη 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 ενωπιον κυριου, see above, p. 105). The first of these variants may be dealt with summarily, since it involves the omission of several words, all of which are “content words.”

Variant 105, on the other hand, involves the retroversion of many words, but



approximately the first half of the addition seems to be a variation of verse 20, so the wording there can help in the retroversion process. Verse 20 reads **וידע כל ישראל מִדָּן וְעַד בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע כִּי נֶאֱמַן שְׁמוּאֵל לְנִבְיָא לַיהוָה**. Starting with this sentence as a base, the following differences may be noted. First, the structure of the sentence is changed, so that the subject (**כל ישראל**) and its adverbial modifier (**... ועד ...**) in verse 20 are now the object of the preposition  $\lambda < \epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , while the subordinate noun clause beginning with **כִּי** in verse 20 becomes the main clause (after **כִּי** and **וידע** are dropped). The change in order and in conjunctions shifts the participle **נֶאֱמַן** of verse 20 to an imperfect with a *waw* consecutive in the reconstruction. The absence of the preposition  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  before  $\pi\rho\phi\eta\tau\eta\varsigma$  in verse 21 suggests that **נְבִיא** should not be preceded by  $\lambda$ , as in verse 20. The presence of  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ , which is as superfluous in Greek as is its equivalent in Hebrew, suggests that the infinitive **לְהִיּוֹת** was in the *Vorlage* (cf. the similar constructions with **לְהִיּוֹת** in 2 Sam 7:8 and 1 Kgs 1:35 [where, however,  $\epsilon\iota\nu\alpha\iota$  is used in LXX]; cf also 1 Sam 24:16, **וְהָיָה יְהוָה לְדִין**, and  $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\tau\omicron\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \epsilon\iota\varsigma \kappa\rho\iota\tau\eta\sigma$ ). Finally, the adverbial phrase that appears as **מִדָּן וְעַד בְּאֵר שֶׁבַע** in verse 20 is replaced by another, approximately equivalent, phrase: **מִקְצֵה הָאָרֶץ וְעַד קִצֵּה** (cf. Deut 13:8; 28:64).

The second half of the retroversion can be divided into two phrases. The first phrase is based on  $\kappa\alpha\iota \text{ Ηλει πρεσβυτης σφοδρα}$ . The word  $\pi\rho\epsilon\sigma\beta\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$  renders **זָקֵן** in twenty-eight of its thirty-two occurrences in LXX, and  $\sigma\phi\omicron\delta\rho\alpha$  renders **מְאֹד** in at least ninety-five percent of its 350+ cases. The second phrase,  $\kappa\alpha\iota \omicron\iota \upsilon\iota\omicron\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \epsilon\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\omicron, \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\alpha \eta \omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu \epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ , begins with a Hebraism, which surely reflects a construction with the infinitive absolute followed by the perfect, carrying the idea of continuous behavior (cf. Judg 14:9; 2 Sam 5:10).<sup>84</sup> In the second part of phrase,  $\pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma$  are by far the most common translations of **רָע** and **דָּרַךְ**, respectively, and  $\epsilon\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu$  regularly renders **לְפָנַי** (though **בְּעֵינַי יְהוָה** is also possible), so the retroversion is relatively certain.<sup>85</sup>

### Peshitta

(3:1) **והנער שמואל משרת את יהוה לפני עלי ודבר יהוה יקר היה בימים  
ההם אין חזון נפרץ**

The only deviation from MT in this verse is P variant 48 (**יִקָּר הָיָה**), see above, p. 121), a variation in word order. It is probable that the variation arose in Hebrew rather than Syriac because of the graphic similarity of **יהוה** and **היה**. Since no

<sup>84</sup>Waltke and O'Connor, *Introduction*, 589-90.

<sup>85</sup>Cf. the retroversions offered in the commentaries: Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 18; Dhorme, *Livres de Samuel*, 45; Budde, *Bücher Samuel*, 29; Klostermann, *Bücher Samuelis*, 13.

change in vocabulary or grammatical form is required, the retroversion is a simple one.

