Durham E-Theses

A Reading of the David and Goliath Narrative in Greek and Hebrew

JOHNSON, BEN,JM

How to cite:

Use policy

A READING OF THE DAVID AND GOLIATH NARRATIVE IN GREEK AND HEBREW

BY
BENJAMIN J.M. JOHNSON

Thesis submitted in Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

University of Durham
Department of Theology and Religion

2012

ABSTRACT

The story of David and Goliath existed in antiquity in two distinct literary versions, a short version found in LXX^B and a longer version reflected in the MT. This thesis proposes that each version is worthy of study in its own right and offers a close literary reading of the narrative of David and Goliath in the Greek text of 1 Reigns 16-18. In this study we explore a method of reading the Septuagint that recognizes it is both a document in its own right and a translation of a Hebrew original. In offering this reading of the septuagintal version of the David and Goliath narrative we will highlight the literary difference between the two final versions of the story that exist in LXX^B and MT.

Declaration

I confirm that no part of the material offered had previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or any other university. Material from the work of others has been acknowledged and quotations and paraphrases suitably indicated.

The copyright of this thesis rests solely with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

_____

Benjamin J.M. Johnson

_____

Date

To Sarah and Samuel.
You both are the support and motivation for my work in innumerable ways.
I am so blessed by you.

Εὐλογημένοι ὑμεῖς τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι ἐπονέσατε περὶ ἐμοῦ
(1 Reigns 23:21)

Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ μου ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν
πάντοτε ἐν πάσῃ δεήσει μου ὑπὲρ πάντων ὑμῶν, μετὰ χαρᾶς τὴν δέησιν ποιούμενος
(Philippians 1:3-4)

To my two grandfathers.
To Jay Beaumont, who told me to learn Greek to better study the Bible, and to Marvin Johnson, who will never see me complete my studies this side of the Kingdom. You both are and have been an inspiration and model to me. I am challenged to carry on your legacy.

זְכֹר יְמוֹת עוֹלָם בִּינוּ שְׁנוֹת דֹּר־וָדֹר שְׁאַל אָבִיךָ וְיַגֵּדְךָ זְקֵנֶיךָ וְיֹאמְרוּ לָךְ׃
(Deuteronomy 32:7)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Writing a Ph.D. thesis can seem like a solitary job. However, the idea that one can sit alone in a room read a lot of books and write a successful thesis is a misconception. It takes the support of many people to research and write a Ph.D. thesis and the present work is no exception.

I must first thank my family, especially my parents, both the Johnsons and the Skagens. Without their tireless emotional, spiritual, and financial support this project would never have been possible.

As for those who have had direct impact on the research and writing of this thesis, pride of place goes to my supervisor, Professor Walter Moberly. His support as a supervisor goes above and beyond the call of duty: from our formal supervisory sessions, to our informal seminars, to dinners at his house (for which we must also thank Jenny!). I have greatly benefited from studying under Professor Moberly and this thesis has benefited from his careful eye and critical comments. It is a testament to his ability as an Old Testament scholar that he, as a specialist in theological interpretation, was willing and able to supervise a thesis on the Septuagint. He is a model of scholar and a person.

I would like also to thank Dr. Stuart Weeks and Dr. Richard Briggs, who read various portions of my research and offered helpful feedback. Significant thanks are also due to my examiners, Professor Robert Hayward and Dr. James Aitken. In every instance their comments were fair and helped improve my work.

Moving to another country to pursue doctoral work would not have been possible for us if it were not for our significant community in Durham. First and foremost I must thank Aaron, Lucy, and Eleanor Sherwood, who I will always consider our Durham family. There

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AB	The Anchor Bible
ABD	Freedman, David Noel, ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 Vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1992.
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
AJPA	*American Journal of Physical Anthropology*
ANES	*Ancient Near Eastern Sutdies*
ANET	Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Third Edition with Supplement. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1969.
AuOr	*Aula Orientalis*
BA	*Biblical Archaeologist*
BASOR	*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*
BDAG	Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt, and F.W. Gingrich. *A Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature.* Third Edition. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BdA	Lestienne, Michael and Bernard Grillet. *Premier Livre Des Règnes: Traduction du texte grec de la Septante*. La Bible d'Alexandrie. Vol. 9. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997.
BDB	F. Brown, S.R. Driver, and C.A. Briggs. *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1907.
BDF	Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
BeO	*Bibbia e oriente*
BGLT	Barthélemy, Dominique, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism.* Orbis Biblicus Et Orientalis 73. Göttingen/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen, 1986.
BHS	K. Elliger, and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997
Bib	*Biblica*
BIOSCS	*Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CATSS	Tov, Emanuel and Frank H. Polak. *The Revised Computer Assisted Tool for Septuagint Studies Hebrew Greek Parallel Text.*
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*

COS	Hallo, William W. and K. Lawson Younger, Jr. *The Context of Scripture*. 3 Volumes. Brill: Leiden, 1997-2003.
CR:BS	*Currents in Research: Biblical Studies*
DJD 17	Frank Moore Cross, Donald W. Parry, Eugene C. Ulrich, and Richard J. Saley, eds. *Qumran Cave 4: Xii: 1-2 Samuel*. Vol. 17, Discoveries in the Judeaen Desert. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
EdF	Erträge der Forschung
EstBib	*Estudios bîblicos*
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses*
EvQ	*Evangelical Quarterly*
FOTL	Forms of Old Testament Literature
GELS	Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters, 2009.
GKC	E. Kautsch, ed. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar.* Trans. E. Cowley, 2nd English edition. Oxford: CLarenden Press, 1910.
HALOT	Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner, et. al. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. 5 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000.
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	Buttrick, George Arthur, et. al. eds. *International Dictionary of the Bible: An Illustrated Encyclopedia*. 4 Vols. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
Jastrow	Jastrow, M. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. 2nd ed. 2 Vols. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1903.
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBQ	*Jewish Bible Quarterly*
JETS	*Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JHebS	*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
Joüon–Muraoka	Joüon, Paul and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Subsidia Biblica Vol. 14. 2 Vols. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005.
JSOT	*Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KTU	Dietrich, M.; J. Loretz, and J. Sanmartin, *Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit*. AOAT 24. Neikrichen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1976.
LASBF	*Liber annus Studii biblici franciscani*
LCL	*The Loeb Classical Library*
LEH	Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek - English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Second Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.

LSJ	Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented by Sir Henry Stuart Jones; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940.
LXX	Septuagint
LXX[B]	Codex Vaticanus as reproduced by Brooke, Alan E., Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thakeray. *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus, Supplemented From Other Uncial Manuscripts, With a Critical Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Chief Ancient Authorities for the Text of the Septuagint*. Vol. II.I. Cambridge, England: Cambridge at the University Press, 1927.
LXX[L]	Lucianic Recencion/Antiochene Text Type as reproduced by Taylor, Bernard A. *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns*. *Volume 1: Majority Text*. Vol. 50. Harvard Semitic Monographs, Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.
LXX[A]	Codex Alexandrinus
LXX.D	Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, eds. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009.
Louw–Nida	Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. Second Edition. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
MM	Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1963.
MT	Masoretic Text as reproduced by BHS
NETS	Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation Of The Septuagint*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament
OBO	Orbis biblicus et Orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTS	*Old Testament Studies*
OTS	Old Testament Series
PEQ	*Palestine Exploration Quarterly*
Rahlfs-Hanhart	Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. Editio altera, Robert Hanhart. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006.
SIL	Summer Institute of Linguistics
SBJT	*Southern Baptist Journal of Theology*
SJOT	*Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*
TA	*Tel Aviv*
TDOT	Botterweck, G. Johannes, Helmer Ringgren and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. 15 Vols. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, England: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1990-2006.
TLG	*Thesaurus Lingua Graecae: A digital library of Greek literature.* Irvine, CA: University of California, Irvine, 2001.
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
UBW	Understanding the Bible and its World
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*

Waltke–O'Connor   Waltke, Bruce K. and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax.* Winnona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

WBC   Word Biblical Commentary

WHS   Williams, Ronald J. Revised and Expanded by John C. Beckman. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax.* Third ed. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

WTJ   *Westminster Theological Journal*

WUNT   Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1. Introducing the Problem: Six Observations

The story of David and Goliath in 1 Samuel 17 is perhaps one of the most iconic stories in all

the Bible. It has probably been portrayed and retold more than any other story, from the

trilogy of paintings by Caravaggio to the popular kids' video series, VeggieTales, which

depicts David as a small asparagus and Goliath as a giant pickle. It is such a part of Western

cultural vocabulary that a mismatched sporting event is frequently referred to as a "David and

Goliath" contest. Despite its well known status and its often reused themes, the story of

David and Goliath and its surrounding context in 1 Samuel 16-18 is beset by many problems

which pose a serious challenge to interpreters. To put it succinctly: we do not have one

version of the story of David and Goliath but two, a short version found in LXX[B] and a

longer version reflected in the MT.

By way of introducing the problem that the existence of two versions of a biblical

story raises, we will offer six preliminary observations and then very briefly survey some of

the reigning scholarly opinions about the textual status of the David and Goliath narrative.

1.1. Two versions of 1 Sam 16-18

The first basic observation is that there are two versions of the story, one contained in MT and one in LXX[B]. The version in the MT is best reflected by the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (*BHS*) which represents the text of the Leningrad Codex B19A. The MT represents the longer version of the story. The short version of the story is contained in LXX[B], which is best represented by the Brooke-Mclean edition of the Septuagint,[1] which represents Codex Vaticanus. A few other Greek manuscripts witness this shorter version of the story.[2]

Other manuscript traditions generally follow the long version of the story found in MT.[3] As far as the Greek manuscripts are concerned, it is universally recognized that LXX[B] reflects the OG in ch. 17-18, while LXX[A] and the manuscripts which follow it are later additions corrected toward the MT.

Finally, the fragmentary witness of 4QSam[a] appears also to contain the longer version of the story as found in MT.[4] The early witness of 4QSam[a] (*c.* 50-25 BCE[5]) means that the two versions of this story existed very early on as competing traditions.

The textual complexity of the story is complicated by the fact that the books of Samuel have one of the most textually complex histories in the Bible.[6] For the purposes of

---

[1] Properly speaking the term Septuagint, should refer only to the original translation of the Torah probably sometime in the 3rd century BCE. We will follow the standard practice of using the term Septuagint to refer to the entirety of the Greek Jewish Scriptures that came to be collected together. On the term Septuagint see the helpful survey of Albert C. Sundberg, Jr., "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism," in *The Canon Debate* (ed. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub., 2002), 68-72. In terms of text-families, in this study we will use the term Septuagint and LXX fairly broadly. Whenever a particular text family (e.g., Antiochene) or textual manuscript (e.g., LXX[B]) is specifically in view it will be explicitly stated, otherwise reference will be made to the Septuagint or LXX to mean the Greek version of the Old Testament generally.

[2] Stephen Pisano, *Additions Or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57 (Freiburg, Schweiz / Göttingen: Universitätsverlag / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 78, lists Nanvyb₂ in addition to LXX[B].

[3] E.g., LXX[A], OL[V], Tg, Syr, Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and Vg (Ibid., 78).

[4] See Benjamin J.M. Johnson, "Reconsidering 4QSam[a] and the Textual Support for the Long and Short Versions of the David and Goliath Story," *VT* 62/4 (2012): 534-49.

[5] *DJD* 17, 5.

[6] For an excellent survey see Philippe Hugo, "Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of Recent Research," in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (ed., Philippe Hugo and Adrien Schenker; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1-19. The rest of the collected volume contains

this study, however, it is enough to focus on the two main traditions found in MT and LXX[B].

An outline of the two versions is depicted in Table 1 below.[7]

Table 1: Outline of the Two Versions of the David and Goliath Story

LXX[B]	MT
1 Reigns 16	**1 Samuel 16**
The Lord Sees David (16:1-13)	The Lord Sees David (16:1-13)
Saul Sees David (16:14-23)	Saul Sees David (16:14-23)
1 Reigns 17	**1 Samuel 17**
Setting the Scene (17:1-40)	Setting the Scene (17:1-40)
Geography (17:1-3)	Geography (17:1-3)
Enter the Giant (17:4-10)	Enter the Giant (17:4-10)
Reaction (17:11, 32)	Reaction (17:11, 32)
--	*Shepherd Boy's Challenge (17:12-31)*
Debating David's Daring (17:33-37)	Debating David's Daring (17:33-37)
What David Will Do (17:36)	--
Arming and Disarming (17:38-40)	Arming and Disarming (17:38-40)
Single Combat (17:42-51a)	Single Combat (17:42-51a)
--	*Drawing Near to David (17:41)*
Battle of Words (17:42-47	Battle of Words (17:42-47
David's Taunt (17:43b)	--
Battle of Arms (17:51a)	Battle of Arms (17:50-51a)
--	*David Runs to Goliath (17:48b)*
--	*Goliath's Death, Take One (v. 50)*
Aftermath (17:51b-54)	Aftermath (17:51b-58)
Geography of a Victory (17:51b-54)	Geography of a Victory (17:51b-54)
--	*Whose Son is This? (17:55-58)*

many helpful and pertinent essays on this issue. For more detailed studies with the Septuagint in focus see Sebastian Brock, *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel* (Quaderni Di Henoch 9; Torino: Silvio Zamorani Ediotre, 1996); and Anneli Aejmelaeus, "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek—Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 353-66; and idem, "How to Reach the Old Greek in 1 Samuel and What to Do with It," in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010* (VTSup 148; ed. Martti Nissinen; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 185-205.

[7] Minuses depicted with --, pluses depicted in *italics*.

1 Reigns 18	1 Samuel 18
--	*David and Jonathan (18:1-6a)*
The Love of Women (18:6b-9)	The Love of Women (18:6b-9)
--	*David, Saul, Spirit, Spear (18:10-11)*
The Love of All Israel (18:12-16)	The Love of All Israel (18:12-16)
--	*David and Merab (18:17-19)*
The Love of Michal (18:20-29a)	The Love of Michal (18:20-29a)
--	*Summary and Prospect (18:29b-30)*

1.2. A "relatively literal" translator

There is a general consensus that the translator of 1 Reigns was a "relatively literal" translator.[8] This observation requires a host of caveats and addenda. First, the category of "literal" is somewhat problematic. It can mean multiple things. For example, a translator can offer a standard equivalence lexically and yet offer a free rendering grammatically. For example in 1 Rgns. 17:35, the translator renders the Hebrew והכתיו with καὶ ἐπάταξα αὐτόν. The use of πατάσσω to translate נכה is a good lexical equivalent, as both mean "strike." However, the use of a Greek aorist indicative to translate a Hebrew iterative *weqatal* form does not accurately represent the grammatical form of the Hebrew. Thus, simply categorizing a translation as "literal" based on the fact that it prefers to represent every word of its source text does not communicate very much about the translation technique.[9]

---

[8] This language is the assessment of Emanuel Tov, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in Light of the Septuagint," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden, Brill, 1999), 346. This basic assessment is supported by S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel With an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1890), lx; F.H. Woods, "The Light Shown by the Septuagint Version on the Books of Samuel," in *Studia Biblica, Essays in Biblical Archaeology and Criticism and Kindred Subjects,* I (Oxford: 1885), 21; I. Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132.1; Helsinki, 1965), 176-90; R. Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF B Dss 19; Helsinki, 1979), 280-89; and Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, revised and expanded edition (Leuven, Peeters, 2007): 124. However, Aejmelaeus uses the label "fairly faithful."

[9] See Arie van der Kooij, "The Story of David and Goliath: The Early history of Its Text," *ETL* 68 (1992): 124, for a similar critique of Tov's observations here. Cf. Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Revised and

Second, Tov's argument is that a basically faithful, word-for-word translation would not omit over forty percent of the text.[10] However, this does not necessarily follow,[11] because this faithful word-based translation, also shows signs of being in good command of the Greek language,[12] shows some tendencies toward theological exegesis,[13] and, as we will see throughout this study, some level of literary sensitivity. Thus, a faithful translator may also be working with their own literary and theological motivations which may affect the translation.[14]

1.3. Doublets and Inconsistencies

The version of the story in the MT contains many apparent doublets and inconsistencies. This observation is held by the majority of scholars.[15] The major doublets that are frequently noted

---

Expanded edition; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 59-69.

[10] Tov, "Composition," 341.

[11] This is the major critique of Robert Polzin, *Samuel and the Deuteronomist* (Part 2 of *A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History*; Indianapolis, MN: Indiana University Press, 1993): 259-60, n. 21.

[12] Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 141.

[13] E.g., H.S. Gehmen, "Exegetical Methods Employed By the Greek Translator of 1 Samuel," *JAOS* 70/4 (1950): 292-95; and William M. Schniedewind, "Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple *Tendenz* in the Greek Text of Samuel-Kings," *HTR* 87/1 (1994): 107-16. Cf. also Emanuel Tov, "Different Editions of the Song of Hannah and of Its Narrative Framework," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSupp 72; Leiden Brill, 1999), 433-55.

[14] Cf. James K. Aitken, "Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes," *BIOSCS* 38 (2005): 55-77, who notes the interesting fact that the faithful and consistent translation technique of Ecclesiastes also produced a translation that was sensitive to its own poetic and rhetorical devices.

[15] See for example, Driver, *Notes*, 116-17; Henry Preserved Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*, (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902), 150-52; Henry Barclay Swete, *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1914), 245-46; Hans Wilhelm Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary* (OTL; London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964), 146-48; Simon J. De Vries, "David's Victory over the Philistine as Saga and Legend," *JBL* 92 (1973): 36; John T. Willis, "The Function of Comprehensive Anticipatory Redactional Joints in 1 Samuel 16-18," *ZAW* 86 (1973): 294-314; P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1980), 306-09; Ralph W. Klein, *1 Samuel* (WBC; Waco, TX: Word Books, Publisher, 1983), 173-74; Pisano, *Additions or Omissions,* 78-86; Johan Lust, "David and Goliath in Hebrew and Greek," *ETL* 59 (1983): 5-25; Tov, "Differences Between MT and the LXX," 354-56; Julio Trebolle, "David and Goliath (1 Sam 17-18): Textual Variants and Literary Composition," *BIOSCS* 23 (1990): 27-30; A. Graeme Auld and Craig Y.S. Ho, "The Making of David and Goliath," *JSOT* 56 (1992): 25-38; van der Kooij, "David and Goliath," 126-31; Walter Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen von David und Goliath in 1 Sam 17," *ZAW* 108 (1996): 180-94; Antony F. Campbell, "Structure and the Art of Exegesis (1 Samuel 16:14-18:30)," in *Problems in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Rolf Knierim* (ed. Henry T.C. Sun and Keith L. Eades; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 76-103; Robert Alter, *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2000), 111; Steven L. McKenzie, *King David: A Biography* (Oxford: OUP, 2000), 70-71; and John Van Seters, *The Biblical Saga of King David* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 157-62. For a good

include 1) David's multiple introductions in 16:1-13 and 17:12ff.; 2) Goliath's double threat in 17:8-10 and v. 23; 3) David's killing Goliath twice, once in 17:50 and once in 17:51; 4) David's promotions in 18:5 and 18:13; and 5) Saul's offer of his daughters in 18:17-19 and 18:20-27. The major inconsistencies that are frequently noted include 1) Eliab's rebuke in 17:28 as showing no awareness of the anointing episode in 16:6-13; 2) the problem of David taking Goliath's head to Jerusalem and his armor to his tent in 17:54; 3) David is portrayed as a shepherd at times and a warrior at other times; and 4) Saul and Abner's failure to recognize David in 17:55-58 despite David's presence in Saul's court in 16:14-23 and 17:15 and Saul's having offered David his armor in 17:31-39. These doublets and inconsistencies in 1 Samuel 16-18 are frequently understood to be classic signs of a text that has a less-than-straightforward compositional history.

1.4. Simplicity of LXX^B

The short version of the story in LXX^B does not contain most of the apparent doublets and inconsistencies in the MT. However, this does not mean that there are no inconsistencies in the short version of the story. The problem of the inconsistent characterization of David as shepherd on the one hand and warrior on the other is also present in LXX^B. David is depicted as being a regular part of Saul's court but he still takes shepherd's equipment with him to battle Goliath (17:40). He is characterized as a "man of war" (ὁ ἀνὴρ πολεμιστὴς) in 16:21 but is unable to wear Saul's armor in 17:38-40.[16] Other problems arise in the short text that are not present in the longer version. For example, LXX^B is missing the initial interaction

---

succinct summary of the difficulties see Theodor Seidl, "David statt Saul: Göttlich Legitimation und menschliche Kompetenz des Königs als Motive der Redaktion von I Sam 16-18," *ZAW* 98/1 (1986): 40.

[16] Cf. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 174; and Alexander Rofé, "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology," in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (ed. Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine, and Ernest S. Frerichs; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1987), 119-20.

between David and Jonathan. This scene is a significant first part in the Jonathan-David relationship and the progression of their relationship makes less sense without it.[17]

What can be concluded is that the shorter LXX[B] text is in fact less repetitive, less apparently contradictory, and contains a simpler and more straightforward story-line. However, is this evidence of originality or harmonization? Many scholars find it highly suspicious that LXX[B] is lacking precisely those texts of the MT which appear to be problematic.[18] It appears that 1 Samuel 16-18 is a case where the time-honored textual-critical principles of *lectio difficilior* (MT) and *lectio brevior* (LXX[B]) conflict with each other.[19] So, while it is clear that LXX[B] does not contain many of the apparent doublets and inconsistencies of MT, what to make of this fact appears less than certain.

1.5. Reading MT as it stands

Despite the apparent problems with the MT there are many reasonable proposals for how it can be meaningfully read as it stands. Some scholars support the priority of the LXX[B] account and recognize the composite nature of the MT version but are nevertheless more interested in the way the redactor of the MT version has artfully combined his sources.[20] Other scholars appear to be aware of the possibility that the MT version of the story may be a

---

[17] See David W. Gooding, "An Approach to the Literary and Textual Problems of the David-Goliath Story: 1 Sam 16-18," in *BGLT*, 78-79.

[18] E.g., F.C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* (Hendrickson Pub. Inc., 1995 ed.; Repr. of Boston, MA: Ginn and Company, 1905), 249; De Vries, "David's Victory," 23-24; Pisano, *Additions or Omissions*, 84; Rofé, "Battle of David and Goliath," 119-22; and Baruch Halpern, *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2001), 6-7.

[19] Cf. Pisano, *Additions or Omissions*, 80; and Erik Aurelius, "Wie David ursprünglich zu Saul Kam (1 Sam 17)," in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testametns: Beiträge zur Biblischen Hermeneutik* (ed. Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 46.