(3:2) ויהי ביום ההוא ועלי שכב במקומו ועינו החלו כהות ולא יוכל לראות

Verse 2 also contains one significant variant in P, variant 56 ( $\text{-ו} < \text{-ו}$ , see above, p. 123). The translators of P were consistent in using *w* to render the Hebrew ו (cf. the nonsignificant P variant 35, above, pp. 116-17), so this retroversion can be made with certainty.

(3:3) ונר יהוה טרם יכבה ושמואל שכב בהיכל יהוה אשר שם ארון אל הים

The variant in verse 3 is P variant 8 ( $\text{וְגַל} < \text{יְהוָה}$ , see above, pp. 114-15).  $\text{וְגַל}$  in P corresponds to  $\text{אל הים}$  in MT only here in chapter 3, compared to fifteen occasions where it corresponds to  $\text{יְהוָה}$ .  $\text{אלהים}$  is used twice in the chapter to render  $\text{אל הים}$ . Data from the rest of 1 Samuel 1-16 suggests that the translators were reasonably consistent in distinguishing between  $\text{יְהוָה}$  and  $\text{אל הים}$  in their renderings, though they do show more consistency in rendering  $\text{יְהוָה}$  with  $\text{וְגַל}$ .<sup>86</sup> Nevertheless, it is likely that the translators read  $\text{יְהוָה}$  in their *Vorlage*.

(3:6) ויסף עוד יהוה קרא שמואל ויקם שמואל וילך אל עלי ויאמר הנני  
כי קראת לי ויאמר לא קראתי בני שוב שכב

One significant variant appears in 3:6, P variant 49 ( $\text{וְגַל} < \text{עוד יהוה קרא}$ )  $\text{וְגַל}$ , see above, pp. 121-22). MT here reads  $\text{יהוה קרא עוד}$ , so this variant involves a change in word order. Since the translators were meticulous in following the word order in the rest of the chapter, it is likely that the deviation from MT occurred in their *Vorlage*, which has been reconstructed above.

(3:9) ויאמר עלי לשמואל לך שכב ו«אם יקרא אליך» תאמר דבר יהוה כי  
שמע עבדך וילך שמואל וישכב במקומו

Two variants in quantitative representation occur in verse 9, P variants 79 ( $\text{«} < \text{«} < \text{«}$  omission of  $\text{-היה}$ , see above, p. 127) and 81 ( $\text{«} < \text{«}$  omission of  $\text{-ו}$ , see above, p. 127). Since both variants involve omissions from the Hebrew text of elements normally represented in translation, the retroversions of the omissions are straightforward. In the case of variant 81, however, the verb itself must also be changed, either to an imperative ( $\text{אמר}$ ) or to an imperfect ( $\text{תאמר}$ ). Table 21 (see Appendix 3, p. \*\*\*) indicates that all eight imperatives in MT are rendered by imperatives in P, but none of the others is part of a conditional sentence, as in the present case. Insufficient data exists in 1 Samuel 3 to accurately predict which form might have appeared in the *Vorlage*. However, Hebrew idiom suggests that the imperfect would have been preferred, though the *waw* is usually

<sup>86</sup>Cf. de Boer, *1 Samuel i-xvi*, 23-24.

attached as well. Perhaps the *waw* was smeared and read as a *taw* at some point in the transmission of the text, leading to the anomalous form **תאמרת**, from which a scribe dropped the final *taw*. It is possible that this variant, and possibly also variant 79, would need to be reconsidered if a larger amount of material, which included more conditional sentences, were analyzed.

(3:14) «לכן נשבעתי לבית עלי אם יתכפר עון בית עלי בזבח ובמנחה עד עולם»

Verse 13 also involves the omission of an element present in MT, P variant 94 («> < omission of **-ל**, see above, pp. 123-24). As in variant 81, the conjunction **ו** appears to have been missing in the *Vorlage* of P.

(3:15) וישכב שמואל עד הבקר ויפתח את דלת בית יהוה ושמואל ירא מהגיד את המראה אל עלי

One significant variant occurs in verse 15, P variant 27 (**ואיזא < דלת**), see above, p. 119). P has a singular noun, whereas MT is plural, and the present case is the only instance in the chapter in which P has a singular noun that corresponds to a plural noun in MT. It seems, then, that the *Vorlage* of P might have omitted a final **ת** from **דלתות** by haplography, especially if it were written defectively, **דלתת**.

(3:17) ויאמר מה הדבר אשר דבר אליך אל נא תפחד ממני כה יעשה לך אל הים וכה יוסיף אם תכחד ממני דבר מכל הדבר אשר דבר אליך

Verse 17 contains what is probably the most interesting variant in P, variant 30 (**ואכחא < תפחד**), see above, p. 116). Instead of a word meaning “to hide,” reflecting **תכחד** of MT, P has a word meaning “to fear.” Since the very same Hebrew word occurs later in the same verse and is translated by **ואכחא**, “to hide,” it is probable that the *Vorlage* of P contained something other than **תכחד**. The Hebrew word **פחד** closely resembles **כחד** and means “to fear,” so it is likely that a form of this word appeared in the *Vorlage* rather than a form of **כחד**.

(3:20) וידע כל ישראל מן ועד באר שבע כי נאמן שמואל לנביא לאל הים

This verse contains one variant, P variant 36 (**אלהים < אל הים**), see above, pp. 114-15). This variant is similar to variant 8 in 3:3, except that here **אלהים** appears parallel to **יהוה** in MT. Of sixteen occurrences of **יהוה** in chapter 3, only here does P have **אלהים** instead of the expected **יהוה**. In fact, in chapters 1-16, according to de Boer's calculations, **אלהים** stands for **יהוה** only six out of 222 times.<sup>87</sup> If P shared certain exegetical traditions with T, as some scholars have claimed, the rendering of

<sup>87</sup>Ibid.

אלהים by מַלְאָכָא (or the replacement of מַלְאָכָא by מַלְאָכָא in the transmission of P) might be expected, but not the opposite, as in the present case. It is probable, then, that the *Vorlage* of P read אלהים.

(3:21) ויסף יהוה להראה בשלה כי נגלה יהוה אל שמואל בשלו בדבריו «»

The last verse contains three variations from MT: P variant 37 (< דבר י' -), variant 123 (< yמ- < 1-), see above, p. 119), variant 124 (< < omission of יהוה', see above, pp. 127-28). These three variants are interrelated, so they may be discussed together. The plural פְּתָאִיְתָא indicates that the translators probably read a plural in their *Vorlage*, a reading which might well have arisen as a result of graphic confusion between יהוה' (or, more likely, its abbreviation, perhaps י') and the third masculine plural ending י'.<sup>88</sup> If so, this confusion also accounts for the extra pronominal suffix of variant 123 that is not reflected in MT, as well as for the omission of יהוה', variant 124.

### Targum

(3:2) ויהי ביום ההוא ועלי שכב במקמו ועינו החלו כהות ולא יוכל לראות

One variation from MT occurs in 3:2, T variant 46 (< ו- < ו-, see above, p. 142). The data indicates that the translators of T were concerned to render conjunctions as accurately as possible, and they show no tendency either to add or to delete conjunctions present in their *Vorlage*. Furthermore, this extra conjunction is supported by several Masoretic mss (including ms 187) and LXX, and its presence is consistent with common Hebrew idiom. It is therefore probable that the conjunction was present in the *Vorlage*, as given above.

(3:11) ויאמר יהוה אל שמואל הנה אנכי עשה דבר בישראל «» כל שמעו  
תצל ינה שתי אזניו

This verse also contains a single deviation from MT, T variant 56 (< < omission of אשר, see above, pp. 142-43). This omission is supported by LXX (see above on LXX variant 93), and its retroversion is obvious.