[20] E.g., Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (Revised ed.; New York: Basic Books, 2011), 183-91; idem, *The David Story,* 111; Jan Fokkelman, *The Crossing Fates* (Vol. 2 of *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*; Assen Maastricht, The Netherlands/Dover, NH: Van Gorcum, 1986), 201-08; Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 19-39. Cf. also David Toshio Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2007), 434-37.

composite text but suggest that the more interesting option is a literary or synchronic reading of the actual existing text, without reference to the historical process by which it may have developed.[21] Other scholars argue that the literary coherence of the longer MT version is evidence that the short version of the story in LXX[B] is a truncated version of the story and the MT should be preferred as the more original.[22] That there are several reasonable attempts at reading the MT version of the story as a coherent narrative seems to suggest that how one views the question of priority largely resides in one's perspective on the following question: is a given biblical narrative assumed to be composite unless one can be persuaded otherwise, or is it assumed a single coherent unity unless one can be persuaded otherwise? The irony is, that persuasive arguments in either instance are very difficult to come by. However, one's intuitive answer to that question greatly influences how one approaches a problematic issue like the two versions of the David and Goliath story.

1.6. Textual and literary criticism

The problem of 1 Samuel 16-18 represents an instance where there is no clear line between textual and literary criticism. This issue is probably still best exemplified by the Joint Research Venture of Barthélemy, Gooding, Lust and Tov (*BGLT*).[23] Nearly thirty years later, this study still remains one of the best discussions on the textual problem of the David and Goliath story. In this volume both text-critical and literary-critical strategies are brought to

---

[21] Polzin, *Samuel*, 259-61, n.21; and Paul Borgman, *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story* (New York: Oxford University Press), 261, n. 6.

[22] E.g., Heda Jason, "The Story of David and Goliath: A Folk Epic?" *Bib* 60/1 (1979): 36-70, esp., 66-67; Gooding, "An Approach," 55-86; idem, "David-Goliath Project: Stage Four," in *BGLT*, 145-53; and Jan-Wim Wesselius, "A New View on the Relation Between Septuagint and Masoretic Text in the Story of David and Goliath," in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality* (vol. 2: Exegetical Studies; ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias; London: T. & T. Clark, 2009), 5-26.

[23] For summaries of the main arguments and insights of this volume see Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 19-22; van der Kooij, "David and Goliath," 119-22; and Walter Dietrich and Thomas Nauman, *Die Samuelbücher* (EdF 287; Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995), 88-90.

bear. The discussion, however, exemplifies the problem with understanding the textual

complexity of the David and Goliath story. The problem is that it is a literary-critical problem

with text-critical complications. If a short version of the David and Goliath story did not exist

the tensions in the MT version would still lead many critics to suggest that the MT is a

composite story. However, LXX[B] does contain a short version of the story, which, rather than

simplifying the issue only complicates it. The problem is as much a text-critical issue as a

literary-critical issue. Fernandez Marcos captures the difficulty that this creates:

> If these phenomena [e.g. 1 Sam 16-18], or some of them, occurred in the period of
> literary growth of the biblical book before its final edition was concluded, they have
> to be analysed by using the methods of literary criticism but not the criteria of text
> criticism. However, since they came to light from comparing different traditions of
> the biblical text, it is necessary to combine the information obtained from both types
> of criticism to reach a suitable solution to the problem. Text criticism and literary
> criticism each have their methods which must not intrude on each other's analysis.[24]

However, the David and Goliath story not only is a difficult case for the competing

methodologies of textual and literary criticism, it is also a difficult case for the competing

methodologies of redaction criticism versus final form literary criticism. Thus, what looks

like evidence of multiple sources from a redactional-critical perspective, looks like artful

repetition from a literary-critical perspective. Despite numerous attempts, the necessary

exercise of scholarly judgment has too few criteria to escape undue subjectivity in this regard.

In other words, scholars tend to see in the phenomena of this text evidence of whichever

paradigm (redaction vs. literary artistry) they prefer.[25] Thus the difficulty in understanding the

---

[24] Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*, (translated by Wilfred G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 82-83. Cf. Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (second revised ed.; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001), 318. In his exploration of the relationship between textual and literary criticism in these difficult texts Tov admits that if such cases as 1 Samuel 16-18 are a further development from the text found in the MT, then they "are beyond the scope of textual and literary criticism."

[25] Attempts to do so have been helpful in defining the different methodologies but unsuccessful in suggesting how they may be integrated. E.g., John Barton, "Historical Criticism and Literary Interpretation: Is There Any Common Ground?" in *The Old Testament: Canon, Literature and Theology: Collected Essays of*

textual history of the David and Goliath narrative is extremely complex. It is perhaps most accurate to conclude with Garsiel that "The question of the primacy of the long or short version seems to me one that cannot be decided as yet."[26]

2. Brief Survey of Recent Theories

There are a number of good surveys of the literature on the textual problem of the David and Goliath story,[27] so we will keep our comments on the existing literature brief. The scholarly opinion regarding this issue can be roughly grouped into two categories: 1) those who view LXX[B] as having textual priority, and 2) those who view MT as having textual priority.

2.1. LXX[B] Priority

Those who view the account in LXX[B] as textually prior fall into two camps. First, the majority of scholars view the MT as a combination of two versions of the David and Goliath story.[28] Tov outlines the two versions as follows:

John Barton (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Co., 2007), 127-36; and Joel S. Baden, "The Tower of Babel: A Case Study in the Competing Methods of Historical and Modern Literary Criticism," *JBL* 128/2 (2009): 209-24.

[26] Moshe Garsiel, *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels* (Israel: Revivim Publishing House, 1985), 158, n. 20.

[27] E.g., Antony F. Campbell, *1 Samuel* (FOTL 7; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 2003), 189-91; Stanley Isser, *The Sword of Goliath: David in Heroic Literature* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 30-34; A. Graeme Auld, "The Story of David and Goliath: A Test Case for Synchrony *Plus* Diachrony*,"* in *David und Saul im Widerstreit - Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit* (ed. Walter Dietrich; Fribourg: Academic Press & Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 119-22; Joseph Scott Arthur, "Giving David His Due: An Investigation of Text, Structure, and Chronology in 1 Samuel 16-18," (Ph.D. Diss.; Dallas Theological Seminary, 2005), 5-18; and Van Seters, *Biblical Saga*, 137-57.

[28] H.J. Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. XVII-XVIII 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta," *VT* 6 (1956): 397-413; idem *Das Erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT; Stuttgart: Gütersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1973), 312-15; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 306-09; Lust, "Story," 11-14; idem, "David dans la Septante," in *Figures de David à travers la Bible: XVIIᵉ Congrès de l'ACFEB (Lille, 1ᵉʳ Septembre 1997)* (Ed. Louise Desrousseaux and Jacques Vermeylen; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999), 246-52; Tov, "Composition," 118; idem, "The David and Goliath Saga: How a Biblical Editor Combined Two Versions," *BR* 2/4 (1986): 34-41; Trebolle, "David and Goliath," 26-30; Campbell, "From Philistine to Throne," 35-41; idem, *1 Samuel*, 171-91; William Boyd Nelson, Jr., "1 Samuel 16-18 and 19:8-10: A Traditio-Historical Study," (Ph.D. Diss.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1991), 24-42; Jacques Vermeylen, *La loi du plus fort: histoire de la rédaction des récits davidiques de 1 Samuel à 1 Rois 2* (BETL 154; Leven: University Press, 2000), 90-92; McKenzie, *King David*, 70-73; Tony W. Cartledge, *1 & 2 Samuel* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, GA: Smyth&Helwys, 2001), 213; Auld,

	Version 1 (LXX and MT)	Version 2 (MT only)
16:17-23	David is introduced to Saul as a skilful harper and he is made his armor bearer.	
17:1-11	Attack by the Philistines. Goliath suggests a duel with one of the Israelites.	
17:12-31		David is sent by his father to bring food to his brothers at the front. He hears Goliath and desires to meet him in a duel.
17:32-39	David volunteers to fight with Goliath.	
17:40-54	The duel. After Goliath's miraculous fall, the Philistines flee.	Short account of the duel (vv. 41, 48b, 50).
17:55-58		Saul asks who David is. David is introduced to Saul by Abner.
18:1-4		David and Jonathan make a covenant.
18:5-6a		David is appointed as an officer in Saul's army.
18:6b-9	Saul's jealousy of David.	
18:10-11		Saul attempts in vain to kill David.
18:12-16	David's successes.	
18:17-19		Saul offers David his eldest daughter, Merab.
18:20-27	Saul offers David his daughter Michal.	
18:29b-30		Saul is enemy of David.[30] David's successes.

"David and Goliath," 118-28; Ronald Hendel, "Plural Texts and Literary Criticism: For Instance, 1 Samuel 17," *Textus* 23 (2007): 99-101; Hutton, *Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 245-56; Van Seters, *David Saga*, 157-62; Raymond F. Person, Jr., *The Deuteronomic History and the Book of Chronicles: Scribal Works in an Oral World* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 74-78.

[29] Adapted from Tov, "Composition," 351-52.

[30] In Tov's table ("Composition," 352), he writes "Saul's love for David. David's successes" and lists it under 19:29b-30. The reference is clearly an error and since he does not mention this elsewhere, and he is speaking of the MT plus in 18:29b-30, I assume he is speaking of the reference to Saul being an "enemy" of David, narrated in 18:29b.

Second, a few scholars hold to the priority of the LXX[B] version but think that the MT pluses do not reflect a separate distinct version of the David and Goliath story. Klein, on the one hand, thinks that many of the pluses come from separate sources, but not from a coherent alternate version of the David and Goliath story.[31] Auld and Ho, on the other hand, suggest that the MT pluses were literary creations based on the Saul tradition in 1 Samuel 9-10.[32]

2.2. MT Priority

Though it is not always noted, there is no clear majority opinion in the literature. At best, we may speak of a slight majority holding to LXX priority, but many hold to MT priority. There are basically two camps of scholars who hold to MT priority. One camp views the MT text as composite but prior. Thus, the LXX[B] account is trying to harmonize an already composite text.[33] All of these scholars, whether they view the MT as a combination of two sources very similar to the two source theory above,[34] or whether they view the MT as evidence of continual growth from a core story,[35] find it more plausible that LXX[B] represents a harmonization of the story, than that LXX[B] has retained an earlier version of the story.

---

[31] Klein, *1 Samuel*, 172-75. Klein argues that the MT pluses in 17:41, 48b and 51a, have dropped out accidentally from LXX[B] and are not from separate sources.

[32] Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 24-38.

[33] E.g., De Vries, "David's Victory," 23-24; Dominique Barthélemy, "La qualité du Text Massorétique de Samuel," in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS – Vienna* (ed. Emanuel Tov; Jerusalem: Academon, 1980), 19-20; idem, "Trois niveaux d'analyse," in *BGLT*, 47-54; Rofé, "Battle of David and Goliath," 119-22; Pisano, *Additions or Omissions*, 78-86; van der Kooij, "David and Goliath," 126-28; Dietrich and Naumann, *Samuelbücher*, 90; Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 180-84; D. Rudman, "The Commissioning Stories of Saul and David as Theological Allegory," *VT* 50/4 (2000): 527; Aurelius, "David," 46-49; Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, 7; André Heinrich, *David und Klio: Historiographische Elemente in der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids und im Alten Testament* (BZAW 401; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 170-87.

[34] E.g., Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 180-84.

[35] E.g., Aurelius, "David," 68, identifies a core story in 1 Sam. 14:52; 17:1-23, 40, 49, 51.55-58; 18:2a, 5, 27b-28; 19:11-12.

Others argue that the long text of MT consists of a literary unity, whose poetics were not recognized by the Septuagint translator.[36] Examples of this line of reasoning include arguing 1) that the MT version better fits generic patterns than the LXX,[37] 2) that the MT version is intentionally telling a chronologically disjointed narrative, which was not understood by the translator,[38] 3) that the MT fits a pattern of repetition that is found throughout the Hebrew Bible,[39] or 4) that the MT version is using a "more sophisticated narrative-technique" that was not recognized by the translator.[40]

3. Plan of This Study

In light of the above discussion, how does one best proceed in studying this justly famous story? One helpful way to proceed is to recognize that the story of David and Goliath exists in two variant literary editions.[41] Lust comments on this narrative by saying that "both the MT and the LXX, or its Vorlage, are final texts with typical characteristics. Both have been accepted by and functioned in religious communities. There is no reason to discard one and to keep the other. A comparison could be made here with the synoptic gospels."[42]

---

[36] E.g., Gooding, "An Approach," 55-86; Rofé, "Battle of David and Goliath", 119-23; David G. Firth, "'That the World May Know.' Narrative Poetics in 1 Samuel 16-17," in *Text and Task: Scripture and Mission* (ed. Michael Parsons;. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster Press, 2005), 20-32; Wesselius, "New View," 5-26.

[37] Jason, "Story of David and Goliath," 66-67.

[38] Firth, "That the World May Know," 20-32. Cf. Arthur, "Giving David His Due," 177-211.

[39] Wesselius, "A New View," 5-26.

[40] Gooding," An Approach," 82.

[41] On this phenomenon see Eugene C. Ulrich, "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections Toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text," in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 78-105; Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd revised and enlarged ed.; Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1997), 237-63; idem, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences Between LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence from Other Sources," in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 155-70; and Hans Debel, "Greek 'Variant Literary Editions' to the Hebrew Bible?" *JSJ* 41 (2010): 161-90.

[42] Lust, "David and Goliath in the Hebrew and Greek Text," in *BGLT*, 126. Cf. Hendel, "Plural Texts," 97-114.

Since we have an example of two variant literary editions of the David and Goliath story, how do we analyze them? Hendel suggests that "We need to read each narrative, text, and edition in its own right, and to read them in their interpretive and intertextual relations with each other."[43] He argues that "each edition of 1 Samuel 17 has its own distinctive textual and literary conditions."[44] To follow Hendel's suggestion means to give interpretive space to each edition of the David and Goliath story. This will be the strategy of this study.

This study will proceed by offering a close literary reading of the short LXX[B] version of the David and Goliath story as it is contained in 1 Reigns 16-18.[45] Several factors lead us to analyze the Greek version of the story, as opposed to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Greek version. First, reconstructing the *Vorlage* of the LXX is a difficult exercise and introduces a layer of conjecture into the analysis.[46] Second, though it is likely that the short version of the story in LXX[B] is based on a short Hebrew *Vorlage*,[47] it is possible that the difference between the two versions is the result of editorial activity at the Greek level.[48] We have evidence that there is a different version of the story in the Greek tradition. We have no direct evidence of a

---

[43] Hendel, "Plural Texts," 105.

[44] Ibid.

[45] The reason for including chs. 16 and 18 in the analysis is that many of the textual difficulties in ch. 17 are created by their association with the surrounding material in chs. 16 and 18.

[46] On the difficulty of reconstrucing the *Vorlage* of the LXX see Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 57-103; and Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What Can We Know About the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (revised and expanded ed.; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 71-106.

[47] This is the main contribution of Tov's extensive study of the translation technique of 1 Reigns 17-18, "Composition," 348-50. Further study into the relationship between LXX-Samuel and 4QSam[a] has continued to show that often when LXX-Samuel and MT-Samuel disagree, the reason for disagreement was likely a *Vorlage* similar to 4QSam[a]. See Emanuel Tov, "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam[a]," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999): 274-83; A. Rofé, "4QSam[a] in the Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: the Case of 2 Sam 24 and 1 Chr 21," in *Biblische und Judaistische Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi,* (ed. A. Vivian; Judentum und Umwelt 29; Frankfurt, 1990), 110-19; F.H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSam[a]/LXX (with a note on the Text of the Pentateuch)," in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings,* SBLSCS 33 (ed. G.J. Brooke, B. Lindars; Atlanta: Scholars Press 1992), 215-76; idem, F.H. Polak, "Samuel, First and Second Books of," in *Encyclopedia of Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, J.C. Vanderkam; Oxford, 2000), 819-23; F.M. Cross and R.J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuel[a] (4Q51)," *DSD* 13 (2006): 46-54. However, 4QSam[a] agrees with MT in 1 Samuel 17-18 (see Johnson, "Reconsidering 4QSam[a]," 547-49).

[48] Van der Kooij, "David and Goliath," 129-30.

14

different version of the story in Hebrew, except via the Septuagint. Thus, my preference is to compare the different versions that we have. Third, it is the version of the David and Goliath story found in LXX[B] that was accepted as an authoritative version in early Judaism and Christianity.[49] Finally, since the Septuagint was an authoritative text in its own right, and since it contributes its own interpretive[50] and literary[51] elements to the translation it is worth studying this document as a literary achievement in its own right.[52]

This study will therefore proceed by offering a close literary reading of the short version of the David and Goliath story contained in LXX[B] (chs. 3-5). We will then turn to a comparison of the two versions of the story by reading the short version of the story against the version of the story in the MT by examining all of the MT pluses in order to see what literary differences they make to the story (ch. 6). It is not the purpose of this study to make a case for textual priority for either version. The purpose of this study is to give the short septuaginal version of the story the literary attention it deserves but has not yet received.

In sum, the plan of this study will be to offer a close literary reading of the narrative of David and Goliath in 1 Reigns 16-18. In so doing we will explore a method of reading the Septuagint as a document in its own right that also recognizes its status as a translated document and thus attempts to hold its dual nature in dialectical tension. Finally, in offering

[49] On the Septuagint as an authoritative text in early Judaism and Christianity see e.g. Mogens Müller, *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint* (JSOTSupp 206; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); Martin Hengel, *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2002); and J. Ross Wagner, "The Septuagint and the 'Search for the Christian Bible,'" in *Scripture's Doctrine and Theology's Bible: How the New Testament Shapes Christian Doctrine* (ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Alan J. Torrance; Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2008), 17-28.

[50] E.g., John W. Wevers, "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version," in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation* (ed. Magne Saebø; Göttingen: Vandehoeck & Ruprecth, 1996), 84-107.

[51] E.g., Takamitsu Muraoka, "Literary Device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8 (1973): 20-30; John A. Beck, *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000); and Eberhard Bons and Tomhas J. Kraus (eds.), *Et Sapienter et Eloquenter: Studies on the Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint*, (FRLANT 241; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

[52] Wevers, "Interpretative Character," 95, writes, that the LXX "is a humanistic document of interest by and for itself. . . . It is not just a source for interesting emendations, but gives us an insight into the faith and attitudes of Alexandrian Jewry of the third century BCE."

this reading of the septuagintal version of the David and Goliath narrative we will highlight the literary difference between the two final versions of the story that exist in LXX[B] and MT.

4. Toward a Method for Reading the Septuagint

Before we can offer a reading of the Septuagint version of the David and Goliath story, we must discuss how one goes about interpreting a septuagintal text. The interpretation of the Septuagint as a document in its own right is a little studied area. The various ways one could approach the interpretation of the Septuagint can be exemplified by the different approaches of the three recent LXX translation projects. The French project, *La Bible d'Alexandrie* (*BdA*), approaches the Septuagint as "an autonomous work detached from its parent text."[53] The English project, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (*NETS*), proposes that the Septuagint can best be described as "a Greek 'inter-linear' translation of a Hebrew original."[54] Because of this, the *NETS* paradigm finds the primary locus of interpretation in the relationship between the LXX and its source text. The German approach, *Septuaginta Deutsch* (*LXX.D*), attempts to take a mediating position, treating the Septuagint both as a document in its own right, and as a translation of a Hebrew original.[55]

---

[53] Marguerite Harl, "Traduire et Septante en Français: Pourquoi et Comment?" in *La Langue Japhet: Quinze Études sur la Septante et le Grec des Chrétiens* (ed. M. Harl; Paris: Cerf, 1992), 36: "oeuvre autonome, détachée de son modèle." Or put differently, in this view the LXX is "a literary work in the full sense of the term" (ibid., "un oeuvre littéraire au sens plein du terme"). See further, Marguerite Harl, "La Bible d'Alexandrie I. Translation Principles," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 51; ed. B.A. Taylor; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2001), 181-97.

[54] Albert Pietersma, "A New English Translation of the Septuagint," in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 51; ed. B.A. Taylor; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2001), 219. See further, idem, "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint," in *Bible and Computer* (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 337-364; Cameron Boyd-Taylor, "Reading Between the Lines: Towards an Assessment of the Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies," (Ph.D. diss; University of Toronto, 2005), esp. 86-108; and Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, "To the Reader of NETS," in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (ed. Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), xii-xx.

[55] See Helmet Utzschneider, "Auf Augenhöhe mit dem Text: Überlegungen zum Wissenschaftlichen Standort einer Übersetzung der Septuaginta ins Deutsche," in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der griechischen Bible* (BWANT 153; ed. H.-J. Fabry and U. Offerhaus; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001), 16-19; and Wolfgang Kraus, "Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives," in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (ed.

For the present study, I propose to view the LXX as its own communicative act that intended to communicate the Hebrew Scriptures in the linguistic, cultural and religious register of Hellenistic Judaism.[56] The LXX is a written act of communication and should be treated as such. In referring to the Septuagint as a written act of communication I am borrowing from Speech-Act Theory which argues that speaking, or in this case writing (or even translating!), is also doing.[57] When one speaks or writes one is also doing a number of acts. Speech-Act Theory has its own distinct, and often variegated, terminology for these acts but these are usually broken down into locutionary (propositional content), illocutionary (nature of the act in speaking[58]) and perlocutionary (effect of the speech-act) acts.[59] The implication of recognizing that both spoken and written discourse are communicative acts is that it necessarily brings with it a level of involvement from both the author and reader.[60] Speech-Act Theory provides a rationale for a hermeneutic that is not purely author-based, nor purely reader-based. Instead, recognizing texts as Speech-Acts implies that the meaning of a text cannot be separated from either the author (or translator) or the reader.

W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden; SBLSCS 53; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2006), 63-83; and idem, "*Septuaginta Deutsch* (LXX.D): The Value of a German Translation of the Septuagint," in *"Translation is Required" The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect* (SBLSCS; ed. Robert J.V. Hiebert; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 243-48.

[56] This definition is intentionally broad enough to encompass most theories of LXX origins. For a recent survey of the various theories of LXX origins, see Jennifer M. Dines, *The Septuagint* (UBW; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 47-61.

[57] Speech-Act Theory was pioneered by J.L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words* (2nd ed.; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975), and John R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969). On the usefulness of Speech-Act Theory for texts see Richard S. Briggs, *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001), 73-103.

[58] Though the language of force or energy is often used in describing illocutionary acts it seems more helpful to this non-specialist to speak of the illocution of the speech-act as the kind or classification of the speech in view. It is helpful to see the different classifications of illocutionary acts: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, declarations, assertive declarations. For summaries see Eugene Botha, "Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation," *Neotestamentica* 41/2 (2007): 277-78; and Briggs, *Words in Action*, 50-58.

[59] For a brief but helpful summary see Botha, "Speech-Act Theory," 277-78.