שפט אני את ביתו עד עולם בעון אשר ידע כי מקלל יך להם בניו ולא כהה במ  
ואגד לו כי (3:13)

Verse 13 contains T variant 24 (< [ו]אגד < [ו]חייתי, see above, p. 138), in which T has a perfect where MT has a perfect with a *waw* consecutive. One would expect T to

<sup>88</sup>The longer ending is preserved here in the retroversion since the graphic similarity is greater than with the shorter ending ו-.

render this form, had it appeared in his *Vorlage*, with an imperfect, as in the rest of the chapter and generally throughout the book. The imperfect of the retroversion is supported by both LXX and V.

(3:16) ויקרא עלי אל שמואל ויאמר שמואל בני ויאמר הנני

The final significant variant in T is variant 30 (ל- < אל), see above, p. 137). Although ל can be used in Aramaic to indicate the direct object of a verb, the translators of T do not seem to have taken advantage of this equivalent when אה appeared in their *Vorlage*, preferring instead the particle ׀. In fact, in every other occurrence of קרא אה in the former prophets, T uses ׀ to render אה. It is probable, then, that the *Vorlage* of T contained the preposition אל (cf. LXX, Masoretic mss 89, 174).

### Vulgate

שפט אני את ביתו עד עולם בעון אשר ידע כי מקל ליד להם בניו ולא כהה במ  
ואגד לו כי (3:13)

After all the nonsignificant variants are eliminated from consideration, only one significant variant remains in V, variant 28 (אגד[ו] < praedixi, see above, p. 155). In contrast to the anticipatory tone of God's statement in MT, V emphasizes that the warning has already been given (probably a reference to 2:27-36) by using both the perfect tense and the prefix *prae-*. Though Jerome exhibits freedom in several aspects of translation technique, he shows quite a bit of consistency in rendering Hebrew inflection with Latin tense and voice.<sup>89</sup> It is likely, then, that Jerome's *Vorlage* contained an imperfect with a *waw* consecutive.

### The Lucianic Recension

The retroverted Hebrew texts of the Lucianic recension and of the other partial secondary witnesses should be viewed somewhat differently than those of the previous witnesses. Whereas LXX, P, T, and V were translated directly from Hebrew, the partial secondary witnesses are revisions of a secondary witness in the direction of one or more Hebrew mss, often, but not always, sharing readings with MT. The extent of the revision varies from witness to witness, but this issue is of little consequence in the present discussion. The Hebrew texts given below are attempts to retrovert not the *Vorlage* of the secondary witness, of which the partial secondary witness is a revision, but rather the readings of the Hebrew ms or mss which were used to correct the secondary witness. Thus, only those variants that differ both from MT and the secondary witness on which the partial secondary witness is based are retroverted. Since most of the revisions of

<sup>89</sup>See below, table 55, pp. \*\*\*-\*\*\*.

secondary witnesses toward another Hebrew text draw the secondary witnesses closer to MT, the retroversions of the significant variants in the partial secondary witnesses are embedded in a text that mirrors MT as closely as possible; in the case of the major addition in verse 21, the retroverted text of that part of LXX is used. However, it should be clear that, although the resulting retroversion is probably close to the text found in the mss used to revise the base text, that part of the text copied from MT merely provides a context for the retroverted variant. It is impossible to know for certain that other deviations from MT did not appear in the mss used to revise the secondary witnesses.

No extensive discussion of the variants in the partial secondary witnesses has been given above, so references to previous mentions of the variants are omitted when describing each of them.

(3:6) ויסף יהוה עוד קרא שמואל ויקם שמואל וילך אל עלי ויאמר הנני כי קראת לי ויאמר לא קראתי בני שוב שכב

One significant variant occurs in verse 6, LXX<sup>L</sup> variant 8 (ετι < עוד קרא). This variant involves the placement of the adverb עוד, as does P variant 49 (cf. LXX variant 79). Since no more than a change in word order is involved in the variation from MT, retroversion is a simple matter.