[60] The hermeneutical approach of self-involvement is the major contribution of Briggs, *Words in Action*, esp. 147-82.

The Septuagint, however, is not simply a written act. It is, more specifically, a written

act communicating a previously written act. In a recent article, Randall Gauthier has provided

one of the first methodologically thorough attempts to interpret the Septuagint as a text in its

own right.[61] Gauthier borrows from cognitive theory, and suggests that the Septuagint can be

described as a higher order act of communication which is seeking to communicate a first

order act of communication (Hebrew *Vorlage*).[62]

Using cognitive theory, Gauthier has proposed a method for septuagintal

interpretation that is complementary to the approach proposed here and in the *LXX.D*

project.[63] He writes,

> Lest we fall into the trap of merely describing an LXX text *in the process of being translated*, on the one hand, or regarding it as a *first-order act of communication* (i.e. a *composition*), on the other, it would appear methodologically incumbent on the modern exegete to consider both source and target as acts of textual communication *in conjunction*.[64]

If we take the LXX translation seriously as its own act of communication, then the

approaches described by *LXX.D* and Gauthier, commend themselves. The translators are not

authors in the sense that they are composing a text, but they are the communicating agents of

the textual act that is the LXX. Thus, if interpreting the LXX is understanding the

communicative act, then paying attention to the LXX *as translation* is invaluable for the

interpretive enterprise. However, the actual communicative act is the text itself, as such the

primary focus for interpretation must be the LXX *as text*. Thus, this approach seeks to read

the LXX in light of both of the two axioms we have mentioned.

Therefore, in this study we will offer a reading of the narrative in 1 Reigns 16-18

based upon the following principles:[65]

[61] Randall X. Gauthier, "Toward an LXX Hermeneutic," *JNSL* 35/1 (2009): 45-74.
[62] Ibid. 67-69.
[63] Gauthier specifically notes that his approach is complementary to the approach in *LXX.D* (Ibid., 68).
[64] Ibid., 68, italics original.
[65] This method is not dissimilar from the one sketched out by Joosten for the purposes of Septuagint

1. The narrative of 1 Reigns 16-18 will be read first and foremost as a literary text in its own right. It will be interpreted in the first instance as a Greek literary text.

2. Recognizing the translational nature of this text, recourse will be made to the best approximation of the translator's source text, in this case MT, and 4QSamª where available. Recourse to the source text helps to discern what the communicative act in the LXX was accomplishing. The reader of the LXX seeks to understand how the translator has rendered his source text, understanding all the while that the object of interpretation is the translator's final product, not only the instances where he has transformed his *Vorlage* in some way.

3. The translator's final product, then, is interpreted as a final literary communication with reference to how it has communicated its source.

These three principles are not necessarily chronological steps, but rather interrelated realities

of an approach to septuagintal literature that takes seriously its nature as a *translated text*.[66]

This method will have a number of implications for our reading of the text. On the one hand,

since our purpose is to interpret the Greek story as its own version but also to reference the

Hebrew text upon which it is based, there will be times when our reading of the text makes

interpretive significance out of what is possibly a variant based on a scribal accident. Thus,

when we encounter a variant between the Hebrew and Greek versions of the story, even if we

are not able to decide how that variant arose, we will still ask what effect that variant has on

the reading of the story. This practice is legitimate because of our principle number 1, that the

Greek text will be read as its own literary text. On the other hand, since we are interested in

interpreting the translator's communicative act of rendering his source text, there will be

times when we allow the source text to inform our interpretation. Thus, both the intention of

the translator and the reception of the reader have meaningful parts to play in the

_____
lexicography ("Source-Oriented Remarks," 152-55).

[66] The approach followed here is similar to the approach suggested by Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 15-19. However, van der Kooij cautions that this particular method may not be suitable for every LXX book (ibid., 8). It seems to me that even recognizing the differences between LXX-Isaiah and 1 Reigns an approach that holds the Greek text in relation to its source and the Greek text on its own in dialectical tension has much to commend it in the study of any LXX book (with all the requisite caveats and addenda required for each individual book). The importance of this kind of approach is also noted by W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos* (VTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 15-16.

interpretation of the Septuagint as a *translated text*.[67] The interpretive fruitfulness of this method will be played out in the reading that follows.

---

[67] Wright, "The Septuagint and Its Modern Translators," 111, would likely view our approach as confusing the Septuagint as produced with the Septuagint as received. While historically this differentiation makes sense, I do not think it does hermeneutically. For all different manuscripts and recensions aside, the Septuagint that was produced is the Septuagint that was received. And as Kraus, "Contemporary Translations, 83, has pointed out, it has a dual nature, it "is a work that is dependent on a Hebrew original (*Vorlage*) but nevertheless stands on its own."

CHAPTER 2

SEEING DAVID: 1 SAMUEL 16 IN GREEK

1. Introduction

The purpose of the present chapter is to examine the narrative of 1 Samuel 16 in the Greek version found in LXX[B]. The existence of two distinct textual versions in our particular text is largely limited to 1 Samuel 17-18, as can be seen by any study dedicated to this issue.[1] However, it is my contention that the textual difficulties in chs. 17-18 cannot be understood apart from ch. 16. Thus, our study will begin with chapter 16 before moving on to the more textually complicated narratives in chs. 17-18.

2. The Lord Sees David (16:1-13)

2.1. The Lord and Samuel (vv. 1-4a)

The first verse of ch. 16 begins a new narrative, but the opening section of this narrative also recalls the previous scene of Saul's rejection in ch. 15. The narrative begins with the Lord speaking to Samuel. The last time the reader heard the Lord speak was at the beginning of the previous narrative unit when the Lord spoke of his regret of making Saul king (15:11). In ch. 15 the word of the Lord came to Samuel (Καὶ ἐγενήθη ῥῆμα κυρίου πρὸς Σαμουηλ λέγων) and

---

[1] E.g. Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope," 397-413; L. Krinetzki, "Ein Beitrag zur Stilanalyse der Goliathperikope (1 Sam 17, 1-18, 5)," *Bib* 54 (1973): 187-236; de Vries, "David's Victory," 23-36; Tov, "Composition," 333-62; van der Kooij, "The Story of David and Goliath," 118-131; Trebolle, "The Story of David and Goliath," 16-30; Hendel, "Plural Texts," 97-114. Though Tov titles his essay "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18" the only texts he actually analyzes in any detail are 17-18.

Saul was rejected. Now in ch. 16 the Lord speaks to Samuel (Καὶ εἶπεν κύριος πρὸς Σαμουηλ) and David will be anointed. In the Lord's speech to Samuel in 16:1 he reproves him for mourning over Saul (πενθεῖς ἐπὶ Σαουλ). The previous narrative ended with the Lord regretting that he had made Saul king and Samuel mourning over Saul (ἐπένθει Σαμουηλ ἐπὶ Σαουλ). The Lord conveys to Samuel that his mourning over Saul is inappropriate because the Lord has rejected (ἐξουδενόω)[2] Saul from being king over Israel. All of these elements combine to set the tone of the anointing of David by recalling the previous story of Saul's rejection.[3]

The Lord now commands Samuel to "fill your horn with oil." It is an interesting fact and perhaps a subtle hint at the distancing of the Davidic kingship from the Saulide kingship that Saul is anointed with a *flask* of oil (τὸν φακὸν τοῦ ἐλαίου, 10:1) while David and Solomon are anointed with a *horn* of oil (τὸ κέρας τοῦ ἐλαίου, 16:13; 1 Kgs. 1:39).[4] The reason that Samuel is to fill his horn with oil is that the Lord has found a replacement for Saul among the sons of Jesse. More specifically, the Lord has "seen" (ὁράω) a king for himself. As

---

[2] The translation "rejected" may not seem obvious for ἐξουδενόω. *NETS* translates this as "I that have set him at naught;" *BdA* translates it with "dédaigner" ("to despise, disdain"); and *LXX.D* translates it with "verwerfen" ("to condemn, reject, dismiss"). *LEH* gives the definition as "to set at naught, to disdain, to scorn" (similarly *LSJ*). *GELS* gives a similar definition of "to consider to be of no account and treat as such." Cf. Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 104-05. This is not a common word in Greek usage, though a Greek reader would certainly be able to understand it. Plutarch appears to use ἐξουδενίζω, a similar verbalization of οὐδείς (*Parallel Minora* 308e, 310c). However, 1 Reigns uses ἐξουδενόω to solely translate מאס with the exception of 2 Sam 6:16 which translates בזה ("to despise"). This is different practice than LXX Pent. which translates מאס with ἀπειθέω "to refuse, to disobey" (3x) and ὑπεροράω "to disregard, despise" (2x). The connection of this verse with the previous chapter where ἐξουδενόω is used to convey a concept that must be translated as "reject" (see 15:23), makes "reject" a likely translation of ἐξουδενόω here. Interestingly, *NETS* translates ἐξουδενόω here as "set at naught" but in 15:23 they translate it as "reject."

[3] Cf. Martin Kessler, "Narrative Technique in 1 Sm 16, 1-13," *CBQ* 32/4 (1970): 546; Ashley S. Rose, "The 'Principles' of Divine Election: Wisdom in 1 Samuel 16," in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg*, ed. J.J. Jackson and M. Kessler (Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick, 1974), 44; and André Caquot and Philippe de Robert, *Les Livres de Samuel* (CAT; Genève: Labor et Fides, 1994), 187.

[4] Smith, *Samuel*, 144; McCarter, *1 Samuel,* 275; and Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 188. For a detailed comparison of the anointing scenes of Saul and David see Johannes Klein, *David versus Saul: Ein Beitrag zum Erzählsystem der Samuelbücher* (BWANT; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002), 64-70.

many commentators have pointed out, the concept of "seeing," especially with the verb ὁράω (ראה in the Hebrew), will become a key theme in this chapter. In this particular usage it carries the somewhat unique shade of meaning suggesting that more than just "seeing" a king among Jesse's sons, the Lord has "provided" or "chosen" for himself a king from among Jesse's sons.[5] This is the first occurrence of the *Leitwort* "see" and as such would not necessarily signal a first time reader to pay close attention to the word. As the story progresses, however, and the word is repeated in significant ways, it will become clear that it is meant as a key term in this narrative.

It may also be significant that the Lord says "I have seen a king for myself (ἐμοί)." This may contrast Saul's anointing where the Lord tells Samuel in 8:22 to appoint a king "for them" (αὐτοῖς).[6] We are already getting a picture that Saul is the people's choice for king, and David will be the Lord's choice.

The Lord tells Samuel, "Come that I may send you to Jesse as far as Bethlehem" (δεῦρο ἀποστείλω[7] σε πρὸς Ιεσσαι ἔως εἰς Βηθλέεμ).[8] In addition to the theme of "seeing" there will be some significant "sending" in this narrative. In the story thus far the Lord has *sent*

---

[5] Smith, *Samuel*, 144; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 160; Walter Brueggemann, *David's Truth in Israel's Imagination & Memory* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1985), 119-20, n. 15; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 414; and J. Randall Short, *The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David* (HTS 63; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 135-44.

[6] A. Graeme Auld, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011), 184.

[7] The translation is based on the reading of ἀποστείλω, an aorist subjunctive (supported by BA s Sah Eth). Multiple manuscripts read αποστελω, a future indicative (Nadjlnpqtvxz c₂e₂), and a few read αποστελλω, a present indicative (c Arm). The use of δεῦρο plus a subjunctive is a not uncommon translation of an imperative of הלך plus *yiqtol* form (e.g., 1 Rgns. 9:5, 9; 14:1, 6) and seems a likely reading here. Cf. Erik Eynikel and Johan Lust, "The Use of δευρο and δευτε in the LXX," *ETL* 67/1 (1991): 57-98. Cf. the sending of Joseph to his brothers in Gen. 37:17 and Moses to Pharaoh in Exod. 3:10 (*BdA*, 284).

[8] While LXX^B reads ἔως εἰς Βηθλέεμ ("as far as Bethlehem"), the MT reads בית־הלחמי ("the Bethlehemite"). The editors of 4QSam^b suggest that the Qumran text may have read בית לחם ("Bethlehem"), and the Greek may have introduced the preposition for grammatical reasons. *DJD 17*, 227.

Samuel to anoint Saul (9:16),[9] the Lord *sent* Saul to destroy the Amalekites (15:2-3);[10] Saul

claims to have gone on the mission that the Lord sent him (15:20). Now the Lord is sending

Samuel to anoint another king (16:1). This significant use of "sending" will continue into

16:14-23.

Samuel's response to the divine command is "how can I go?" (Πῶς πορευθῶ).

Samuel's reticence to go on the Lord's mission appears to paint a negative picture of him. The

reader will recall that Samuel previously appeared to disagree with the Lord's decision to

remove Saul and debated with him all night (15:11), he continued mourning over Saul, which

the Lord apparently considered inappropriate (16:1), now he has doubts about the Lord's

mission for him (16:2), and later on in this text he, the "Seer," will not "see" right and will

choose to anoint the wrong person. Such a reading implies to many scholars that the

depiction of Samuel's character is one that includes a significant negative element.[11] Samuel's

reticence to go also seems to contradict the picture of Samuel in ch. 15, where he boldly

confronts Saul and tells him of his divine rejection.

In regards to the negative picture of Samuel, though this text is often seen to suggest a

general negative assessment of Samuel's character,[12] such a reading neglects certain signals in

the text. First, from the very beginning of Samuel's story we read the narratorial assessment

of him, that "the Lord was with him and let none of his words fall to the ground" (1 Rgns.

3:19). Second, though Samuel does seem to question the Lord at certain points (1 Rgns.

---

[9] Cf. Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Das Erste Buch Samuel: Ein Narratologisch-philologischer Kommentar* (BWANT; Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1996), 227; and Lyle Eslinger, "A Change of Heart: 1 Samuel 16," in *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and Other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie* (Lyle Eslinger and Glen Taylor; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2009), 343.

[10] Though the word ἀποστέλλω is not used here, it is used in 15:18 to refer back to the original sending in 15:2-3.

[11] See Polzin, *Samuel*, 152-57; Bruce C. Birch, "The First and Second Books of Samuel," in *The New Interpreter's Bible* (Vol. II; Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998), 1098.

[12] E.g., Yairah Amit, "'The Glory of Israel Does Not Deceive Or Change His Mind': On the Reliability of Narrator and Speakers in Biblical Narrative," *Prooftexts* 12, (1992): 201-212, on ch. 16 specifically see p. 210.

15:11; 16:2) he is also the agent through whom the most significant acts are carried out in the early chapters of Samuel: he anoints Saul (9-10), he announces Saul's rejection (13:8-15; 15:11-35), and he anoints David (16:1-13). Finally, in the present text, though Samuel does question the Lord's command (16:2), the text is quick to note that he "did *all*[13] which the Lord spoke to him" (16:4), in such a fashion that we see this as a clear fulfillment of the command in v. 2.[14] Furthermore, Samuel's objection to this divine commission is reminiscent of a common Hebrew tradition of leaders who question their commission, e.g., Abraham (15:2-3), Moses (Exod. 3:11) and Jeremiah (Jer. 1:6).[15] Thus, the two aspects of Samuel's character, his willingness to question the Lord, as well as his role as one who carries out the Lord's will, suggests that rather than viewing Samuel as a purely negative character (or purely positive for that matter) we should rather see in Samuel a more complex character, who, nevertheless, does in fact carry out the Lord's will.[16]

In regards to the second issue, there does appear to be some difference in the attitude of Samuel toward Saul in ch. 16 when compared to ch. 15. This kind of action by Israel's prophets is not uncommon. Elijah has a similar turn of confidence. In 1 Kings 18, he fearlessly confronts Ahab and the priests of Baal. However, in 1 Kings 19, he is afraid of Ahab and Jezebel and asking the Lord to die. In the context of 1 Samuel this discontinuity most likely can be explained by the escalating tension between the main players—Samuel, Saul, and the Lord's new anointed. Samuel simply recognizes the reality that Saul still rules and has significant political power.[17]

---

[13] The LXX makes this all the more clear by stating that καὶ ἐποίησεν Σαμουὴλ πάντα ἃ ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ Κύριος ("and Samuel did *all* which the Lord told him"), in contrast with the MT which simply reads ויעש שמואל את אשר דבר יהוה ("and Samuel did what the Lord spoke").

[14] Kessler, "Narrative Technique," 549. Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 416; and Joyce G. Baldwin, *1-2 Samuel* (TOTC; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988), 121.

[15] Cf. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 160; and Rose, "Wisdom in 1 Samuel 16," 45.

[16] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel,* 168.

[17] John Mauchline, *1 and 2 Samuel* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1971), 128.

The Lord, in turn, responds to Samuel's fears and gives him a guise for his mission to Bethlehem. He is to take a heifer of oxen in his hand and tell people, "I have come to sacrifce to the Lord" (16:2). Thus, Samuel is to call Jesse and his sons to the sacrifice. Much has been made of this apparent subterfuge or "white lie."[18] While for the purposes of constructing a biblical theology of the character of God this question is quite appropriate, in the current narrative context the question of God lying seems beside the point. More significant is the theme of sacrifice that has been present throughout Samuel's previous missions. In ch. 9 Samuel first meets and anoints Saul at a sacrifice, in ch. 13 Saul failed to wait for Samuel to come to sacrifice, in ch. 15 Saul tried to defend his plunder by arguing they had taken the items in order to sacrifice, and now Saul is being dethroned by the anointing of another under the cover of sacrifice.[19] The irony is keenly felt in that Saul's sin, sparing some of the Amalekite spoil, was done under the guise of sacrifice (see 15:15), and now his replacement is being anointed under the guise of sacrifice.[20]

After the Lord details the guise he has arranged for Samuel's mission, he tells Samuel, "I[21] will make known to you what you shall do and you will anoint whomever I say to you." The phrase καὶ γνωριῶ σοι ἃ ποιήσεις ("and I will make known to you what you shall do") is almost identical to Samuel's phrase to Saul to wait for him until he comes in 10:8: καὶ γνωρίσω σοι ἃ ποιήσεις ("and I will make known to you what you shall do"). This puts Samuel in comparison to Saul. Just as Saul did not wait for Samuel, Samuel will not wait for the

[18] See e.g., Yael Shemesh, "Lies by Prophets and Other Lies in the Hebrew Bible," *JANES* 29 (2002): 90; Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 121; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 137.

[19] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 168.

[20] Cf. Robert P. Gordon, "Simplicity of the Highest Cunning: Narrative Art in the Old Testament," in *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon* (Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2006), 30-31; and V. Philips Long, "Scenic, Subtle, Succinct: An Introduction to the Literary Artistry of 1 & 2 Samuel," *Presbyterion* 19/1 (1993): 39.

[21] The LXX does not represent the ואנכי ("I") of the MT possibly because of the repetition of several letters in אודיעך, "I will make known to you" (so *DJD 17*, 227). It could also be that the LXX translators saw the pronoun as superfluous. In the Hebrew, however, it functions as a *casus pendens* emphasizing the change in subject from Samuel to Yhwh (Cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 274, who tentatively follows the MT).

Lord.[22] This, as is often pointed out, is part of the narrative's critique of Samuel. However, it seems that the primary reason for this critique is to emphasize that the election of the Lord's anointed one in this chapter is solely at the behest of the Lord. David is not Samuel's anointed, or the people's anointed as Saul could have been seen to be. He is the *Lord's* anointed.

The narrative now gives a brief summary statement of Samuel's obedience, as we have noted above, "and Samuel did all which the the Lord spoke to him" (16:4a). This functions both to finish the first part of the story and lead into the next part, which will detail *how* Samuel did all that the Lord told him to do.

2.2. Samuel Arrives in Bethlehem (vv. 4b-5)

Samuel now comes to Bethlehem. The reaction of the elders of the town to Samuel's coming is one of fear.[23] This reaction could be due to general fear/respect for Samuel[24] or it could be fear of the potential political danger Samuel's visit could bring in light of his rift with Saul.[25] It is likely, however, that the narrator has left the reason for the elders' fear ambiguous, so that for the elders, as for the reader, Samuel's visit is shrouded in mystery. However, given Samuel's latest action of hacking a foreign king to pieces (15:33), and the growing tension in Samuel and Saul's relationship, we know enough to be concerned.[26]

[22] Garsiel, *Samuel*, 112.

[23] The use of ἐξίστημι here most likely has a fearful connotation rather than one of confusion or surprise. Cf. Eli's fear (ὅτι ἦν ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ ἐξεστηκυῖα) for the Ark (4:13) and Saul and the people's fear (καὶ ἐξέστησαν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα) of Goliath (17:11). *NETS*, on the other hand, translates ἐξίστημι here as "surprised" (cf. *BdA* which translates it as "stupéfaits") while translating it as "distraught" in 4:13 and "dismayed" in 17:11. The LXX is translating חרד ("to tremble," *HALOT*) in both 16:4 and 4:13 and translating חתת ("to be shattered, filled with terror," *HALOT*) in 17:11. Cf. the discussion of the semantic overlap between חרד and ἐξίστημι in 1 Rgns 4:13 in Bernard A. Taylor, "The NETS Translation of 1 Reigns," *BIOSCS* 36 (2003): 82.

[24] So Mauchline, *Samuel*, 129; Kessler, "Narrative Technique," 549; David M. Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story*, JSOTSup 14 (Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1980), 77; Gordon, *Samuel*, 150-51; and Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 169.

[25] So Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 137; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 160; Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 121; and Alter, *The David Story*, 96.

[26] Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 417.

Approaching Samuel in fear, the elders now ask him "Is your coming in peace, O

Seer?" (Ἡ εἰρήνη ἡ εἴσοδός σου, ὁ βλέπων). The MT does not include the reference to Samuel

as "Seer." Smith has argued that the reading of LXX, which is supported by 4QSam[b],[27] is

original, noting that "the omission by one who thought the title not dignified for Samuel is

supposable."[28] This seems plausible, especially given the support of 4QSam[b]. The effect that

this reading has on the narrative is twofold. First, the only other place where Samuel is

referred to as "Seer" is in ch. 9 (vv. 9, 18, 19).[29] This causes the reader to recall the scene of

Saul's initial anointing. Second, referring to Samuel as "Seer" reinforces the key theme of

seeing that will continue to play a prominent role in this narrative, while simultaneously

heightening the irony that Samuel, the Seer, fails to see rightly at the key moment.

Samuel responds by saying that he does in fact come in peace. He lets the elders know

that he has come to sacrifice to the Lord. He further tells them to sanctify themselves and to

rejoice with him today (ἁγιάσθητε καὶ εὐφράνθητε μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ σήμερον).[30] The MT is rather

different in this phrase reading, התקדשו ובאתם אתי בזבח ("sanctify yourselves and *come* with

me *to the sacrifice*"). The editors of 4QSam[b] have reconstructed this phrase, which is not

extant in the manuscript, as התקדשו ושמחו אתי היום ("sanctify yourselves and rejoice with me

today").[31] Many scholars view the reading attested by LXX as original.[32] Ralph Klein

suggests that the LXX reading was ambiguous, leaving the reader to wonder why the the

elders were told to sanctify themselves. Thus, the MT reading arose in order to explain why

---

[27] See *DJD 17*, 226-27.

[28] Smith, *Samuel*, 146. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 274, also follows LXX. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 157, seems to suggest that ὁ βλέπων ("O Seer") is an insertion.

[29] Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 100.

[30] This may recall Samuel's phrase to Saul in 9:19: "eat with me today" (καὶ φάγε μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ σήμερον). This is another aspect that connects this anointing scene to the previous anointing of Saul.

[31] *DJD 17*, 226.

[32] E.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 274; Smith, *Samuel*, 146.

the elders are sanctifying themselves.[33] Not all scholars are convinced that the LXX is

original. Hertzberg argues that the LXX reading arose in order to explain why the elders have

no further part in the story: they were invited to rejoice, not to the sacrifice.[34]

Each reading has an interesting effect on the story. The reading in the MT with its

second mention of sacrifice (זבח) again brings to mind the theme of sacrifice, especially the

scene in ch. 9 where Saul meets Samuel in the context of a whole town's sacrifice. This is in

some sense a looking back and *contrasting* with a previous event. The LXX reading which

calls the elders to rejoice (εὐφραίνω) has a different connotation. The word εὐφραίνω

("rejoice") is relatively rare in 1 Reigns. It is used in only three other scenes. The use of

εὐφραίνω ("rejoice") that is closest to the context of 1 Reigns 16 is the opening of Hannah's

song.[35] Hannah begins her song by saying, "My heart was made firm in the Lord; my horn

(κέρας) was exalted in my god; my mouth was made wide against enemies; I rejoiced

(εὐφραίνω) in your deliverance" (2:1). The song of Hannah ends detailing how the Lord

"gives strength to our kings (βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν) and will exalt the horn (κέρας) of his anointed

(χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ)."[36] The setting of our text in ch. 16 where Samuel has taken up his horn

(κέρας) to anoint (χρίω) the future king (βασιλεύς), now further recalls the song of Hannah in

Samuel's call to the elders of the city to rejoice (εὐφραίνω) with him. The variant reading of

the LXX rather than recalling the sacrifice theme, and especially the scene of Saul's

anointing, instead recalls the joyful and triumphant song of Hannah. This suggests to the

---

[33] Ralph W. Klein, *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran* (Old Testament Series; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1974), 74-75.

[34] Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 137. So too Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 101. Interestingly, Klein, *1 Samuel*, 158, reads with the MT, despite what he argues in his earlier *Textual Criticism*, 74-75.

[35] The other uses are in 6:13 and 11:9, 15.

[36] Among the many variant readings found in the song of Hannah, the most significant for our purpose is the reading of the plural "our kings" (βασιλεῦσιν ἡμῶν) in LXX against the singular "his king" (למלכו) in MT. On the textual issues of this text see Theodore J. Lewis, "The Textual History of the Song of Hannah: 1 Samuel II 1-10," *VT* 44/1 (1994): 18-46; and McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 68-71, both of whom view the LXX reading as secondary. In either reading v. 10 gives the song a monarchic setting and so connects with our text.

reader that *this* anointed one is going to be the one we have waited for throughout the whole of 1 Reigns.

2.3. Samuel and the Sons of Jesse (vv. 6-11)

The scene now changes, marked by καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν τῷ αὐτοὺς εἰσιέναι ("and it happened when they came. . .").[37] The syntax here of καὶ ἐγενήθη followed by a temporal clause meaning "when" or "during" suggests that the action happens as soon as they arrive.[38] Furthermore, the absence of an object, which we would expect in such a construction,[39] further suggests that the action happens even before they arrive at their destination, which must be assumed to be Jesse's house.

What happens immediately as they arrive at Jesse's house is that Samuel sees (ὁράω) Eliab. This is the second reference to someone seeing that we have heard in this narrative. The first was that the Lord had seen (ὁράω) among the sons of Jesse a king for himself (16:1). Now, the Seer (ὁ βλέπων) arrives at Jesse's house and sees (ὁράω) Eliab. It would be natural to assume that there is an expected connection between the first person Samuel sees the person that the Lord saw. This, however, turns out not to be the case. The present act of seeing introduces the most significant cluster of references to seeing in the entire chapter.

Samuel's response to seeing Eliab is to proclaim, "surely before the Lord is his anointed" (Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνώπιον Κυρίου χριστὸς αὐτοῦ). While the LXX faithfully reflects the MT in this verse,[40] Jan Joosten has pointed out a significant variant in the Peshitta and argued for

---

[37] Καὶ ἐγενήθη is the equivalent of the Hebrew ויהי which frequently marks a scene change or some sort of narrative shift. See Roy L. Heller, *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 433-34.

[38] On the use of ἐν + dat. to express time see *BDF* §107; and Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 155.

[39] See e.g., 1 Sam. 1:7, 26; 2:19; 9:9; 15:6; 16:16; etc.

[40] MT reads אך נגד יהוה משיחו ("surely before the Lord is his anointed").

its originality.[41] Joosten argues that the Peshitta, which reads ܐܟܘܬܗ ܕܡܪܝܐ ܡܫܝܚܗ

(*ʾakwāteh dmāryā mšiḥeh*, "like the Lord is his anointed"), likely reflects an original Hebrew

Vorlage which read כנגד יהוה משיחו ("like the Lord is his anointed").[42] Joosten is likely

correct in noting that the similarity between אך נגד ("surely before") and כנגד ("like" or

similar to") is the reason for the variant. However, it is difficult to argue which reading is

prior, as Joosten himself admits.

What this reading would do to the narrative is rather interesting. While it is still a

positive assessment of Eliab on the part of Samuel, it is also an assessment about the

character of God as viewed by Samuel. In this case, Samuel sees something about Eliab that

he thinks makes him "like the Lord" (כנגד יהוה). Since in the narrative the only information

we are given about Eliab is his height and great stature (though we are not even given that

yet), we assume that Samuel views Eliab as "like the Lord" in the sense of his grandeur. The

idea of the Lord's anointed being *like* him in some way also calls to mind the classic passage

in 13:14 where Samuel tells Saul the Lord is going to choose someone "after his own heart"

(כלבבו).[43]

This variant reading calls for careful reflection and allows for an interesting nuance to

the narrative. However, while a final assessment of Joosten's proposal must wait for an

examination of the second half of v. 7, at this point it can be noted that the fact that this

reading is limited exclusively to the Peshitta may suggest that it should be treated as a

peripheral variant rather than, as Joosten argues, the original reading.[44]

---

[41] Jan Joosten, "1 Samuel xvi 6,7 in the Peshitta Version," *VT* 41/2 (1991): 226-33.

[42] Ibid., 227-28.

[43] See further Benjamin J.M. Johnson, "The Heart of Yhwh's Chosen One in 1 Samuel," *JBL* 131/3 (2012): 455-67.

[44] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 418-19, argues that Joosten's argument is "highly hypothetical" and the Peshitta reading is likely secondary.

We previously noted that the Lord's statement to Samuel in 16:3, "I will make known to you what you shall do" (γνωριῶ σοι ἃ ποιήσεις) recalled Samuel's statement to Saul in 10:8, "and I will make known to you what you shall do" (καὶ γνωρίσω σοι ἃ ποιήσεις). Now Samuel, just like Saul, fails to wait to be shown what to do. This appears to be a critique of Samuel's use of discernment.

Samuel is immediately reprimanded for his high opinion of Eliab. The Lord says to Samuel, "Do not look upon his appearance nor upon his great stature," (Μὴ ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν ὄψιν αὐτοῦ μηδὲ εἰς τὴν ἕξιν μεγέθους αὐτοῦ).[45] This reprimand by the Lord suggests that it was Eliab's outward appearance that won him Samuel's approval. The resonances with Saul's appearance (cf. 10:23) are clear and often noted.[46] It appears, therefore, that Samuel, who was recently mourning the old monarch, is still thinking in terms of the paradigm of the old monarch, one of great stature. The Lord must inform him that he has something different in mind.

The Lord tells Samuel, "I have rejected him" (ὅτι ἐξουδένωκα αὐτόν). The use of "reject" (ἐξουδενόω) in reference to Eliab recalls the rejection (ἐξουδενόω) of Saul in 15:23, 26; and 16:1. Thus, the character of Eliab further causes the reader to recall the character of Saul, and in a way, the rejection of Eliab becomes another rejection of Saul.[47] The narrative

---

[45] It is likely significant that the LXX uses ἐπιβλέπω ("to look carefully upon," *LEH*; "to look or watch attentively," *GELS*) here. The Hebrew is not ראה ("to see") as elsewhere in the chapter, but נבט ("to look"). Throughout the majority of this chapter the LXX will translate ראה consistently with ὁράω ("to see"), with the exception of one interesting variation, noted below. Rose, "Wisdom in 1 Samuel 16," 50, claims that נבט carries with it "the implications of external observation."

[46] E.g., Eslinger, "A Change of Heart," 346-47; Keith Bodner, "Eliab and the Deuteronomist," in *David Observed: A King in the Eyes of His Court* (Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 14; Shimon Bar-Efrat., *Narrative Art in the Bible* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2008), 49; and Michael Avioz, "The Motif of Beauty in the Books of Samuel," *VT* 59/3 (2009): 347-49.

[47] Tryggve N.D. Mettinger, *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings* (Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976), 175. So also Alter, *David Story,* 96. Cf. Bar-Efrat, *Samuel,* 228.

has in many and various ways built the present scene upon the rejection of Saul in the previous narratives.

The next phrase is textually difficult. The Hebrew reads כי לא אשר יראה האדם ("for not what man sees"). This phrase is likely elliptical, and appears somewhat ambiguous. It is most often understood as implying "for not what man sees *does God see*" but it has been proposed that the Hebrew could be understand as "I am not as man sees."[48] It is difficult to tell whether the different versions are operating with a different *Vorlage* or simply trying to interpret the cryptic phrase found in MT.[49] The two renderings mentioned each have textual attestations, the first by LXX, the second by the Peshitta.

Jan Joosten has argued that the Peshitta version which reads, ܐܠ ܗܘܝܬ ܓܝܪ ܐܝܟ ܕܚܙܐ ܐܢܫܐ (*lā hwīt gēr ʾa(y)k dḥāzē (ʾ)nāšā*, "For I am not as man sees"), is likely the original reading and reflects the following Hebrew *Vorlage*: כי לא כאשר יראה האדם אני (אנוכי) ("I am not similar to what man sees").[50] The strength of Joosten's argument for the originality of the Peshitta version is the coherence between v. 6 and v. 7. We noted previously that the Peshitta's rendering of Samuel's reaction to Eliab was "similar to the Lord is his anointed." The Peshitta's reading of the present verse now fits this argument because this phrase would not be a critique of how humans see (as LXX and probably MT) but a critique on Samuel's view of God. Though Joosten makes a good case and the Peshitta's reading is interesting and well worth noting as a possible variant, it may well reflect an attempt by the

---

[48] So Tsumura, *Samuel*, 419.

[49] Dominique Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhmie, Esther* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg, Suisse / Göttingen: Éditions Universitaires / Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), 189, suggests that the MT reading may be due to accidental omission from homoiarcton.

[50] Joosten, "1 Samuel xvi 6,7," 228-29. Though Tsumura, *Samuel*, 419, notes that it is possible that the Peshitta is simply reading the MT.

Peshitta to make sense of a difficult text. Though this variant is an attestation of an ancient interpretation of these verses, in the context of this passage, which is about how humans judge compared to how the Lord judges, it seems an unlikely original reading. The Peshitta's reading also loses the parallelism comparing human and divine seeing, which is so poetically played out in the next clause.

In the second half of v. 7, the LXX reads ὅτι οὐχ ὡς ἐμβλέψεται ἄνθρωπος, ὄψεται ὁ θεός ("for not as man will see, will God see"). Most scholars read the LXX in this verse as the preferred reading and suggest that יראה האלהים ("God sees") must have fallen out of the MT due to haplography.[51] Though it is difficult to argue whether the LXX is translating a longer Hebrew *Vorlage* or trying to make sense of a cryptic text similar to the MT, it seems clear that the sense of the LXX is most likely the sense that is communicated by the MT.

The LXX's reading allows for two related themes to be emphasized: 1) the contrast between divine seeing and human seeing is much more pronounced and 2) the key word ὁράω ("to see") is repeated again. The first theme, the contrast between the human and divine, is further emphasized by another variant in the LXX that is seldom mentioned by scholars. Throughout this passage the LXX has consistently translated the Hebrew word ראה ("to see") as ὁράω ("to see"). The consistency is not surprising because, as we have noted, the concept of seeing is a key theme in this narrative and one way to emphasize that theme is the repetition of a single keyword. In one instance the MT deviates from using the keyword ראה and instead uses נבט ("to look"), which the LXX recognizes and translates as ἐπιβλέπω ("to look carefully upon") instead of ὁράω. However, in the present clause, where the MT reads

---

[51] Driver, *Samuel*, 133; Smith, *Samuel*, 146; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 301; Mauchline, *Samuel*, 129; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 274; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 158. See also Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 77. *DJD 17*, 228, suggests that 4QSam[b] had the longer reading as reflected in the LXX. It appears that 4QSam[b] probably reflected a longer reading than MT and the reading in LXX seems a likely candidate (see Frank Moore Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts From Qumran," *JBL* 74 [1955]: 166).

"for not as man sees (ראה)," the LXX reads "for not as man sees (ἐμβλέπω)." Though

translating ראה with some form of the verb βλέπω is not strange and is done elsewhere in 1

Reigns,[52] in ch. 16 where the word ראה is a key word and otherwise consistently translated as

ὁράω it seems a significant variation.[53] Though stylistic lexical variation is a translation

technique that has been noted in other contexts,[54] it is possible that in the present context

more than just style is at play. The effect of this translational variation is that it makes for a

further contrast in this clause between human seeing (ἐμβλέπω) with divine seeing (ὁράω).[55]

Furthermore, the word βλέπω appears to be used in a consistently negative way in this

chapter. Samuel is referred to as "the Seer" (ὁ Βλέπων) which functions as a subtle critique of

the Seer who does not see right. He is told not to look (ἐπιβλέψῃς) at Eliab. Finally, the

insufficiency of human seeing (ἐμβλέψεται) is contrasted with divine seeing (ὄψεται).

The difference between divine seeing and human seeing is now made explicit by the

statement at the end of v. 7 that, "man looks upon the face (πρόσωπον),[56] but God looks upon

the heart (καρδίαν)." In Old Testament anthropology the heart is not a symbol of love, as it is

---

[52] E.g., 1 Sam. 1:11; 3:2: 4:15; 9:16.

[53] Cross, "Oldest Manuscripts," 166, notes that 4QSam[b] could have read כ]י לא כאשר יביט האדם following the LXX.

[54] Nechama Leider, "Assimilation and Dissimilation Techniques in the LXX of the Book of Balaam," *Textus* 12 (1985): 79-95, discusses this phenomenon as "dissimilation." Though Leider's classification of "dissimilation" does not exactly fit what we see in the translation of ראה in 1 Reigns 16, it does show that the technique of lexical variation was available to the translator.

[55] The use of a form of βλέπω to contrast divine and human seeing is not carried through to the next clause, but would probably have been deemed unnecessary due to the fact that the two kinds of seeing in the next clause are already differentiated by the qualifiers εἰς πρόσωπον ("into the face") for human seeing and εἰς καρδίαν ("into the heart") for divine seeing.

[56] The MT reads כי האדם יראה לעינים ויהוה יראה ללבב (lit.: "for man looks to the eyes, but Yhwh looks to the heart"). The difficult phrase is לעינים ("to the eyes"), and has been taken to mean either looking to the appearance of another person (so Driver, *Samuel*, 133; and Arnold B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches,* Dritter Band: Josua, Richter, I. u. II. Samuelis [Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968], 223) or it can mean seeing *with* the eyes (so Tsumura, *Samuel*, 419). Either way the syntax is odd. Given the nice parallelism between לעינים and ללבב, it seems likely that what is meant is that humans look "into the eyes," i.e., the eyes are the best window into a person's inner character, whereas the Lord can really penetrate into the heart of the matter. The LXX has nicely emphasized the inner/outer dimension of human vs. divine sight by keeping the parallelism but making it clear what is being spoken of by translating the odd phrase לעינים ("to the eyes") as εἰς πρόσωπον ("into the face").

in contemporary western culture, but something more akin to the modern conception of the mind. The heart can be used to refer to the seat of the emotions (e.g., Pr. 14:30; 23:17; Ps. 25:17; 1 Sam. 1:8; etc.); the desires (e.g., Pr. 6:25; 13:12; Ps. 21:2); the intellect (e.g., Pr. 15:14; 16:23; Ps. 90:12, etc.), the memory (e.g., Ps. 27:8; Dan. 7:28; etc.), and the place where decisions are made (e.g., Pr. 6:18; 16:9; Gen. 6:5; 2 Sam. 7:27).[57] But in the present context, looking into the heart of something also implies a degree of hiddenness. To refer to the heart of something is to refer to something "inaccessibly unexplorable . . . anything that is quite simply impenetrably hidden."[58]

This statement is one of the key phrases for the interpretation of the whole narrative. We have previously noted that the concept of seeing is a central theme, if not *the* central theme, in this whole narrative. Now in this one verse there are six references to seeing (5 in the MT). And finally, in this last part of the verse the theme is used to show the difference between divine categories and human categories. Samuel has by this point capitulated to human categories of approval by assuming that Eliab is the Lord's anointed. Like Saul, who is the king like all the other nations that the people asked for (1 Rgns. 8:5), Eliab fits the human qualifications for king. However, this narrative makes clear that the qualifications that humans seek are not necessarily the same as the ones the Lord seeks. Eliab, like Saul before him, has been judged and found wanting in the terms that the Lord requires for his chosen one.[59] In revealing this judgment about Eliab (and by inference Saul) the Lord has also judged Samuel and found him wanting. The Seer is called to task for not seeing rightly. That the

---

[57] Carole R. Fontaine, *Traditional Sayings of the Old Testament: A Contextual Study* (Sheffield, England: The Almond Press, 1982), 100-01. A key study of the heart in Old Testament anthropology is Hans Walter Wolff, *Anthropology of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1974), 43-55.

[58] Wolff, *Anthropology*, 43.

[59] Note that when Saul was anointed the Lord found it necessary to give him a "new heart" (1 Sam. 10:9).

Lord looks upon the heart reminds the reader that the chosen one, whom the reader, the Israelites, and the Lord are waiting for, is one who is "after [the Lord's] own heart."[60]

The reader, along with Samuel, has now spent two rather lengthy verses looking solely at Eliab. The action will now speed up considerably for the rest of the brothers. In v. 8 Jesse calls Abinadab, and he comes before Samuel,[61] and Samuel says "neither has the Lord chosen this one."[62] Next, in v. 9, the narrative does not take the time to mention Jesse calling the next son, Shama, but simply causes him to pass in front of Samuel before Samuel pronounces again that "the Lord has not chosen this one." Finally, in v. 10, the action is sped up even more and all that is said is the summative statement that "Jesse caused his seven sons to go before Samuel, and Samuel said 'the Lord has not chosen among these.'" As has been frequently noted the use of the formulaic "seven sons" may well function to make David seem even more the unlikely one.[63] He is the youngest, and he is, in some sense, "outside" the perfect number of seven sons.[64] This may be the case, but the main element that this narrative uses to portray David as the unlikely candidate is appearance, as we will see shortly. The function of this formulaic pattern of bringing the brothers before Samuel seems to create a feeling of anticipation. On the one hand it slows the narrative down significantly,[65] but on the other hand it gives the sense of the narrative being in a hurry. We are privy to a detailed look at Eliab and his reason for being rejected (vv. 6-7). However, each successive brother is given

---

[60] See further, Johnson, "The Heart," 464-65.

[61] Gehmen, "Exegetical Methods," 295, observes that the MT's ויעברהו ("and he [Jesse] caused him to pass by") is rendered by the LXX as καὶ παρῆλθεν ("and he passed by"), and refers to it as an example of intentional exegesis. However, too much should perhaps not be made of this. The editors of 4QSamᵇ reconstruct this phrase as ויעבר on the assumption that MT is influenced by the Hiphil verbs in vv. 9 and 10 (*DJD 17*, 228).

[62] As was previously noted, with the remainder of Jesse's sons Samuel uses the softer "the Lord has not chosen (ἐκλέγομαι) them" instead of the harsher "rejected" (ἐξουδενόω), as was used to refer to Eliab. In a subtle way the narrative seems less to be looking back at the rejection of Saul and more looking forward to the one who will be the Lord's chosen.

[63] See Tsumura, *Samuel*, 420-21; Alter, *David Story*, 96; and McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 277.

[64] Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 420-21, who uses this feature to explain how David can be the "eighth" son here and the "seventh" son in 1 Chr. 2:15.

[65] Cf. Kessler, "Narrative Technique," 550.

less narrative space, until the final four are spoken of collectively. Thus, the narrative both creates suspense by delaying the arrival of the "chosen one" and creates a sense of urgency by rushing toward the final son.

If the reader's expectations are heightened by the previous few verses, then the sense of frustrated expectations is felt keenly with Samuel's statement to Jesse, "Have the youths failed?"[66] This statement is presented in an odd way so that the narrator seems to interrupt Samuel by telling the reader again that Samuel is speaking: "and *Samuel said* 'the Lord has not chosen among these.' And *Samuel said* to Jesse, 'have the youths failed?'" (16:10-11). Most likely this repetition of introduction to speech functions as a structuring device separating what follows from what has gone before but it may also cause the reader to pay attention to what follows as especially important.[67]

The fact that Samuel speaks of the "youths" (παιδάρια) rather than simply Jesse's "sons" (υἱός) as in 16:1, is somewhat suggestive. Tsumura argues that Samuel is looking for a

---

[66] The Hebrew reads התמו הנערים ("have the youths ceased?"), i.e., "is this all of them?". The sense in the Hebrew is neutral. The Hebrew word תמם often simply means completed or come to an end. It seems that if the LXX translator had wished to convey this neutral sense, they would have translated it with the word τελέω ("to be finished"), which is frequently used to translate תמם (e.g., Deut. 34:8; Josh. 3:17; 4:1; Isa. 18:5; etc.). The word the LXX uses here, however, is one which implies a more negative context. The word ἐκλείπω most frequently has a negative connotation of "to fail" (e.g., Gen. 25:8); "to forsake" (e.g., Judg. 5:6) or "to die" (e.g., Gen. 49:33). The Hebrew word תמם is capable of these negative meanings, but also capable of a more neutral meaning. The LXX appears to use the word to convey the negative aspects of תמם rather than the more neutral aspect. The word ἐκλείπω is used eight other times in the LXX to translate תמם (Gen. 47:15; 18; 2Sam 20:18; 2Kgs. 7:13; Psa. 9:7[MT 9:6]; 63:7[MT 64:7]; 101:28[MT 102:28]; 103:35[MT 104:35]), each of those times it appears to be meant in a negative context thus translated something like "to fail" (cf. the *NETS* translation of these verses). An example of this is seen in Gen. 47:18. In the MT the word תמם is used twice. The first time it is used to describe the end of the year, a neutral meaning. Thus the LXX translates it with ἐξέρχομαι to convey the simple passage of a year. The second time it is used in this verse is to describe that all the money has failed, a negative connotation. Here, the LXX translates תמם with ἐκλείπω. This negative usage of ἐκλείπω suggests, in reading ch. 16, a more negative implication of coming to the end of Jesse's sons. The sense of disappointment is heightened ever so slightly so that the reader gets the impression that Jesse's sons are not just completed, but they have failed in some sense. On a similar contextual use of ἐκλείπω in the LXX that can be understood to communicate "failure" see Alain Le Boulluec and Pierre Sandevoir, *L'Exode* (BdA 2; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989), 161, on Exod. 13:21.