(3:7) ושמואל טרם ידע את יהוה וטרם יגלה דבר יהוה אלו

Verse 7 contains LXX<sup>L</sup> variant 12 (δבר יהוה אלו < ορημα κυριου προς αυτον). Like the previous significant variant, this one revolves around a difference in the placement of a word (i.e., word order). MT reads אלו דבר יהוה, and LXX reflects the same word order with ορημα κυριου. It seems likely that the revisers of LXX changed the word order in their base text to reflect that found in a Hebrew ms used to correct the text.

(3:12) ביום ההוא אקים אל עלי את כל אשר דברתי ועל ביתו החל וכלה

Verse 12 contains one deviation from MT, LXX<sup>L</sup> variant 20 (και επι < ועל). The additional conjunction in LXX<sup>L</sup> restructures the sentence, making the last four words an independent clause. As noted above, interchange of אל and על is fairly common in Hebrew mss of Samuel, so it would not be surprising for the Hebrew exemplar used by the revisers to read על. Furthermore, επι is a common rendering of על, while it rarely if ever renders אל.<sup>90</sup>

<sup>90</sup>For a similar construction (with על), cf. 1 Kgs 2:27.

(3:15) וישכב שמואל עד הבקר ויפתח את דלתות בית יהוה ו«ירא מהגיד את המראה אל עלי שמואל

One Lucianic variant occurs in this verse, namely, variant 30 (transposition of שמואל from after ו- to the end of the verse). This variant is represented in the retroversion by the marks «» where the word appears in MT and by the larger שמואל at the end of the verse. The retroversion of a transposition requires little comment, except perhaps the reminder that all the translators examined in this study show a propensity to follow the word order of their *Vorlagen* whenever the grammar of the target language permits. It should also be noted that the transposition changes the conjunction to a *waw* consecutive, and the verb that follows becomes an imperfect rather than a perfect. However, since the verbal root begins with י, the consonants of the two forms are identical (if the imperfect is spelled defectively).

(3:19) ויגדל שמואל ויהוה היה עמו «לא הפיל מכל דבריו ארצה

In verse 19, LXX<sup>L</sup> has one significant variant, variant 40 («» < omission of ו-). As an omission, the retroversion of this variant requires no comment.

(3:21) ויסף יהוה להראה בשלה כי נגלה יהוה אל שמואל ויאמן «ל היות ל נביא «יהוה אל כל ישראל מקצה הארץ ועד קצה ועלי זקן מאד ובניו הלוך הלכו ורע דרכם לפני יהוה

Verse 21 contains three variants from the base text (LXX in the long addition): LXX<sup>L</sup> variant 46 («» < omission of Σαμουηλ), variant 47 (του < ל היות ל נביא), and variant 48 («» [omission of -ל] < του κυριου for τω κυρω). The retroversion of the omission in variant 46 needs no explanation. Variant 47 involves both the reversal of the two words present in the retroversion of LXX (נביא ל היות) and the addition of the preposition ל before נביא. As noted above, εις often represents the preposition ל, especially in the context of the second accusative of a double accusative or similar construction. Finally, in variant 48, LXX<sup>L</sup> differs from LXX in interpreting the final יהוה as a genitive rather than a dative, suggesting that the preposition was not present in the Hebrew exemplar used to correct the text.

### The Hexaplaric Recension

(3:3) ונר אל הים מרם יכבה ושמואל שכב בבית יהוה אשר שם ארון אל הים

Verse 3 contains one significant variant in LXX<sup>O</sup>, variant 1 (οικω < בית). Here LXX νωω reflects MT היכל (though LXX has nothing that corresponds to יהוה), so בית seems to be a correction in the direction of a different Hebrew reading. Such a reading is present in one Masoretic ms (cf. also 1:9), so the retroversion is justified.