[67] E.J. Revell, "The Repetition of Introductions to Speech as a Feature of Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 47 (1997): esp., 91 and 102-03. Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 421 and Garsiel, *Samuel*, 113, and 115, n. 15, who notes that this device may suggest "bewilderment" on the part of Samuel.

boy not just one of Jesse's sons.[68] That may be possible, but seems to stretch the evidence.

Campbell reminds modern readers that what is meant by "youths" (παιδάρια in Gk. and נערים

in Heb.), is dependent upon the context and can mean anything "from an unweaned infant (1

Sam 1:22) to a king's minister for public works (1 Kgs 11:18)."[69] Though Campbell is correct,

in the present context, where David will be described as the small one (ὁ μικρός), the use of

the term παιδάριον to describe Jesse's sons may perhaps be used in order to give the reader the

first subtle hint of the theme of smallness and youngness which will be pervasive in much of

the early account of David.

Jesse's response to Samuel's question is in classic storytelling fashion. Just as we have

seen all seven of Jesse's sons pass by and none of them have been chosen, we picture a

disappointed Samuel asking, "is this it?" At that very moment we hear Jesse mention, almost

as an afterthought, "there is still the small one" (Ἔτι ὁ μικρός). There is still hope in the

unlikeliest of choices. Jesse continues, "behold he is shepherding the sheep" (ἰδοὺ ποιμαίνει ἐν

τῷ ποιμνίῳ). Jesse's response reminds the reader of Saul's anointing where he too was found

missing at the critical moment (1 Rgns. 10:21-23).[70] Unlike Saul, who was hiding, David is

shepherding the flock, an image that will later be used as a metaphor for kingship.[71]

We are left wondering what to make of the small one's absence at this juncture. It is

unlikely that we are to assume that the job of shepherding was so important that this son

could not come when the family of Jesse was called to an important sacrifice. The other

seven sons presumably had important work that they managed to leave. Most likely the

reference to shepherding the flock functions to 1) emphasize this last son's youthfulness in

---

[68] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 421.
[69] Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 164.
[70] Cf. Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 175; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 227; and Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 170.
[71] Kessler, "Narrative Technique," 550.

that he was deemed so young, so unlikely that he was left tending the sheep, and 2) create a

great dramatic pause in the narrative so that the reader and all the characters await this final

son of Jesse upon whom all our hopes are set.[72]

It is worth noting that while it is clear in the context that referring to this son as "the

small one" (ὁ μικρός) is meant to give his status as the youngest son,[73] it cannot help but bring

the idea of "smallness" to the reader's mind. In a context where the great height of Eliab has

called to mind the great height of Saul, the theme of David as "the small one" offers an

interesting contrast.[74]

Samuel now brings all the action to a halt while the party waits for this last son to

arrive. He tells Jesse to "Send (Ἀπόστειλον), and bring him." The Lord has sent (ἀποστέλλω,

16:1) Samuel to Jesse in order to anoint one of his sons, now Samuel tells Jesse to send

(ἀποστέλλω) for this last son, leading the reader to expect that this is the one whom Samuel

was sent to anoint.

Samuel explicitly states that the action will halt while the party waits for the one who

is tending the sheep: "for we will not sit down until he comes."[75] And so the reader and all

those present must wait; just as the reader has been waiting for the whole of the book of

Samuel.

---

[72] Brueggmann, *Samuel*, 122.

[73] Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 164, argues that this statement "says nothing about David's age or size."

[74] Cf. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 161; and Kessler, "Narrative Technique," 550.

[75] The Hebrew of this verse is rather difficult. It reads כי לא נסב עד באו פה (lit.: "for we will not turn until he comes"). What is meant by this use of סבב ("to turn, go around, encircle" *HALOT*) is difficult. This term could be referring here to some sort of procession around the altar for sacrifice or it could possibly be taken, as it is in later Hebrew (e.g., Sir. 32:1) to refer to sitting down or around a table. The LXX has clearly understood it in this later sense translating with κατακλίνω ("to sit down"). Regardless how one understands this verb the meaning is clear, that nothing will happen until this last son comes. For discussion see Driver, *Samuel*, 134; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 301-02; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 275; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 161; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 422 and *HALOT* s.v. סבב.

2.4. The Anointing of David (vv. 12-13)

As the crowd and the reader waits, Jesse sends for (ἀποστέλλω) and brings in his smallest son. The narrator refers to him as "this one" (οὗτος), we do not yet know his name, but what follows is a description of him. Before understanding the function of this description in the narrative we must first understand the meaning of this description, which is not as straightforward as one would hope.

The first thing we learn about this last son is that he is "ruddy" (πυρράκης). Only three people in the Old Testament are referred to as "ruddy": Esau (Gen. 25:25); David (1 Sam. 16:11; 17:42); and the beloved in the Song of Songs (Song 5:10, though πυρρός is used here). Interestingly, what scholars make of the use of this term leads to diametrically opposing viewpoints. On the one hand it has been argued that describing someone as "ruddy" is to picture them as the essence of manhood, perhaps a sign of their virility. This is seen, it is argued, in the fact that "two of the most heroic men of the Old Testament, Esau and David, are described as naturally red: showing that they were born to be heroes."[76]

On the other hand, it has been argued that the connotation of red should be understood in the opposite of manly. It is suggested that "Rather than 'ruddy and virile,' he [David] was pink and pretty."[77] In defense of this view Greenspahn cites a study by Ullendorff that argues that "ruddy" (אדם in the Heb., πυρράκης in the Gk.) was a feature that was considered "beautiful" or "pleasant."[78] This can be further supported by its use in the Old Testament.

---

[76] C.H. Gordon, *Before the Bible: The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations* (London: Collins, 1962), 231. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 423, cites Gordon in defense of this reading of "ruddy." Tsumura further notes the parallel description of a king with "ruddy countenance" and "beautiful eyes," though I do not follow how this supports his argument for a "manly" connotation, the context in the "Sun Disk" Tablet, which he cites, suggests a "smiling, happy face" (*COS* II. 367), not a "manly" or "heroic" figure.

[77] Frederick E. Greenspahn, *When Brothers Dwell Together: The Preeminence of Younger Siblings in the Hebrew Bible* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 88. Cf. Stuart Macwilliam, "Ideologies of Male Beauty and the Hebrew Bible," *BibInt* 17/3 (2009): 276-69.

[78] E. Ullendorff, "The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography," *VT* 6 (1956): 191-92.

First, in 17:42 Goliath will look upon David with scorn because he is a "youth" and "ruddy" (πυρράκης). This suggests David's "ruddiness" is not a sign of his machismo. Second, it is used of Esau, but specifically it is used of the *newborn* Esau (Gen. 25:25), and thus in that context it may not be meant to convey manliness at all.[79] Furthermore, the usage of the theme of "red" or "ruddy" in Esau's story is part of a larger narrative technique, of an etiology of the name of the people of Edom and a narrative irony that Esau, the "red one" (πυρράκης) gives up his birthright for some of that "red (πύρρος) stew."[80] Finally, it is used in a sexual context in the Song of Songs (5:10), where it is meant to be a sign of "health, youthfulness, and beauty."[81] Clearly it is meant as a positive qualification. Thus, this youngest son is attractive in some way that probably has something to do with his coloring,[82] but how exactly that is meant may require more study of the immediate context.

The next descriptor of this youngest son's good looks is that he is μετὰ κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν (lit., "with beauty of eyes"). This somewhat awkward phrase (cf. the similarly awkward Heb. עם־יפה עינים "with fair of eyes") probably means "beautiful eyes."[83] Though this exact phrase is used nowhere else, except again of David in 17:42, language very similar to it is used most often to describe the beauty of women. Phrases such as a "beauty of ..." is used many times to describe beautiful women in the Old Testament.[84] Other than David, the

---

[79] See Greenspahn, *When Brothers Dwell Together*, 88.

[80] Cf. Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 49. Notably some of the wordplay is lost in the Greek in that the Greek reads, τοῦ ἐψέματος τοῦ πυρροῦ τούτου ("this red stew") as opposed to the Hebrew's האדם האדם הזה ("this red, red stuff"). The irony of the "red one" (πυρράκης), losing his birthright for some "red" (πυρρός) stew is nevertheless present.

[81] J. Cheryl Exum, *Song of Songs: A Commentary*, (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005), 203.

[82] Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 138.

[83] So *LEH* s.v. "καλλός;" and *BdA*, 287. *Cf.* Tsumura, *Samuel*, 423; Alter, *David Story*, 97; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 161; and Driver, *Samuel*, 134. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 275, emends the text to אדם ונעים ("ruddy and attractive"). I agree with Tsumura and Klein that, based on a similar phrase in 17:42 (which clearly alludes to the present phrase), the original wording should be retained, as the LXX does. Though cf. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 302, who argues that the existence of the similar phrase in 17:42 may imply textual change.

[84] See Gen. 12:11, 14; Gen. 28:17; Deut. 21:11; 1 Sam. 25:3; 2 Sam. 13:1; 14:27; 1 Kgs. 1:3, Esth. 2:7. Cf. Greenspahn, *When Brothers Dwell Together*, 88.

only other man in the LXX that is described in these terms is Joseph (Gen. 39:6, καλὸς τῷ εἴδει).[85] Joseph is not particularly noted for his warrior prowess. His beauty even becomes a significant problem for him. He is thrown in jail because his beauty entices Potiphar's wife (Gen. 39:7-20).[86] One gets the impression that, somewhat similar to contemporary culture, to refer to a man as a beauty (i.e., "beautiful of eyes" or "beautiful of form") may be something of a sideways compliment. It implies attractiveness but it also implies a quality that may not always be regarded as entirely positive for a man.[87]

The final description of this last son is that he is "good in appearance to the Lord" (ἀγαθὸς ὁράσει Κυρίῳ). This is different from the MT which reads, "good in appearance" (טוב ראי). Most commentators argue that the presence of "to the Lord" in the LXX is a pious insertion in order to make the description of this last son fit with the statement about the Lord not looking upon appearances but looking upon the heart in v. 7.[88] The inclusion of the phrase "to the Lord" on the one hand, emphasizes that this last son has divine approval as opposed to human approval, but on the other hand, it suggests that that divine approval is in some way on the basis of external looks.[89]

---

[85] Absalom in 2 Rgns. 14:25 is described as יפה ("fair"), but this is not present in many of the LXX mss (e.g., AMNa-jm-qs). However, given that 14:25 is within the *Kaige* section of Reigns, the presence of κάλος in the Lucianic mss (c₂e₂, and κάλλως in o), may support the possibility of this being in the OG.

[86] Absalom's beauty is also an important part of his story. See Avioz, "The Motif of Beauty," 351-52; and Macwilliam, "Male Beauty," 279-83.

[87] This suggestion may perhaps be somewhat mitigated by the recognition that this kind of language is found of men in Greek literature. For example Aeneus recounts his lineage to Achilles, mentioning Ganymedes who is described as "most fair" (κάλλιστος) and on account of his "beauty" (κάλλεος) is taken to be cupbearer to Zeus (*Il.* 20.232-35). Achilles describes himself as "beautiful" (κάλος) and tall or large (μέγας), holding both the concepts of beauty and impressive stature together (*Il.* 21.108). Thus, in Greek literature beauty seems to be a notable quality for a warrior. However, while this could possibly be in the mind of the translators, it is not evident that heroes in the Septuagint are to be understood in this regard. It is worth noting the importance of the theme of the "beauty" (καλός or κάλλος) of the *female* hero Judith (Judith 8:7; 10:7, 14, 19, 23; 11:21; 12:13; 16:6; 16:9).

[88] So Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 138-39; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 302; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 275; and Eslinger, "A Change of Heart," 357, n. 23. Though Macwilliam, "Male Beauty," 277, notes that the LXX actually accentuates the disparity between v. 12 and v. 7.

[89] Cf. Macwilliam, "Male Beauty," 277.

The reader must ask why the narrator would tell us so much about the appearance of this final son, whom we know will be the chosen one, when the reader was explicitly informed in v. 7 that the Lord looks upon the heart not the appearance of individuals. There are several options for understanding the good looks of this final son. First, the description of this last son could describe something of a paradox: God may judge by the heart, but divine approval and favor is often viewable by human standards.[90] Second, perhaps this son's good looks are just a lucky coincidence, or maybe even divine capitulation to human weakness.[91] Third, this final son's good looks could be in anticipation of the importance of David's attractiveness in the coming narratives, as character after character will be drawn to him.[92] Fourth, the attractiveness of this final son may be something of a test for Samuel. After being reprimanded by the Lord for his opinion of Eliab, Samuel sees another attractive lad but does not anoint him until he receives direction from the Lord.[93] Fifth, the appearance of this last son could be in contrast to the appearance of Saul and Eliab in order to show that his appearance, though attractive in some way, is in fact not something that would render him a viable option for kingship by human standards.[94]

In terms of the present narrative, options one and two do not commend themselves since they would weaken the impact of the key passage in v. 7. Option three is an important point in terms of the larger narrative. There is certainly something about David that is inherently attractive and winning, but this can only be seen in retrospect and does not explain

---

[90] See Kessler, "Narrative Technique," 551; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 276; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 161; Gordon, *Samuel*, 151; and Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 171. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 131, argues the negative of this option. He argues that this description proves that the assertion from v. 7 does not logically lead to the conclusion that "ugliness is a proof of ability."

[91] Gunn, *Fate of King Saul*, 78. Cf. also Rose, "Wisdom in 1 Samuel 16," 52.

[92] Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 123; Alter, *David Story*, 97. Herbert Rand, "The Biblical Concept of Beauty," *JBQ* 30/4 (2002): 211-15, notes that when a character is described as "beautiful" in the Bible it normally functions as an important characteristic in the narrative that follows.

[93] Garsiel, *Samuel*, 113-14.

[94] Greenspahn, *Brothers*, 87-88. Cf. Macwilliam, "Male Beauty," 276-79.

the discrepancy arising from v. 7. Option four is intriguing in that it continues the theme of "seeing" as discernment but it doesn't explain why the physical description of this last son is given in such different terms than Eliab and Saul. This leaves the reader with option five which, given its very limited acceptance, requires further support.

We have previously noted that the first two descriptors of the appearance of the eighth son, "ruddy" and "beautiful of eyes," are not as clearly positive as is often assumed, at least as descriptions of a warrior king. We noted that "ruddy," though most likely an attractive quality, does not necessarily imply virility or masculinity. As to the phrase "beautiful of eyes" we noted that this is a phrase more akin to typical descriptions of womanly beauty. Furthermore, it is worth looking briefly at the difference in the descriptions of appearance between this final son and Eliab and Saul.

Both Eliab and Saul have two aspects of their physical descriptions. One, they are described as in some sense tall. Eliab is described in 16:7 as having "great stature" (ἕξιν μεγέθους, trans. Heb. גבה קומה), and Saul is described twice as being "taller than anyone from the shoulder and up" (1 Rgns. 9:2; 10:23). Two, they are both described as having good appearance. It is said of Saul, in the context of describing his appearance, that he is "good" and most scholars and translations agree that this is in reference to his physical appearance (1 Rgns. 9:2).[95] The Lord tells Samuel not to look upon Eliab's appearance (1 Rgns. 16:7), which by implication, suggests that it is an attractive or impressive appearance in some way. Thus, the "good" appearance of Eliab and Saul are closely associated with their height and one may suggest that the "goodness" of their appearance comes from their size or the impressiveness of their stature. No other statements about their appearance are given.

---

[95] E.g., Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 80; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 173; Gordon, *Samuel*, 112; Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 79; and Avioz, "Motif of Beauty," 346-47. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 264, is one of the few scholars who argues that the reference to Saul's "goodness" here is in reference to his nature and personality.

By contrast, nothing is said of David's height except the hint in v. 11 that he is "the small one." This, as we noted, means youngest in the context, but certainly by association gives the reader the impression that he is not a big lad.[96] Instead, we are given detailed descriptions of David's actual appearance ("ruddy with beautiful eyes") in such a way that we think of the descriptions of beautiful women in the biblical narrative.[97] Thus, when we read that this last son is of "good appearance" (so MT) or "good appearance to the Lord" (so LXX) we do not associate this with his size but with his beauty. This suggests that the description of the appearance of this last son is such that he would not normally be judged, by human standards, as a good candidate for warrior king, who, it is assumed, should be of impressive stature. Instead, we are to think of this last son as small and pretty, perhaps in a boyish or womanly way. This is not an obvious candidate for king.

Reading the descriptions of this last son as attractive but inappropriate for a king fits the present narrative perfectly but it also paves the way for future themes of David's story. This description is a way of saying something good about David's appearance and hint at his attractiveness which will become evident as various characters will immediately love him, while still making good sense in a narrative which has downplayed physical appearance.

Immediately after the appearance of this last son the Lord tells Samuel "Arise and anoint David for this one is good" (Ἀνάστα καὶ χρῖσον τὸν Δαυείδ, ὅτι οὗτος ἀγαθός ἐστιν, v. 12b). Two differences mark this sentence apart from its Hebrew counterpart in the MT. First, the Hebrew simply says "arise and anoint him" (קום משחהו), while the Greek includes a reference to the name David. Second, in the MT, the Lord says of David, "for this is he"

---

[96] Cf. Alter, *David Story*, 97; and Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 131.
[97] Greenspahn, *When Brothers Dwell Together*, 88 and Macwilliam, "Male Beauty," 276-79.

(כִּי־זֶה הוּא), whereas the Greek has the qualification that "this one is good."[98] These Greek variants have an interesting effect upon the narrative.

First, when commenting on the Hebrew text scholars often note that David's name is not mentioned until the climactic moment when the spirit rushes upon him.[99] It could be that this feature allows the anticipation of David to be emphasized by not revealing his name until the very last minute but it is also interesting that the name of David is mentioned casually, as if the reader already knows about him.[100] In the LXX the introduction of David's name is in v. 12 rather than v. 13. The interesting effect of that is that the first time the reader hears the name David it is from the mouth of the Lord. The reader gets the impression, as in much of the previous narrative, that the Lord knew David before we are ever introduced to him.

Second, the addition of another qualification of David as "good" also has an interesting effect. We know that David was "good" of appearance to the Lord (v. 12a), but now David is referred to as "good" without qualification. This unqualified reference to David as "good" is a weighty pronouncement about his character from the mouth of the Lord. This pronouncement could also recall 1 Rgns. 15:28, where Samuel tells Saul that the Lord is giving Saul's kingdom to his neighbor who is *better* than he is (τῷ ἀγαθῷ ὑπὲρ σέ). This reference also hints at a theme which will be on display in the second half of this chapter when Saul is tormented by an "evil spirit" (πνεῦμα πονηρόν) and needs David who is "good of appearance" (16:18) to play music and make things "good" for Saul (16:16, 23).

---

[98] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 275, follows the MT in both of these variants. He notes that they are supported by LXX[L.] Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 302, also views both of these as insertions by the LXX.

[99] E.g., Smith, *Samuel*, 145; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 162; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 424.

[100] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 137. It is difficult to know what to make of the narrative's casual familiarity with the unintroduced David. On the one hand Eliab, Abinadab and Shammah are similarly inserted into the narrative without any introduction, so perhaps David should be viewed the same way. However, it could be argued that Eliab, Abinadab and Shammah are not true characters but merely narrative set pieces.

In v. 13 Samuel anoints (ἔχρισεν) David with his horn of oil (τὸ κέρας τοῦ ἐλαίου), creating an inclusio with the beginning of the chapter.[101] Samuel's mission was to take his horn of oil and anoint a king whom the Lord had seen among Jesse's sons. That mission is now complete.

Immediately after David is anointed "the spirit of the Lord came upon him from that day on" (καὶ ἐφήλατο πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπὶ Δαυεὶδ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης καὶ ἐπάνω). This exact phrase is used of Saul (1 Sam 11:6, predicted in 10:6) with the exception of the phrase "from that day on." This additional phrase suggests that the spirit's indwelling of David is of a slightly different kind than Saul's, or at the very least it reminds the reader that David's story does not end in divine abandonment, as Saul's story does.[102] The role of the spirit will become even more important in the second half of the chapter, but for now it functions as a climax of the present narrative. The chosen one of the Lord whom the reader has been waiting for at least since 1 Samuel 13 but implicitly since 1 Samuel 2 is now on the scene and indwelt by the spirit of the Lord. Samuel now arises and exits the scene for Ramah. His part in this particular narrative is over, and his role as a main character in the book of Samuel is also over—a clear signal that this is the end of the present pericope.[103]

3. Saul Sees David (16:14-23)

3.1. Saul's Spiritual Problem (vv. 14-18)

The scene now changes from Bethlehem to Saul's court. On the one hand, this begins a new story. On the other hand, the narrative feels as if it begins immediately where the last story

[101] Cf. Kessler, "Narrative Technique," 552; and Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 191.

[102] So Smith, *Samuel*, 147; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 162; and David G. Firth, *1 & 2 Samuel* (AOTC; Nottingham, England: Apollos, 2009), 184. Though Tsumura, *Samuel*, 423, argues that too much has been made of the sporadic vs. permanent nature of these two anointings of the spirit.

[103] Cf. Rose, "Wisdom in 1 Samuel 16," 52-53; Howard, "The Transfer of Power," 475-76; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 132-33; Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 171; Auld, *Samuel*, 186.

left off, such that the reader gets the impression more of a continuation of the previous story than a narrative break.

Having just heard that the "spirit of the Lord" came upon David (v. 13), we now hear that that same "spirit of the Lord" departed from Saul (v. 14). These are clearly interconnected events and the reader gets the impression that they are happening almost simultaneously, or as Alter has said, these two events form "a kind of spiritual seesaw."[104] Thus, the climax of the previous narrative becomes the impetus of the present narrative.[105]

As the spirit of the Lord leaves Saul, he is immediately seized by another spirit: "and an evil spirit from the Lord strangled him" (καὶ ἔπνιγεν[106] αὐτὸν πνεῦμα πονηρὸν παρὰ Κυρίου). McCarter argues that in the ancient world once a person was seized by a divine spirit they "can never again be free."[107] While this doesn't seem to fit the biblical portrayal, where people are seized by the spirit sporadically (cf. Judg. 13:25; 14:6, 19; 15:14; 1 Sam. 10:10; 11:6), the movement of the two spirits in Saul does seem to suggest that the one is filling the void left by the other.

A major difficulty in this verse, from a modern perspective at least, is what to make of an "evil spirit" that is specifically said to be "from the Lord." It could be that what is meant by an "evil spirit" is one who *does* evil rather than one who *is* evil.[108] This, however, seems to

---

[104] Alter, *David Story*, 98. See also Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 172; and Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 133.

[105] Cf. Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 191

[106] The verb πνίγω, which may mean "to choke" or "strangle" (*LEH*, *BDAG*), or perhaps the softer "to vex" (*GELS*), is not an obvious translation of בעת in the piel which means "to frighten" or "terrify" (see *HALOT*). LXX[L] translates בעת as συνέχω, which can mean "to cause distress" (*BDAG*). It seems clear that in the whole of the Greek Jewish Scriptures the translators are struggling with the translation of בעת, not a common word (16x in *BHS*), translating it variously as θαμβέω, "to amaze" (2 Sam. 22:5); βαπτίζω, "to baptize" (Isa. 20:4/21:4[MT]); ἐκταράσσω, "to throw into confusion" (Psa. 17:5); καταπλήσσω, "to terrify" (Job 7:14; 13:21); στροβέω, "to distress" (Job 9:34; 13:11; 33:7); ὄλλυμι, "to destroy" (Job 18:11); ταράσσω, "to trouble" (Esth. 7:6); θορυβέω, "to stir up trouble" (Dan. 8:17); and κατασπεύδω, "to make haste" (1 Chron. 21:30). The word בעת is clearly meant as a strong negative action (cf. Driver, *Samuel*, 134; Howard, "Transfer of Power," 476) and by translating it as πνίγω it is perhaps intended to convey a visual image of that tormenting action. Cf. *BdA*, 288.

[107] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 280-81.

[108] So Tsumura, *Samuel*, 426-28, though Tsumura's linguistic agument does not work in the Greek text which clearly sees πονηρὸν ("evil") as an adjective in the nominative case qualifying the noun πνεῦμα ("spirit").

be only marginally less difficult. While the concept of an evil spirit from the Lord may sound problematic, we should be cautious about understanding "evil" here in a moral sense. In Hebrew the noun רעה and the adjective רע frequently carry a meaning other than moral evil, such as "calamity," "misfortune," or just generally "bad."[109] The Septuagint uses πονηρός to translate רע and רעה almost exclusively and so the Greek word πονηρός takes on some of that nuance in the context of the Septuagint. Here, however it poses no problem in the narrative and is in fact essential to it. The evil spirit from the Lord is the instigating event that brings David to the court of Saul. The Lord, it seems, is clearing his path to the throne.[110]

The reader has been made aware of Saul's spiritual problem, but surprisingly in v. 15 Saul's servants are also aware of it. Saul's servants show remarkable insight when they say to him in v. 15, "Behold an evil spirit of the Lord is strangling you" (Ἰδοὺ δὴ πνεῦμα Κυρίου πονηρὸν πνίγει σε), using almost identical language to the narrator's previous statement.[111] In the first half of the chapter the main character, Samuel, failed to show the spiritual insight that we expected him to show as a Seer. In the present narrative Saul will also prove to lack insight into the real matter. It is interesting, therefore, that these unnamed servants of Saul (οἱ παῖδες Σαούλ) show such discernment into the reality of the situation. This likely functions as 1) a subtle critique of the characters we would expect to have better insight, 2) a convenient plot device alerting the reader to the deeper realities of what is going on in this scene and

_____

Supporting Tsumura's view is Daniel I. Block, "Empowered By the Spirit of God: The Holy Spirit in the Historiographic Writings of the Old Testament," *SBJT* 1/1 (1997): 47. See further Robin Routledge, "'An Evil Spirit From the Lord — Demonic Influence or Divine Instrument?" *EvQ* 70 (1998): 3-22; and Esther Hamori, "The Spirit of Falsehood," *CBQ* 72 (2010): 15-30.

[109] See *HALOT* and *TDOT* for many more possible meanings and many examples.

[110] Cf. Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 125; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 281. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 165, notes that such attributions of negative actions to the Lord are not uncommon (cf. Deut. 1:2-4; Judg. 9:23; 1 Kgs. 22:19-22; Amos 3:6; etc.).

[111] This is brought out more in the Greek. In the MT, the servant refers to the evil spirit as "of God" (אלהים), whereas the Greek more closely matches v. 14 by referring to the evil spirit as "from the Lord" (Κυρίου).

perhaps 3) a theological assertion that the Lord's works are discernible by humanity, though they may not always be obvious.[112]

The servants' proposed solution is to let them speak before Saul[113] and "seek (ζητέω) for our lord a man who knows how to play the lyre." Though in the present context the servants are seeking someone to play music for Saul, in the larger scope of the narrative we are reminded of 1 Rgns. 13:14 where the Lord was also seeking (ζητέω) a man—a man to whom we have been recently introduced.

The reason for this solution to Saul's problem is that the servants believe that when the evil spirit (πνεῦμα πονηρὸν) comes upon him, this musician will play his lyre and it will be well (ἀγαθός) with Saul and it will give him rest. So, while the Lord has brought Saul "evil" (πονηρός) his servants are now seeking a man who will bring Saul "good" (ἀγαθός). The further irony can be seen in that Saul will feel better (ἀγαθός) because of the person who is said to be better (ἀγαθός) than him (1 Rgns. 15:28).[114] The theme of David as one who is good was developed in the previous narrative and that theme continues as David is seen to be the one who brings good.

The LXX includes the additional phrase "and he will give you rest" (καὶ ἀναπαύσει σε).[115] This may be just another description of the relief Saul will get from the evil spirit. However, this could also be a subtle pun, which works in English as well. David will come to

---

[112] On the multiple layers of the servants' words see Benjamin J.M. Johnson, "David Then and Now: Double-Voiced Discourse in 1 Samuel 16:14-23," *JSOT* (forthcoming).

[113] LXX[B] places "our Lord" from the MT's "let now *our lord* speak to your servants before you" (יאמר־נא אדננו עבדיך לפניך) later in the phrase so that it becomes an indirect object rather than the subject of the verb: "let now your servants who are before you speak and let them seek *for our lord*" (εἰπάτωσαν δὴ οἱ δοῦλοί σου ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ζητησάτωσαν τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν). Many scholars prefer the reading attested in LXX[B] (so Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text Der Bücher Samuelis Untersucht* [Göttingen: 1871], 102; Driver, *Samuel*, 135; Smith, *Samuel*, 149), though others prefer the MT, which is also supported by LXX[L] (McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 279-80; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 429). Neither reading does much to change the interpretation of the text.

[114] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 172-73.

[115] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 280, suggests that והנחה לך ("and it will be release to you") was lost by haplography.

give Saul rest through his music, but his coming to Saul's court begins his downfall and will lead to him being put to rest.[116]

Saul responds positively to his servants' advice and tells them to "See (ὁράω) for me a man who plays well and bring him to me." As we noted, the previous scene contained a significant wordplay with the concept of seeing, most predominantly using the verb ὁράω. Now that theme is carried forward with this significant use here. Where the servants asked to seek (ζητέω) someone Saul asks them to see (ὁράω) someone. This use of the verb "to see" meaning "to provide" is parallel with the Lord's use of this word in 1 Rgns. 16:1, where he says "I have seen (ὁράω) for myself a king." Thus Saul's quest for a musician is put in parallel with the Lord's quest for a king, both of whom turn out to be the same person.[117]

In response, one of his servants speaks up and says "Behold I have seen (ὁράω) a son of Jesse the Bethlehemite" (16:18). The formulation, Ἴδετε ἑόρακα, gives the impression of the servant saying, "Behold, I have already seen a son of Jesse." Just like the servant, the reader too has already seen a son of Jesse, in fact the reader has spent a good deal of time looking for and looking at this son of Jesse.[118] The servant notes that he is able to play music. However, he does not say, "he knows how to play music" which would be a possible translation of the Hebrew ידע נגן (participle plus infinitive construct), instead he says, "he knows a psalm" (αὐτὸν εἰδότα ψαλμόν). The translator has previously translated the verbal forms of נגן ("to play music") with a verbal form of ψάλλω (16:16, 17). Now here, when David is specifically referenced, he translates the verbal נגן with the noun form ψαλμόν. For a reader who knows that David will be known as the psalmist of Israel, it is difficult not to read

---

[116] On the possibility of ἀναπαύω meaning "put to rest," as in death, see Sir. 22:11 (cf. *LEH*).
[117] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 138; Alter, *David Story*, 98; Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 173.
[118] The phrase "I have seen a son of Jesse" also recalls the Lord's statements in 16:1. Cf. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 166; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 136; and Rose, "Wisdom in 1 Samuel 16," 51.

this as an ironic understatement, i.e., "he knows a psalm or two." The reader is introduced to David in such a way that it recalls the David of later tradition.[119]

If Saul's servant were to stop at a reference to the musical abilities of this "son of Jesse" it would be an adequate description of a man capable of performing the job that Saul requires. But he does not stop there. Instead he continues and gives a much fuller list of the qualifications of this son of Jesse: he is "an intelligent man, and a man of war, and wise in words, and a man of good appearance, and the Lord is with him." These descriptions require some attention.

In the LXX the servant describes David as an "intelligent man" ($\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\eta}\rho$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$). The MT, on the other hand, describes him as a "mighty man of valor" (גבור חיל). Though an intentional change is possible it is also possible that the reading of $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ reflects an inner Greek corruption from $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$.[120] Though both intelligence and warrior prowess are described later in the list, the LXX reading creates an interestingly different emphasis on David's "wisdom."

The next qualification of this son of Jesse is that he is a "man of war" ($\dot{o}$ $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\eta}\rho$ $\pi o\lambda\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$). This description has caused no end of difficulty for interpreters. It seems to

---

[119] See Johnson, "David Then and Now."

[120] In all of the LXX this is the only place where חיל is translated with $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$. Elsewhere $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is used to translate some form of חכמה, בין or ידע. The term חיל is translated with $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma/\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (16x); $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\varsigma$ (2x); and $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ only here. It is plausible that the original reading was $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ which was corrupted to $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ (cf. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 308; and *BdA*, 290). This possibility is strengthened when we considerer LXX^{A}, which reads $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\nu\eta\rho$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau o\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ o $\alpha\nu\eta\rho$ $\pi o\lambda\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau o\varsigma$ $\lambda o\gamma\omega$ ("a man of wisdom, a man of war, and wise in words"). And while this reading could well be due to the Hexaplaric influence on LXX^{A}, it is possible that a scribe, faced with a text similar to LXX^{A}, could have misheard/misread $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ as $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in anticipation of the $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ that follows. The only manuscript evidence for the reading of $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is a late 15th century MS labeled 242 by the Cambridge edition (they are citing this on the authority of Holmes and Parsons, the manuscript is labeled Vienna, Theol. Gr. 135). If $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is a variant reading it must have happened very early because the MSS support for $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is extremely well represented. Another interesting textual variant that suggests something along the lines that we are suggesting here is the plus of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\nu\eta\rho$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau o\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ o $\alpha\nu\eta\rho$ $\pi o\lambda\epsilon\mu\iota\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\underline{\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau o\varsigma}$ $\underline{\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\iota}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau o\varsigma$ $\lambda o\gamma\omega$ in one manuscript of the Antiochene tradition (MS b). This variant seems likely a product of the classic Antiochene doublets, which suggests that this Antiochene text knew of a tradition that had $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau o\varsigma$ and probably $\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\varsigma$ in this verse somewhere (both of these words are likely translations of חיל). Furthermore, when 1 Sam. 9:1 refers to Saul's father Kish as a "mighty man of valor," LXX translates that as $\dot{\alpha}\nu\dot{\eta}\rho$ $\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$.

contradict both the previous scene where David is pictured as a youth and the following scenes where Saul will tell David that he is too young to fight Goliath (17:33) and Goliath will despise David because of his youth (17:42). Scholars, therefore have offered several options for what this phrase could mean. 1) It could simply mean that he is of proper age and means to serve in the military or in Saul's court.[121] 2) It could refer to his father as a man of war.[122] 3) It could in fact mean that he is trained in war or one who is known for his military exploits.[123] 4) It could be that the narrator is describing David as the tradition will come to know him, as the slayer of Goliath and the great warrior, not as he is at the present.[124]

As an interpretation, option 2 does not commend itself. It is based on an analogy with Kish the father of Saul who is said to be a "mighty man of valor" (9:1) as David is in the MT. However, the text makes it clear in 9:1 that it is referring to Kish not Saul, whereas the text in 16:18 is clearly referring to David. Option 1 seems possible, and some of the uses of "man of war" in the Old Testament could be read this way (e.g., Judg. 20:17), but often it seems to be used to describe especially mighty warriors (e.g., Josh 17:1; 2 Sam. 17:18) and thus is a difficult case to make. Option 3 requires understanding the present narrative as having a different textual history than 16:1-13 and much of 17. This would explain how the text came to be in the shape that it is currently in,[125] but it does little to help explain how the present text should be understood. Option 4 has much to commend it and is the view that most literary

---

[121] Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 176. Cf. Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 141.

[122] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 429-30.

[123] Smith, *Samuel*, 149; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 281; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 166.

[124] Willis, "Redactional Joint," 295-300; Cf. also Fokkelman, 137; Gordon, *Samuel*, 153; Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 125-26; Alter, *David Story*, 99. Cf. the proposal of chronological disjunction by Firth, "That the World May Know," 21-24.

[125] E.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 295-98; and Pisano, *Additions Or Omissions*, 84-86.

critics of this chapter take.[126] This option, however, does require reading backwards into this narrative information that is detailed only later.

A solution to this problem both in terms of the present narrative and the larger narrative presentation of David seems to be as follows. In terms of the present narrative the reader could readily interpret Saul as understanding the phrase "man of war" as meaning option 1. We know that Saul was on the look out for able bodied men, described in 14:52 as any "strong man" (ἄνδρα δυνατόν) or any "man a son of might" (ἄνδρα υἱὸν δυνάμεως). These terms are used in parallel with "man of war" in Josh. 8:3; 10:7; 2 Sam. 17:8; Isa. 3:2 and elsewhere. So while David's "smallness" and "youth" has indeed been emphasized, at least in comparison to the towering Saul, this young man could still be considered able to serve militarily. On a broader level, however, we must remember that these narratives were written, at least in their final form, for readers who already know the stories. The assumed reader of this text knows David, the warrior king, so this reference to him as a "man of war" functions to foreshadow David's destiny. Furthermore, as we will have cause to notice shortly when we discuss the function of these descriptions in the narrative, this young servant sees more than the reader expects him to. He, like the other servants who perceived Saul's spiritual predicament in 16:15, is functioning on multiple levels. He is referencing David as he is in the current narrative, but he is also referencing David as he will come to be known.[127]

The next phrase describes David as "wise in words" (σοφὸς λόγῳ). McCarter notes that "the ideal Israelite hero was clever with words."[128] David will certainly prove himself to be one who is full of witty remarks (cf. 17:43[LXX], 45-47; 24:14).[129]

[126] Though I am reticent to go as far as Willis, "Redactional Joints," esp., 300-02, in seeing such detailed anticipatory material in this narrative. Rather, it seems that some of the material may be foreshadowing or detailing David as the later tradition knows him.

[127] See further Johnson, "David Then and Now."

[128] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 281, comparing David to Jacob, Joseph, Esther and Daniel.

[129] Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 176, notes that this phrase "may indicate training in rhetoric or the wisdom to give good counsel."

The next phrase describes him as "a man of good appearance" (ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς τῷ εἴδει).

The reader already knows that David is "good of appearance" (ἀγαθὸς ὁράσει, 16:12), but now

it is announced to Saul. The LXX reflects a slight difference from the MT which simply

refers to David as "a man of form" (איש תאר).[130] McCarter simply thinks that the LXX

reflects the fuller form of the phrase as is found in 1 Kgs. 1:6.[131] In this narrative, however, it

allows for another instance of David being referred to as "good" (ἀγαθός). David, who is the

good one, brings *good* to the king who suffers from an *evil* spirit.

The final phrase, which seems almost like the climactic qualification in this incredible

resumé is that "the Lord is with him" (καὶ Κύριος μετ' αὐτοῦ).[132] In the immediate context this

phrase is meant to explain to Saul that this person is perhaps favored, or blessed by the

Lord.[133] However, to the reader it sounds a very ominous tone because it reminds the reader

that the Lord is *not* with Saul. Furthermore, the fact that the Lord is with David will become

something of a *Leitmotiv* throughout the stories of 1 Reigns.[134]

David has now been presented before Saul and the reader in all his glory. Once again

we must marvel at the servants' spiritual insight. In giving a resumé of David that goes above

and beyond what we know of him in the current context,[135] the servant has sealed David's

---

[130] This phrase is similar to the descriptions that we noted above that predominantly refer to women in the Old Testament. Though cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 430.

[131] See McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 280. It is difficult to know whether the LXX reflects some fuller expression. The phrase טוב־תאר ("good of form") is used only once in *BHS* (1 Kgs. 1:6) and is translated as ὡραῖος τῇ ὄψει, which is part of the *kaige* portion of 1-4 Kgdms and of little use. The normal biblical expression is יפת־תאר ("fair of form") and is translated most often as some form of καλός + εἶδος and is again of little use. It may well be that MT could have had טוב here (thus David would be described very similarly to Adonijah in 1 Kgs. 1:6), it may also be that LXX has inserted ἀγαθός here because 1) it is implied by the Hebrew phrase and 2) it allows for a greater association with David as "the good one" (ἀγαθός) who makes all things "good" (ἀγαθός) for Saul, which is the great irony because he will be the cause of great "evil" (πονηρός) for Saul eventually (cf. 1 Rgns. 18:8).

[132] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates,* 136, notes that a word count of 16:14-23 (MT) shows the word "with him" to be the exact middle word.

[133] Cf. Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 176, who suggests this may have an almost secular sense as "a well favored young man."

[134] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 281. Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 430.

[135] Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 125-26, notes that the servant "overnominates David" and that "David overpowers the job—and the narrative."

access to the royal court as well as hinted to the reader the many impressive characteristics

that David will show throughout his career. Bodner compares this servant to Saul's servant

who accompanies him on his search for his father's donkeys. Both servants are referred to as

"one of the lads" (ἓν/εἶς τῶν παιδαρίων, 1 Rgns. 9:3, 16:18). He notes,

> both servant lads are knowledgeable about people who live out of town (Samuel and
> David), and both servant lads speak *way too much*. Both servant lads are cognizant of
> things that Saul is not, and in both cases the servant lad takes initiative. . . . There is one
> slight difference: the lad of chap. 9 speaks *about* a prophet, whereas the lad of chap. 16
> speaks *like* a prophet.[136]

Thus, by the actions of these two lads Saul is directed first, to his own anointing, and second,

to welcome the new anointed one into his court who will eventually replace him. The actions

and insights of these unnamed lads suggest that God is directing this narrative, even when his

actions are not explicitly mentioned.[137]

Furthermore, it is clear that these unnamed servants are speaking beyond the surface

level of this story. As Bruegemann has noted, on the surface, this story is about the solution to

Saul's spiritual problem, but at a deeper level or on the level of the larger narrative this story

is about David's rise to power.[138] It is this deeper or macrostructural level of narration on

which the unnamed servants appear to be operating. Chapter 16 is in the nexus between the

stories of Saul and the stories of David. David has not yet functioned as a real character.[139]

However, he is the driving force of each of these narratives in such a way that the reader

knows that the story is all about him, even if he hasn't been very present in either of these

narratives.

---

[136] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 173, italics original. Cf. Alter, *David Story,* 98.

[137] Cf. Ferdinand Deist, "Coincidence as a Motif of Divine Intervention in 1 Samuel 9," *OTE* 6/1 (1993): 7-18; Jonathan Jacobs, "The Role of Secondary Characters in the Story of the Anointing of Saul (I Samuel IX-X)," *VT* 58 (2008): 495-509.

[138] Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 124.

[139] To use Adele Berlin's terminology, David is not yet a full-fledged character, at this point he merely functions as an agent, or perhaps more appropriately as an object (see *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* [Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983], 23-42, esp. 32).

3.2. The Arrival of David (vv. 19-23)

Just as chapter 16 began with the Lord sending (ἀποστέλλω) Samuel to Jesse to anoint David, Saul now sends (ἀποστέλλω) messengers to Jesse to collect David. He asks Jesse to "send to me your son David, the one who is among your flock." It is interesting that Saul mentions the two pieces of information that were not included in v. 18: David's name and his role as a shepherd.[140] This fact could imply that a full investigation was carried out, but nothing of this is mentioned in the narrative and the text seems to imply that Saul sent for David immediately after hearing the young lad's report. We noticed previously that David's introduction into the narrative seemed to treat him as an entity already well known to the reader. The same here happens with Saul. It is as if Saul already knew of David. This makes Saul the first person in the present narrative to name David and while this is often noted, little is made of it.[141]

That Saul is the first person to name David in this narrative highlights the irony that Saul is the one who welcomes David, his future rival, into his court. He invites him by name. Furthermore, the fact that Saul seems to be privy to *some* of the information about David highlights the information that Saul is lacking, i.e., that David is anointed of the Lord as his chosen king.[142]

Jesse responds to Saul's summons by sending David with several gifts. He sends "a donkey and places on it a gomor of bread,[143] a skin of wine and a kid of the goats" (16:20).

---

[140] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 174. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 311, sees this as a harmonization. However, it seems more likely that if a harmonization was meant between David the shepherd of 16:1-14 and David the warrior of the later narratives, this information would have been put on the lips of the servant not Saul.

[141] Cf. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 166; Cartledge, *Samuel*, 209. Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 126, says that "It is appropriate and compelling that Saul knows it [David's name] and is the first to name him." However, what Brueggemann finds "appropriate and compelling" he does not say.

[142] Cf. Cartledge, *Samuel*, 209.