(3:8) ויסף יהוה קרא עוד שמואל בשלשית ויקם וילך אל עלי ויאמר הנני  
כי קראת לי ויבן עלי כי יהוה קרא לנער

This verse contains one hexaplaric variant, LXX<sup>O</sup> variant 2 (עוד < ετι). Other variants involving the presence, absence, or placement of עוד have been noted in other witnesses. Since the retroverted text is identical to that at the beginning of verse 6, the accuracy of the retroversion is secure.

(3:10) ויבא יהוה וייתצב ויקרא בפעם בפעם שמואל שמואל ויאמר שמואל  
דבר יהוה כי שמע עבדך

One variant also appears in verse 10, LXX<sup>O</sup> variant 3 (יהוה < κυριε). Retroversion of κυριε is straightforward, since it reflects the proper name יהוה in Hebrew. Furthermore, דבר יהוה is also found in 3:9.

(3:15) וישכב שמואל עד הבקר ויפתח את דלתות בית אל הים ו«ירא מהגיד  
את המראה אל עלי

Two hexaplaric variants occur in 3:15: LXX<sup>O</sup> variants 8 (אל הים < θεου) and 9 («» < omission of שמואל). That LXX<sup>O</sup> alters κυριου in LXX to θεου suggests that a Hebrew reading אל הים instead of יהוה precipitated the change. As is the case with LXX<sup>L</sup> variant 30, the omission of שמואל from its position in MT changes the following verb to an imperfect with a *waw* consecutive, but it does not alter the consonantal text of the verb.

(3:21) ויסף יהוה להראה בשלה כי נגלה יהוה אל שמואל ויאמן שמואל נביא  
«יהוה אל כל ישראל מקצה הארץ» עד קצה ועלי זקן מאד ובניו הלוך הלכו  
ורע דרכם לפני יהוה

The last verse has two significant variants from the base text (the long addition of LXX): LXX<sup>O</sup> variant 10 («» [omission of -ל] < του κυριου for τω κυρω) and variant 11 («» < omission of και). The retroversion of the omission of και in variant 11 requires no comment, but variant 10 is more complex. The substitution of the genitive in LXX<sup>O</sup> for the dative of LXX implies that the preposition ל was not present in the Hebrew exemplar used to correct the text, as in LXX<sup>L</sup> variant 48. However, whereas LXX<sup>L</sup> reads και επιστευθη του γενεσθαι εις προφητην κυριου, LXX<sup>O</sup> reads και επιστευθη Σαμουηλ προφητης γενεσθαι του κυριου, with γενεσθαι intervening between προφητης and του κυριου. Though such a construction is perfectly good Greek, a literal retroversion into Hebrew is not possible, for ויאמן שמואל נביא להיות יהוה, as the word order in LXX<sup>O</sup> suggests, separates the *nomen regens* (נביא) from the *nomen rectum* (יהוה) with the infinitive להיות. Two options present themselves: either להיות preceded the phrase יהוה להיות, or else it was omitted entirely. The solution to this conundrum is evident when one recalls that, although LXX<sup>O</sup> often corrects the Greek text



of LXX by adding words, changing forms, and changing word order that does not match the Hebrew exemplar, it does not as consistently omit words. Origen preferred rather to mark words not found in his Hebrew mss with an obelus and a metobelus, signs which were frequently omitted when the fifth column of his Hexapla was copied. It is probable, then, that the reading of LXX<sup>O</sup> reflects a Hebrew text in which the infinitive was absent and in which **יהוה נבִיא** formed a construct chain, as presented above.

#### Other Possible Hebrew Readings

Other possible Hebrew readings (abbreviated OPH below) are readings present in individual secondary witnesses that might reflect an attempt to revise the witness toward a particular Hebrew ms. Only those readings which differ from both the versional base text and from MT are considered. In 1 Samuel 3, one other possible Hebrew reading was discovered in some of the mss of each of the following witnesses: LXX, P, and T. The secondary version whose ms contains each reading is listed before the retroversion.