[143] This reading is following LXX^L. LXX^B reads γόμορ ἄρτων ("a gomor of bread"). MT however reads חמור לחם (lit., "a donkey of bread"). Obviously this is quite a discrepancy in meaning. It must be noted that,

These items: bread, a skin of wine, and a kid of the goats, recall the three men that Samuel

told Saul he would encounter as a sign of his anointing (10:3). Thus, in a sense, David "is

beginning anew the process on which Saul launched."[144]

As soon as David arrives on the scene the action speeds up, signaled by four

successive verbs: "And David came . . . and he stood . . . and he loved . . . and he was."[145] So

David comes to Saul and he stands before him, and Saul loves him, or does David love Saul?

The text is not exactly clear. LXX[L] supplies the subjects in this phrase, "and Saul loved him"

(και ηγαπησεν αυτον Σαουλ). This line of interpretation is certainly a possible and popular

way to read this phrase.[146] It would fit the overall pattern in the narrative in which everybody

loves David (Jonathan, Michal, and "all Israel and Judah").[147] However, as Wong points out,

the grammatical context of a rapid succession of four verbs without noting a change in

subject suggests that David may be the subject of the verb "loved," and it is he that loves

Saul.[148] This would fit the theme of David's loyalty to Saul and his house that is developed

---

phonetically, the Hebrew חמור ("donkey") and עמר ("omer") are quite similar, especially given the pronunciation of the *ayin* in antiquity (see Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 251). This, however, doesn't help determine whether an amount of bread or the means of transporting the bread and other gifts is meant here. McCarter argues that LXX[L], supported by OL, reflects the original reading: και ελαβεν Ιεσσαι ονον και επεθηκεν αυτω γομορ αρτων ("and Jesse sent a donkey and placed on it a gomor of bread"). McCarter argues that MT and LXX[B] have each lost part of the original due to haplography and the similarity between חמור and עמר (McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 280; cf. also Auld, *Samuel*, 189; for a different explanation see Smith, *Samuel*, 150).Tsumura, *Samuel*, 431, on the other hand argues that McCarter's and LXX's attempts at emendation are uneccessary. He argues that an omer "is about the size of a modern loaf and would be too small an amount to take to a king as a gift." Instead, Tsumura suggests that the term חמור here is "a *calque* (loan translation) of the Akkadian *imēru* 'ass'-measure of about 80-160 liters. He further notes that a 'homer' is how much a donkey can carry (Tsumura, *Samuel*, 431 and idem, "*Ḥămôr Leḥem* (1 Sam xvi 20)," *VT* 42/3 [1992]: 412-14). Tsumura's appeal to an Akkadian loanword is possible, but there do not appear to be other instances of this use of חמור. Furthermore, Tsumura's contention that an omer would be too small for a gift to a king doesn't convince because the other gifts are similarly small, "a skin of wine" and a "kid of the goats." It seems rather that the gifts are intended to be more ceremonial than a serious monetary contribution. Thus, it seems much more likely that McCarter's explanation of haplography is the preferable view.

[144] Alter, *David Story*, 99. This scene is also similar to 17:17-18 (not present in the LXX) where David brings provisions to his brothers and their captains, including bread. Thus, in the MT the two times David arrives on the national scene he is bringing provisions.

[145] Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 431, who notes that in the Hebrew this is shown by the four successive *wayyiqtol* forms.

[146] E.g., Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 142; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 280; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 167; Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 126; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 432; Bodner, *1 Samuel,* 174.

[147] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 174; Auld, *Samuel*, 190.

later in the book of Reigns. The text may be intentionally ambiguous here. Seeing David as

the one loving Saul may be the most grammatically obvious reading, but Saul loving David

seems to be the most obvious in the larger narrative.[149] Whatever the case, what is established

here is a relationship of love between David and Saul. This heightens the drama that will

come about as that relationship becomes more and more strained.

We must also pause and consider what exactly "love" means in this context. It is often

noted that "love" has political overtones and means something like "political allegiance." So

Saul is declaring himself to be David's lord (or David is declaring himself to be Saul's loyal

vassal).[150] On the other hand, the concept of "love" can simply be read as some sort of

affection or fondness of Saul for David (or vice versa).[151] The question is: are these two

options mutually exclusive? If we think of the use of "love" here in terms of the more

ambiguous, though in some sense more concrete, idea of loyalty it can perhaps fit both of

these options.[152] People show loyalty both for political reasons as well as for reasons of

affection. It seems to me that to force a choice between a political or affectionate use of the

word "love" robs this word of its explanatory power in regards to the relationship between

David and Saul.

---

[148] G.C.I. Wong, "Who Loved Whom? A Note on 1 Samuel XVI 21," *VT* 47/4 (1997): 554-56.

[149] Cf. the theme of everyone loving David in ch. 18 as well as the general theme of opacity in the characterization of David in much of his story. See Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 143-62.

[150] So J.A. Thompson, "The Significance of the Verb Love in the David-Jonathan Narratives in 1 Samuel," *VT* 24/3 (1974): 334-338; followed by McCarter, 281-82. Cf. W.L. Moran "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy," *CBQ* 25/1 (1963): 81-82, who reads political overtones of the love of the people for David in 1 Sam. 18:16.

[151] So Tsumura, *Samuel*, 432; and Gordon, *Samuel*, 153.

[152] Cf. Uriah Y. Kim, *Identity and Loyalty in the David Story: A Postcolonial Reading* (HBM 22; Sheffield, Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008), 78, who describes this relationship as a *ḥesed*-relationship or an "honor-based relationship." On Kim's view of a *ḥesed*-relationship see pp. 31-60. On the use of the word ἀγαπάω in the Septuagint as a broad term for "love" covering a wide range of applications see S.P. Swinn, "Ἀγαπᾶν in the Septuagint," in *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography* (ed. Takamitsu Muraoka; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990), 49-82.

David now becomes Saul's armor bearer. While it is often noted that David was probably one of many armor bearers,[153] it seems that the narrative is painting a picture of a close relationship between David and Saul. Perhaps we are to call to mind the closeness of relationship between Jonathan and his armor bearer (ch. 14). Whatever the case, David is well established as a popular member of Saul's court.

Now in v. 22 Saul sends word to Jesse with one more request concerning David: "Let David stand before me" (Παριστάσθω δὴ Δαυεὶδ ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ). Clearly some change in David's status before Saul is in mind but what exactly is meant is difficult to say. It could be, though this is not clearly signaled in the text, that this request is to make David a more permanent member of Saul's court.[154] Or it could be that v. 21 was something of an interview and v. 22 is the request to Jesse for David's employment in the court of Saul.[155] The phrase is the same in both cases, παρίστημι + ἐνώπιον. Whatever the case, this is a request for David to enter his service.

The reason for Saul's request of David's employment is that "he has found favor in my eyes" (εὖρεν χάριν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς μου). The theme of "seeing" continues to be emphasized as David has now found favor in Saul's *eyes*. David now appears to be approved of by all parties, his heart is right in God's eyes, he is attractive to the eye, and he has found favor in Saul's eyes. David has now been judged to be good according to the Lord and according to Saul. If in some sense the Lord was king before Saul (cf. 1 Rgns. 8:7), and Saul was king before David, David now has approval of both.

---

[153] So Tsumura, *Samuel*, 432; and Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 140. However, the LXX phrase "and he became *his* armor bearer" vs. the MT's "and he became an armor bearer" suggests, to my mind at least, that the LXX understands this as being a more specific role than just one of many.

[154] So Klein, *1 Samuel*, 167; and Gordon, *Samuel*, 152.

[155] So presumably Tsumura, *Samuel*, 432, though Tsumura's comments on v. 21 and v. 22 seem to be somewhat in conflict.

The narrative now ends with a summative verse dictating what *would* happen now that this relationship between Saul and David is established. That this verse describes a summary of actions that would happen repeatedly is signaled by the verbal pattern of γίνομαι followed by a temporal clause (ἐν + Inf.) followed by a series of imperfect verb forms. So it would be that when the evil spirit[156] would come upon Saul, David would take up and play (note again the quick succession of verbs) and Saul would be refreshed,[157] and it would be well with him. The narrative notes again that David's actions bring "good" (ἀγαθός) to Saul.

But in addition to rest, and good, David's playing would also bring about the final action of the narrative "and the evil spirit would depart (ἀφίστατο) from him [Saul]." This pericope began with the spirit of the Lord departing (ἀφίστημι) from Saul. It now ends, because of David, with the evil spirit departing (ἀφίστημι) from him. The narrative has come full circle, and it is all because of David. Because the spirit of the Lord came upon David in 16:13, the spirit of the Lord departed Saul and an evil spirit came upon him in 16:14. Now, because David plays music for Saul the evil spirit departs from him.[158]

4. Conclusion: Seeing David

We have looked at some length at the narrative of 1 Reigns 16. We are now in a place to comment upon the particular themes and emphases that this story addresses. We will first

---

[156] Note the LXX's "evil spirt" (πνεῦμα πονηρὸν) compared to the MT's "spirit of God" (רוח־אלהים). LXX[L] appears to be combining these two readings with παρα θεου πονηρον πνευμα. *BHS* notes that several MSS add רעה, but this, as well as the natural theological discomfort with equating רוח הרעה with רוח אלהים, may suggest conflation. Cf. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 308; and McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 280.

[157] Klein, *1 Samuel*, 167; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 433, note the pun in Hebrew between רָוַח ("respite") and רוּחַ ("spirit"). Though the pun doesn't quite work in the Greek, the fact that the translators used the word ἀναψύχω ("to refresh"), a word that is never used to translate רָוַח elsewhere, but is related to the word ψυχή ("soul," "life," or "self," cf. Louw & Nida, §§26.4, 26.9), which is a related concept to πνεῦμα suggests that the translator may have been doing his best to reproduce the Hebrew pun.

[158] Cf. Alter, *David Story*, 100; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 433.

address the themes that are present in the narrative regardless of which version one is reading before turning to look at the special emphasis of the Greek text.

4.1. Themes of 1 Reigns 16

Several elements in this narrative, not least the beginning, caused the reader to recall Saul's story: 1) Samuel mourns over Saul and the Lord reminds him that he has rejected Saul (16:1); 2) the Lord's call to Samuel to anoint someone with a horn of oil (16:1) recalled Saul's anointing; 3) the various ways that sacrifices were used in the story recalled several elements of sacrifice in Saul's story; 4) the use of Eliab and his great stature portrayed him as a second Saul (16:6-7); 5) the spirit coming upon David (16:13) recalled the spirit coming upon Saul; 6) David's bringing gifts (16:20) recalled the items carried by the men who were a sign to Saul.

These various elements cause the reader to read the beginning of David's story in juxtaposition with Saul's story. So that, more than simply preceding David's story, Saul's story, especially his failures, are the impetus for David's story. Also, by causing the reader to recall the anointing of Saul, these elements suggest that David's anointing is somehow restarting what was started with Saul.

We observed there was a repeated motif of sending in this chapter. The story begins with the Lord *sending* Samuel for David (16:1). After none of Jesse's sons are chosen Samuel tells Jesse to *send* for David (16:11-12). In the second half of the chapter, Saul *sends* a messenger to Jesse, asking him to *send* David to him (16:19). Jesse *sends* gifts in David's hand to Saul (16:20). Then, after being quite taken with David, Saul *sends* a messenger to Jesse asking that David might enter his service (16:22).

This motif of sending brings out a couple of interesting themes. First, in 16:1-13 the Lord himself sends for David, and this is the cause of the rest of the sendings in the first half of the chapter. The Lord is directly the initiator of the action in 16:1-13. In 16:14-23 it is the presence of the evil spirit of the Lord that causes Saul to send for David. Thus Saul, at the suggestion of his unnamed servants, is the initiator in sending for David in 16:14-23. The Lord is still the initiator of the action in the second half of the chapter, but in an indirect way. Second, all of this sending is always centered around David so that, though David is not on the scene all that often in this chapter, he remains the center of attention because the action is always, in a sense, seeking him.

Another element that plays a key role in this chapter is the concept of seeing. In the 16:1-13 the Lord tells Samuel that he has *seen* (or provided) for himself a king among Jesse's sons (16:1). As soon as Samuel *sees* Eliab he assumes that this is the Lord's anointed (16:6). The Lord then reprimands Samuel for this and explains that the Lord does not *see* as humankind *sees*. Humankind *looks* upon the eyes, but the Lord *looks* upon the heart (16:7). Great descriptions are given of the outward appearance of Eliab and David. Then, in 16:14-23 Saul tells his servants to *see* (or provide) for him a person to play music for him (16:17). One of his servants immediately tells him that he has already *seen* the person for the job, David (16:18). Finally, we note that David finds favor in Saul's eyes (16:22).

This web of seeing and appearance has more than one function in this narrative. First, it touches on the theme of providence and election. The Lord has seen/provided David as a king for himself. Almost perfectly parallel to that act is Saul's request to see/provide for himself a musician, who turns out to be David. Immediately after that request one of his servants says he has *seen* David. The Lord had seen David and so had Samuel anoint him.

Similarly, one gets the impression that the Lord caused this unnamed servant to see David and commend him to Saul.

Second, the concept of seeing emphasizes the difference between human and divine criteria. Samuel looks upon Eliab's height and mistakenly thinks he will be the Lord's anointed. This causes perhaps the most poetic section of the whole narrative where the Lord contrasts human seeing with divine seeing. Humans look upon the exteriors, but God looks upon the heart. This means that the Lord is not looking for impressive stature but a person whose heart and will strive to do what is in the Lord's heart.

Third, the concept of seeing emphasizes the theme of discernment. Samuel is reprimanded in 16:7 for not being able to see/discern the kind of person the Lord would chose as his anointed king. Saul asks for his servants to see/provide for him a musician, but instead they see/discern David and the kind of person he is or will be is evident from his overly impressive resumé (16:18). Throughout the narrative the characters we would expect to show insight or discernment do not and it is the unnamed characters who show insight and discernment into the "heart" of the matter.

Another key element that we saw in this story was the movement of the spirits. The climax of 16:1-13 is the coming of the spirit upon David. This proves to be the impetus for the action in 16:14-23 as the spirit of the Lord departs Saul and an evil spirit from the Lord comes upon him. The action proceeds until the evil spirit departs from Saul, albeit temporarily, because of the actions of David.

On the one hand, this movement of the spirits shows the divine approval of David and the divine disapproval of Saul. On the other hand, the movement of spirits also shows God's hand guiding this story because it is the movement of the spirits that is the catalyst for the

narrative in 16:14-23, which ends with David, the future king, being accepted into the royal court of Israel.

A final narrative element is the play of good and evil: the Lord brings and declares both, Saul receives one and David is and brings the other. That the Lord brings evil upon Saul and declares that David is good implies that he is both the providential actor in this story as well as the judge and jury. Both of these are appropriate assertions about God as far as Israel's Scriptures are concerned. That Saul receives evil from the Lord puts him on the bad side of the narrative. Whether Saul's reception of evil is deserved or it makes him a tragic character is beyond the scope of this analysis. But it identifies him as the antagonist and as the polar opposite of David. That David is repeatedly declared as good and seen as the bringer of good to Saul implies 1) that he is divinely approved by the Lord who refers to him as good and 2) that he is a force for good in the narrative. He is, or will be, the protagonist who is on the side of the Lord.

4.2. Special Emphases of the Greek Text

The version of the story in 1 Reigns 16 is only slightly different from the version of the story in MT. However, that does not mean that the reading experience is identical between the Hebrew and the Greek nor that the story in both versions has the same emphases. Though the difference between the two versions is slight, that difference does nuance story. The following are a few of the potentially more significant differences between the Greek and Hebrew version of the story. These differences are judged not by whether or not they were intended, which is often difficult to discern, but the effect they have upon the narrative.

In two different places in the Greek text there is an extra reference to seeing. In 16:4, Samuel is addressed as "O Seer" in the Greek text only. This emphasizes the irony that the

Seer does not see/discern rightly. In 16:7 the LXX has an additional reference to seeing when it says "for not as humankind will see, *will God see*" (italics Gk. only). This is a more explicit contrast between divine seeing and human seeing that is not present in the MT.

In the MT, David is declared of good appearance (16:12) and he brings good to Saul (16:23). However, in the Greek text David is not just of good appearance, but of good appearance *to the Lord* (16:12). Then, when in the MT the Lord simply declares "this is he" (זה הוא), the Greek records the Lord declaring "this one is good" (οὗτος ἀγαθός ἐστιν). Not only do these two variations add an unqualified good to David's descriptions but they connect David's goodness to the Lord so that his goodness appears linked to his divine approval in some way.

A few final variations will complete our observations on the special emphasis of the Greek text. In the MT the reader first learns David's name from the narrator at the climactic coming of the spirit of the Lord upon him (16:13), in the LXX David's name is first pronounced by the Lord (16:12) hinting at the Lord's knowledge of David even before the narrator reveals his name. In the MT Samuel invites the elders to "sanctify yourselves and come with me to the sacrifice." But in the Greek he says, "sanctify yourselves and rejoice with me today." We noted that this reference to rejoicing (εὐφραίνω) in this context recalls Hannah's song, which connects the event of the anointing of David to the prophetic message of kingship in Hannah's song. Finally, in addition to the MT's statement that the musician will make things well with Saul, the LXX includes an additional phrase that notes the musician will give him rest, which is possibly a subtle pun hinting at the fact that David's coming to Saul's court begins the sequence of events that will eventually put him to rest.

There is not really any new theme in 1 Reigns 16. However, there is a slight adjustment in emphasis, especially regarding the two extra usages of seeing and the extra connection of David's "goodness" to God's approval of him. The Greek translators are certainly telling the same story, but they have included, perhaps intentionally, perhaps unintentionally, a few elements that allow for a subtle nuance of that story. In any version this is a masterful story at a critical nexus in the early chapters of the story of Israel's monarchy. Having studied the narrative in 1 Reigns 16 we are now prepared for the narratives that will follow in chs. 17-18.

CHAPTER 3

DAVID AND THE GIANT IN MONOMAXῙΑ: 1 SAMUEL 17 IN GREEK

1. Introduction

We come now to the centerpiece of the narrative under examination. Not only does this chapter contain the greatest bulk of the story, the central set-piece of the confrontation between David and Goliath, but it also contains the greatest degree of variance between the OG and the MT traditions. According to Emanuel Tov's count 44% of the narrative in MT is not represented in the OG, as reflected in LXX[B].[1] As we have noted, our primary focus of investigation is the Greek text of 1 Samuel 16-18 and our method for reading the Greek text of 1 Samuel 16-18 is reading it as its own literary document and also as a translation of a Hebrew *Vorlage.* Thus, though we will read the Greek text with reference to its source text we will not comment on the major OG minuses in this chapter. We do this for two reasons.

First, it is not my intention to pass judgment on the priority of either version of this story, and reading the Greek version against the Hebrew pluses implicitly suggests that the MT version was original while the Greek version was a later abbreviation. To faithfully read the OG version of 1 Samuel 17 as a translation may require that it be read against an assumed short Hebrew text. Second, several of the major OG minuses occur in chapter 18. Since these major minuses make a significant difference to the larger structural flow of the whole narrative unit in chs. 16-18, we will not deal with them until we have offered a close reading

[1] Tov, "Composition," 333.

72

of the whole unit in Greek. After we have finished our reading of the Greek text in the present and following chapters, we will turn to reading the whole of the Greek text of chs. 16-18 against the Hebrew text.

Thus, in the present chapter we will offer a close reading of 1 Reigns 17, as its own literary entity, but, as a translation, we will read it against the backdrop of the Hebrew text in all instances except those which constitute the major OG minuses.

2. Setting the Scene, Raising the Tension (17:1-41)

Literary critics of the Bible often take note of the pace in which narrative action is depicted. Indeed, the slowing down of a narrative is one of the key techniques an author can use to heighten the tension of a scene and build suspense.[2] The first part of this narrative moves at a snail's pace. It includes many references to geography, long physical descriptions and long speeches. It seems quite evident that one of the principle purposes of this first section is to raise the ambient tension in the narrative heightening the anticipation of the final confrontation that is inevitably coming.

2.1. Geography of a Confrontation (vv. 1-3)

1 Reigns 17:1 begins with the notice that "The Foreigners gathered their armies for war." This opening statement changes the subject of the preceding narrative, where Saul and David had been the focus, and introduces the main antagonist of this narrative: the Foreigners (οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι). The Greek term ἀλλόφυλος is used consistently in 1 Reigns to translate the gentilic פלשתי ("Philistines"). This is the standard practice of the Septuagint translators outside of the Hexateuch (Gen-Josh). In the Hebrew Bible the Philistines are Israel's closest

---

[2] See the discussion in Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 141-84.

neighbors, major antagonists, and frequently labeled as "uncircumcised" (ערל). In light of this, it seems that the Septuagint has labeled them, using the same stereotypical label used in the later struggle for Jewish identity against Hellenism (1-2 Macc.).[3] Apparently, after the translation of the Hexateuch the Philistines came to represent the quintessential "other." Thus, I have chosen to translate the use of ἀλλόφυλος in 1 Reigns as a title, using the standard meaning of the word: "the Foreigner."[4]

These Philistine Foreigners are extremely important in the book of 1 Samuel, indeed 1 Samuel mentions them more than any other book.[5] More than any other group, they are the standard antagonists and come to represent the epitome of the enemy of the Lord, as will be seen in the following narrative.

In addition to the identification of the enemies, the opening statement in 17:1 also notes that it is the Foreigners who are said to be gathering their armies. In short, they are described as the aggressors.[6] Thus, in this scene Israel is in danger from an encroaching army. It is a setting of national crisis, one in which a hero would be most welcome.

The action of the opening narrative is depicted with present tense verbs. The use of this "historic present" to render Hebrew *wayyiqtol* forms is not uncommon in 1 Reigns,[7] and while, as a narrative device, it may be too simplistic to argue that these forms are used to add drama or vividness to a narrative, they certainly do convey a certain amount of immediacy or

---

[3] See Roland de Vaux, "Les Philistins dans la Septante," in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zur Septuaginta* (ed. J. Schriener; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1972), 192-93; Robert P. Gordon, "The Ideological Foe: The Philistines in the Old Testament," in *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon* (Hants, England: Ashgate, 2006), 165; *BdA*, 74-76; and Auld, "The Story of David and Goliath," 123.

[4] See *LSJ*, s.v. "ἀλλόφυλος." *NETS* has decided to transliterate the Greek word and render all uses of it as "allophyle." However, this functions as a label for the Philistines without capturing the meaning of the Greek term, "Foreigner." I am inclined to agree with the renderings of *BdA* and *LXX.D*, which render the Greek ἀλλόφυλος as "Étranger" and "Andersstämmige" respectively.