(3:2) ויהי ביום ההוא ועלי שכב במקמו ועינו החלו כהות לא יוכלו לראות  
(LXX)

One significant variant occurs in some mss of LXX in verse 2, OPH variant 1 (יכולו < ηδυσαντο). This reading has a plural rather than a singular verb, shifting the subject from Eli to his eyes. Well attested in Greek mss, this reading also occurs in mss of V and MT, including Masoretic ms 187, whose reading of the verb is identical with the retroversion given above.

(3:5) וירץ אל עלי ויאמר הנני כי קראת לי ויאמר לא קראתי בני שוב שכב  
(P) וילך וישכב

Verse 5 contains one significant variant found in various mss of P, OPH variant 2 (בני < ב). It is possible that this reading reflects that of various Hebrew mss in existence at least as early as the fifth or sixth century C.E. The same reading seems to be reflected also in two Masoretic mss (including the margin of ms 70) and in two *it* mss. Since the retroversion matches the rendering in the Masoretic mss, it can be assumed to be accurate.

(3:9) ויאמר עלי לשמואל לך שכב והיה כִּי יקרא אליך ואמרת דבר יהוה כי  
(T) שמע עבדך וילך שמואל וישכב במקומו

Verse 9 has one significant variant, OPH variant 3 (אִרְי < כִּי). Whereas the majority of T mss read אִרְי in agreement with MT, at least one reads אִרְי, perhaps reflecting the Hebrew כִּי. The latter reading is found in two Masoretic mss listed by

Kennicott, so the retroversion is valid.<sup>91</sup>

### Conclusions

It is important to note that no claim has been made that the retroversions given above represent the precise *Vorlagen* used for the various translations. Three factors preclude such a claim. First, no attempt was made to reconstruct the *Vorlagen* away from the places where significant variants were found. Other differences in orthography and content undoubtedly existed; however, no reliable means of determining what they were and where they occurred has yet been devised. Second, the retroverted Hebrew texts produced in this study are not an end in themselves. Rather, they are tools that will be used in the following chapter to attempt to determine the oldest form of the Hebrew text of 1 Samuel 3 that can be determined text-critically. Thus, some variants that have been deemed significant are probably the result of choices and errors at the point of translation or during the transmission of the versional witness.<sup>92</sup> However, since many or most of these misevaluations lead to clearly secondary readings, they will be eliminated at the stage of evaluation in the next chapter and so will not affect the final outcome. It seems better to include too much than to omit what might be a reflection of an early reading. Third, the retroversions given for the partial secondary witnesses obviously cannot claim to reflect any single Hebrew ms formerly extant, since Hebrew mss were only consulted or used for corrections sporadically. Thus, the Hebrew text surrounding the retroverted significant variants in the partial secondary witnesses merely provides a context for the readings to be examined in the following chapter.

Before proceeding to the evaluation stage, it is important to remember Tov's dictum that the accuracy of a retroversion says nothing about the originality of the reading in question.<sup>93</sup> If a retroversion is accurate, that the reading occurred in at least one Hebrew ms is all that is claimed. The evaluation of the Hebrew readings, both original and retroverted, is reserved for Chapter 7.

---

<sup>91</sup>Cf. the Masoretic list ח בתיב ולא קרי (list 2752 in Weil), which gives four instances in which כ"ס is written, but כ"ס is not to be pronounced. These may be other instances of the substitution of כ" and כ"ס; Gérard E. Weil, ed., *Massorah Gedolah iuxta Codicem Leningradensem B 19 a*, vol. 1: *Catalogi* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1971), 307.

<sup>92</sup>See again the definition of "significant variant", above, p. 6: "those variants which have some probability of representing a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the base text, MT." How much probability "some probability" is is not defined. However, even variants with a fifty percent probability of reflecting a deviation in the *Vorlage* also have a fifty percent chance of having originated with the translators or transmitters of the version.

<sup>93</sup>See above, p. 205, n. 19.