[5] David Jobling, *1 Samuel* (Berit Olam; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998), 212.

[6] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 176.

[7] See Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 136.

nearness to the narrative.[8] In the context of this narrative, where the story starts with the

gathering of enemy forces, a sense of immediacy certainly adds to the urgency of the

narrative and increases the tension.

The first verse continues with a description of the precise geographical setting. The

first description is a general location καὶ συνάγονται εἰς Σοκχὼθ τῆς Ἰουδαίας ("and they

gathered unto[9] Socoth of Judah[10]").

Describing the location of the Foriegners' gathering army as Socoth was not enough,

the narrative gives further detail describing them as encamping between Socoth and between

Azeka in Ephermem.[11] Azekah in Ephermem (Ἐφερμέμ) is most likely to be equated with

Ephes-damim (אפס דמים). The Greek translators were probably unfamiliar with this place and

___

[8] On the use of the historic present in Classical Greek see C.M.J. Siccking and P. Stork, "The Grammar of the So-Called Historical Present in Ancient Greek," in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts* (Mnemosyne Supp.; ed. Egbert J. Bakker; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 131-68. On the use of this category in Koine Greek see Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1989), 189-98; Buist M. Fanning, *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), 226-39; and Steven E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010), 125-43.

[9] The Greek adds εἰς which has no equivalent in the Hebrew text, presumably to make sense of the Hebrew accusative of place (see *WHS* §54b). Two manuscripts (236, 242) have εκ in place of εἰς, but the Foreigners certainly didn't come from Socoth.

[10] Bya₂ Eth Sah all read Ἰδουμαίας ("Idumea") here. Whereas ANa-jl-qstv-c₂e₂ Arm read Ἰουδαίας ("Judah"). The confusing of Ἰουδαίας with Ἰδουμαίας is not uncommon in 1 Reigns. The phenomenon occurs in 1 Rgns. 23:3 (τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ B ANgijl-qstv-c₂ Arm Sah^cw Eth – τη ιδουμαια acxya₂); 27:10 (Ἰουδαίας B AM-jl-qstv-c₂e₂ Arm Sah^(m)w Eth – ιδουμαιας Nefmw); 30:14 (Ἰουδαίας B AMN-jm-qst-c₂e₂ Arm Sah^lw Eth – ιουδμαιας acdi(txt)vx Eth). It is significant that these textually unstable references occur in three of the four uses of Ἰουδαίας (23:3; 27:6, 10; 30:14; and probably OG of 17:1) instead of the standard Ἰούδας (e.g. 11:8; 15:4; 17:52; 18:16; 22:5; 23:23; 30:16, 26). B.H. Kelly, "The Septuagint Translators of I Samuel and II Samuel 1:1-11:1," (Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1948), 26-28, argues that the use of Ἰουδαίας interchangeably with Ἰούδας, the standard septuagintal equivalent of יודה, is distinctive of the OG translator of 1 Rgns and 2 Rgns 1-11:1. Therefore, it seems likely that the existence of the unusual Ἰουδαίας at 17:1; 23:3; 27:10; and 30:14 led to extensive inner-Greek corruption in the Greek manuscript tradition. Thus, it seems that Ἰουδαίας reflects the best reading at 17:1. See also F.C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* (repr. Hendrickson Pub. Inc., 1995 ed.; Boston, MA: Ginn and Co., 1905), 252; and *BdA*, 293-94. Auld, *Samuel*, 195, further notes "Idumea later expanded northward into territory that had previously been Judean," which likely added to the confusion.

[11] The repetition of ἀνὰ μέσον ("between") makes for awkward Greek, but it successfully corresponds to the Hebrew idiom. Though I will argue that this story is often artfully told in the Greek, instances such as this show that the desire to closely represent every Hebrew word influenced the translation technique.

seem to have transliterated it, albeit with some corruption.[12] Azekah is likely equated with

Tell Zakariya, a fortress located a few miles northwest of Socoth in the middle of the Elah

Valley.[13] The significance of the Judean Shephelah in general and the Elah Valley in particular

in the geopolitical struggle between Israel and the Philistines is well known. It is an important

area for both agricultural[14] and military reasons.[15]

The geographical detailing in this opening verse makes for a very slow introduction to

the narrative, which heightens the drama—it depicts a situation whereby the army of

Foreigners is acting as the aggressor and moving eastward from their territory and

encroaching on Judahite territory, and it sets the scene for an important military

confrontation.[16]

The second verse of this chapter details the response of Saul and Israel. Whereas the

Foreigners were introduced with the standard word order: verb + subject, Saul and the

Israelites are introduced in subject + verb word order. Thus, the change in subject to Saul and

the Israelites is highlighted: "*Now* Saul and the men of Israel gathered."[17] The action of Saul

---

[12] Cf. Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, 252; and *BdA*, 293. The unfamiliarity with this site by the Greek translators can be seen by the fact that virtually every Greek MS has a different spelling for this place.

[13] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 290; Joe D. Seger, "Azekah," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East* (ed. E.M. Meyers; New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 1: 243; Ephraim Stern, "Azekah," in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. E. Stern; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993), 1:123.

[14] See John A. Beck, "David and Goliath, a Story of Place: The Narrative-Geographical Shaping of 1 Samuel 17," *WTJ* 68/2 (2006): 325-26.

[15] With the important Philistine city of Gath on its western end, the Elah Valley was one of the two main approaches to the Judean hill country. Thus, it was an important and frequently disputed region for its strategic military location. See William M. Schniedewind, "The Geopolitical History of Philistine Gath," *BASOR* 309 (1998): 74; and A.F. Rainey, "The Biblical Shephelah of Judah," *BASOR* 251 (1983): 1-22.

[16] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 437; Beck, "Story of Place," 327; Amihai Mazar, *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000–586 B.C.E.* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 306; and Moshe Garsiel, "The Valley of Elah Battle and the Duel of David with Goliath: Between History and Artistic Theological Historiography," in *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded* (VTSup 130; ed. Gershon Galil, Mark Geller and Alan Millard; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 393-95.

[17] I make this observation on a narrative level rather than a linguistic level. The Greek word order here reflects the Hebrew and so arguments about the word order necessarily have to involve the Hebrew standard word order. However, in a recent study Robert D. Holmstedt, "The Typological Classification of the Hebrew of Genesis: Subject-Verb Or Verb-Subject?" *JHebS* 11/14 (2011): 1-39, has argued that in non-*wayyiqtol* clauses Hebrew shows a tendency towards a SVO word order, and thus the word order in the clause "And Saul and the men of Israel gathered," would be the standard word order. Even if that is the case, the use of a non-*wayyiqtol* clause here is a deliberate choice that allows for the change of subject to be highlighted and the action of Saul

and the Israelites is thus depicted as a *reaction to* the action of the Foreigners. The Greek version does not name the valley that the Israelites encamped in, stating simply that "they encamped in the valley." The Hebrew specifically names the valley as "the valley of the terebinth" (עמק האלה), otherwise known as the Valley of Elah. The OG has apparently read the Hebrew האלה as the pronoun אֵלֶּה ("these") rather than the noun אֵלָה ("terebinth"), and thus rendered it as the subject of the second clause: "*These* formed ranks for war from before the Foreigners."[18] What is lost is another place name, but the sense is retained; the reader assumes that this is the valley between Azekah and Socoth, which must be the Valley of Elah.

The next locational notice is that Saul and Israel "drew up ranks for war against (ἐξ ἐναντίας) the Foreigners."[19] After this, we are given a summarizing picture: the Foreigners stand on one side of the valley and Israel stands on the other side, with something between them. The Greek manuscript tradition is not consistent concerning exactly what is between the ranks of the Foreigners and the ranks of Israel. LXX[B] states that there was a "circle" (κύκλῳ) between them. LXX[A] and several other manuscripts instead read "and a valley" (καὶ ὁ αὐλών). The reading of κύκλῳ could be understood as a corruption of καὶ ὁ αὐλών.[20] If this is the case, καὶ ὁ αὐλών reflects the best reading and κύκλῳ is a corruption. On the other hand,

---

and the Israelites to be marked more clearly as a reaction to the Philistine aggression rather than a simple consequent action as would have been the case in a series of *wayyiqtol* actions.

[18] Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, 252; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 286. Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 114, finds this interchange in numerous places. It may be that given the SV word order in the first half of the verse, the translator thought a similar word order would occur in this second half of the verse. Numerous Greek MSS, mostly in the Antiochene tradition, correct this, replacing αὐτοὶ with: της δρυος (boc$_2$e$_2$ dlpqtz g) and τερεβινθου (jz(mg)b$_2$).

[19] The rendering of the Hebrew לקראת with the Greek ἐξ ἐναντίας is not uncommon in the LXX. It appears that various translators have understood the Hebrew phrase לקראת ("to greet") in many instances to be an idiom meaning "before" or "in front of." Thus, they have translated it with ἐξ ἐναντίας. This is especially true in instances which speak of an army "forming ranks" (ערד) "against" (לקראת) their enemy. In these cases (1 Sam. 4:2; 17:2; 2 Sam. 10:9, 10, 17; 1 Chr. 19:10, 11, 17), the LXX translates them as ἐξ ἐναντίας (5x) or something similar. On the use of ἐναντίον in the LXX and other Greek literature see Raija Sollamo, "Some 'Improper' Prepositions, Such as Ενωπιον, Εναντιον, Εναντι, Etc. In the Septuagint and Early Koine Greek," *VT* 25/4 (1975): 779-80.

[20] So McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 286; and Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, 252.

κύκλῳ could be the original reading and καὶ ὁ αὐλών reflect a correction towards MT.[21] If this is the case, then the translators perhaps intended to evoke a circular battle arrangement due to their position in the mountainous terrain.

However, in this instance it seems unlikely that the translators meant to evoke this circular battle formation. Neither of the two examples of this circular formation cited by Lestienne seem to fit the depiction in 1 Reigns 17. In 1 Rgns. 26:5 the Israelites are forming a protective circle around Saul, while in Xenophon the Egyptian mercenaries are the last group standing and so, outnumbered, have formed a defensive circle (*Cyrop.* 7.1.40).[22] In the context of 1 Rgns. 17:3 where the circle is depicted as between (ἀνὰ μέσον) the Israelite ranks and the ranks of the Foreigners, it seems an implausible picture. Thus, it seems more likely that LXX[B] has a corrupted text, and Rahlfs-Hanhart was right to restore καὶ ὁ αὐλών as the best original reading. In either case, in terms of the narrative, it is clear that the two armies are encamped on opposing sides of a valley and there is a space between them.

The scene is now set. The reader has been given a detailed description of the geography of the scene, the armies are now facing each other on opposing sides of a valley. The reader is anticipating the action that will come from this confrontation.

2.2. Enter the Giant (vv. 4-10)

The action begins in 17:4 and the first one to act is a Foreigner: "and a mighty man came from the ranks of the Foreigners" (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς ἐκ τῆς παρατάξεως τῶν ἀλλοφύλων).[23] The action is depicted with an aorist verb (ἐξῆλθεν), the first one in the

---

[21] So *BdA*, 294.

[22] Ibid.

[23] The MT describes the champion coming from the "camps" (מחנות), which is usually translated in 1 Reigns with παρεμβολή, while LXX[B] describes the champion coming from the "ranks" (παράταξις), which usually translates מערכה in 1 Reigns. McCarter, noting that v. 3 makes it clear that the two armies have left the camps, suggests emending the MT to agree with LXX[B] (*1 Samuel*, 286). Tsumura, on the other hand, suggests

narrative. The translator has thus far consistently translated all previous Hebrew *wayyiqtol* verbs using "historical" or "narrative" present tense verbs but now switches, with no provocation from his source text, to using aorist tense verbs.

How do we explain the translators' switch from present to aorist verbs? As Sicking and Stork argue in their investigation of the "historical" present in ancient Greek, the "historical" present is used in the same way as an aorist, in that they both have the same narrative value and they both continue the mainline action of the story.[24] They are, in a way, interchangeable in terms of narrative value, but that does not mean the shifting between the two cannot be done for intentional rhetorical purposes.

For example, in Thucydides, we have a narrative which has a similar varying of verbal tense.

> . . . while the rest of the army advanced (ἐχώρουν) in two divisions, the one with one of the generals to the city in case of a sortie, the other with the other general to the stockade by the postern gate. The three hundred, attacking, took (αἱροῦσι) the stockade; its garrison, abandoning it, took refuge (κατέφυγον) in the outworks round the statue of Apollo Temenites. Here the pursuers burst in (ξυνεσέπεσον) with them. . . (Thuc. 6.100.1-2)

The narrative framework for this narrative is told with the imperfect verb ἐχώρουν, i.e., the main action of the story is told against this backdrop. The main action of the narrative, the taking of the stockade, is told with the use of "historic" present verb, αἱροῦσι. Once this part of the narrative has been told, the action continues with a series of aorist verbs (κατέφυγον,

_____

that in the Hebrew, "from the camps" is modifying the champion not the coming out of the champion. Thus, suggesting the translation: "A champion of [lit., from] the Philistine camps" (Tsumura, *Samuel*, 439). Tsumura's reading would explain the variant. It seems implausible that a scribe would change "ranks" to "camps" but it is plausible that the translator of 1 Reigns, assuming, like McCarter, that the reference to the "camps" is out of place, would instead offer a contextually sensible emendation and refer to the "ranks." Cf. also Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 137.

[24] Sicking and Stork, "Grammar of the So-Called Historical Present," 167, prefer the term "focus function." They use it as a term to describe the action that "from a viewpoint of information, is the most prominent in the sense of being its 'nucleus'" (C.M.J. Sicking, "Aspect Choice: Time Reference Or Discourse Function," in *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* [C.M.J. Sicking and P. Stork; Mnemosyne Supp.; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996], 75).

ξυνεσέπεσον), as it had done before the use of the imperfect. The point is that both the present αἱροῦσι and the aorist κατέφυγον and ξυνεσέπεσον continue the main action of the story. However, the varying use of tenses helps structure the narrative. The action of taking the stockade is told with the present tense and is the main event of this section of the narrative. The subsequent actions are told with aorist verbs, so they are, in a sense, told as the consequence of the taking of the stockade.[25]

We can similarly understand the variation between present and aorist verbs in 1 Rgns. 17:1-4. The first three verses are told using present tense indicative verbs. This is part of the main story line, but it is setting the scene for the story that follows. It is not necessarily more vivid or dramatic, though the use of the present probably adds some immediacy. Starting at verse 4, the narrative switches to aorist verbs. This is a new section of the story and tells of what happens when these two armies arrive to face each other. Thus, the translator has varied his translation so as to conform with dynamic Greek storytelling. This did not require major alterations of his source text, merely a variation in the verb tenses he uses. The picture of the translator of 1 Reigns that begins to emerge is one who is faithful to his *Vorlage*, but also sensitive to the reality that he is telling a story in Greek.[26] One way that the translator brought out the narrative dynamic of the story he was telling, was by this technique of the varying use of verb tenses.[27]

This new scene begins with a man from the ranks of the Foreigners stepping out. He is described as ἀνὴρ δυνατός ("a mighty man"). This is a translation of the Hebrew phrase איש

---

[25] This example taken from Rutger J. Allan, "Sense and Sentence Complexity. Sentence Structure, Sentence Connection, and Tense-Aspect as Indicators of Narrative Mode in Thucydides' Histories," in *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 13; ed. R.J. Allan and M. Buijs; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 107.

[26] Cf. Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 123-42; and, from a more theological perspective, Gehmen, "Exegetical Methods," 292-95.

[27] See further Appendix I.

הבנים ("man of the between"), about which there is much debate. This phrase may describe a champion, i.e., one who would step out into the space between the armies,[28] or, in light of evidence from Qumran (1QM), it may refer simply to "infantrymen."[29] In light of the fact that the use in 1QM is plural and the use in 17:4 is singular, and the context of 17:4 is virtually demanding to be interpreted as "champion," it seems likely that the translators had a good sense of the narrative when they paraphrased the Hebrew idiom "a man of the in-between" with "a mighty man."[30] The narrative effect of the Greek translation is that, while perhaps lacking some of the vivid imagery of the "man of the in-between," it is clear that it is a champion that has stepped out from among the ranks of the Foreigners.

This champion is introduced to us as Goliath from Gath. It seems significant that he is from Gath for two reasons. First, Gath is the important, and as yet unmentioned, city on the western end of the Elah Valley,[31] so we have another geographical reference to add to an already abundant list of geographical locations. Second, in the biblical narrative, Gath is known as a place wherein the giant Anakim reside (Josh. 11:22).[32] Therefore, in Goliath we encounter a champion who is from a people who are more technologically advanced than Israel (cf. 1 Rgns. 13:19-22), from a place that is known to breed giants.[33] This champion is being set up to be a formidable foe.

Starting in v. 4b the narrative begins an extensive physical description of the champion from the ranks of the Foreigners. The first description of this champion is the most

---

[28] So Roland de Vaux, "Single Combat in the Old Testament," in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (trans. Damian McHugh; Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1971), 124-25; Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 202; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 439.

[29] So McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 291.

[30] So Mark K. George, "Constructing Identity in 1 Samuel 17," *BibInt* (1999): 395.

[31] The identification of Gath appears to be confirmed as Tel Zafit. See Ephraim Stern, "Zafit, Tel," in *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Explorations in the Holy Land* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993): 1522; Schniedewind, "Geopolitical History," 75; and Beck, "Story of Place," 324.

[32] The biblical record consistently refers to the Anakim as giants (e.g., Deut. 2:10, 21; 9:2).

[33] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 177-78.

famous and the most problematic: his height. In the OG, he is described as being "four cubits and a span," (τεσσάρων πήχεων καὶ σπιθαμῆς), which would make him roughly six feet nine inches tall.[34] In the MT he is described as being six cubits and a span (שש אמות וזרת), which would make him roughly nine feet nine inches tall.[35] There are basically two scenarios for how this number changed: either the change came about unintentionally through some scribal error, or it came about intentionally as an example of scribal exegesis.

The most likely explanation involving unintentional scribal corruption is probably the thesis that a scribe may have accidentally changed ארבע אמות ("four cubits") to שש אמות ("six cubits") in anticipation of שש מאות ("six hundred") in v. 7.[36] Though this is possible, the reference to "six hundred" in v. 7 seems fairly far removed from v. 4. For example in 4QSamᵃ it is four lines apart. Furthermore, if the reception history of this story is anything to judge by, it seems unlikely that a scribe would accidentally change something as iconic as the height of Goliath. It seems more likely that the change in height is the result of intentional exegesis.[37]

The usual arguments for intentional scribal exegesis in the changing height of Goliath are: 1) a scribal exaggeration in order to aggrandize David's feat,[38] or 2) a scribal

[34] This number is reached by calculating a cubit at about eighteen inches. See R.B.Y. Scott, "The Hebrew Cubit," *JBL* 77/3 (1958): 205-14; and J. Daniel Hays, "Reconsidering the Height of Goliath," *JETS* 48/4 (2005): 701.

[35] A number of Greek manuscripts seem to take a mediating position and list the champion as being five (πέντε) cubits tall (Nae-jmnswyb₂).

[36] This argument is found preferable by McCarter (*1 Samuel*, 286) who attributes it to Michael D. Coogan. It is also noted in Frank Moore Cross, "Problems of Method in the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible," *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts* (Berkeley Religious Studies Series 2; ed. W. D. O'Flaherty; Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1979) 54, n. 2 and *DJD* 17, 79.

[37] Another possibility for unintentional corruption would be if a Hebrew manuscript used the numerical value of letters rather than spelling out שש or ארבע. The alphabetic equivalents of שש and ארבע are ו and ד respectively. Thus unintentional confusion between them is possible. M.H. Pope thinks this possibility very unlikely in the majority of cases ("Number, Numbering, Numbers," in *IDB* 3:563).

[38] So Hays, "Height," 707; and Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek,* 252. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 286, prefers this reading to scribal rationalization, but ultimately opts for the Coogan's theory (n. 36 above). Presumably Cross, "Problems of Method," 54, n. 2 and *DJD* 17, 79, prefer this reasoning to the rationalizing theory but also mention Coogan's theory as viable.

rationalization in order to give the account more verisimilitude.[39] The argument against a

scribal rationalization is that in lowering the height of Goliath the scribe would only lessen

David's feat, which is something no pious scribe would do.[40] However, if Goliath is merely

four cubits and a span, or around six foot six inches tall, then, though a towering figure, he is

not a creature of legend but merely an extremely big man. Rather than give the account

verisimilitude, this shortening of Goliath can be read as offering a critique of Saul, who is

head and shoulders taller than everyone in Israel (1 Rgns. 9:2). After all, who better to face

the Philistine giant, than the Israelite giant—Saul?[41]

It is difficult to weigh the internal evidence for this variant. There are logical reasons

for each reading. The strongest support for the OG reading is the external evidence. In 17:4

LXX[B] agrees with 4QSam[a], which reads אַרבע ("four").[42] This variant is made all the more

significant when it is realized that elsewhere in this chapter 4QSam[a] agrees with the MT and

has the longer reading of the story.[43]

In either account Goliath is still a giant. In a day where the average height of Semitic

males was probably somewhere between five feet and five feet six inches tall, someone six

[39] Gehmen, "Exegetical Methods," 295; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 317; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 441. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 175, lists this as an option but makes no argument one way or the other. It seems that Smith, *Samuel*, 155, suggests this reading as well.

[40] *DJD* 17, 79*;* McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 286; and Cross, "Problems of Method," 54, n. 2.

[41] Cf. Hays, "Height," 710-13; Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 399; and Rachelle Gilmour, *Representing the Past: A Literary Analysis of Narrative Historiography in the Book of Samuel* (VTSupp. 143; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 277.

[42] See *DJD* 17: 78-80; and Plate XIIa.

[43] See Johnson, "Reconsidering 4QSam[a]."

feet nine inches tall is a true giant.[44] In the Greek version, however, he is a giant that is not beyond the reach of Israel's giant and king, Saul.

The height of Goliath is not the only intimidating thing about him. Starting in verse 5, the narrative turns to a three verse litany of the champion's armaments, making him perhaps the most described and certainly the most well-armed character in the Bible. The fact that he is armed to the teeth is certainly narratively important. It has been well documented that Goliath's armor does not match the typical depictions of Philistine armor that we know from other sources, most notably the iconic feathered helms depicted in the Egyptian relief from Medinet Habu.[45] This suggests that the description of Goliath may not be historical, but may instead be narrative creation of a mix of several types of armor.[46] However, it is not implausible that Goliath's armor fits an 11th century setting. First, the narrative makes clear that Goliath is not a typical warrior and so it is not surprising that he does not fit the "typical" picture of Philistine warrior.[47] Second, every element in Goliath's panoply can be found in references to early (ca. 14th-12th centuries) Mycenaean warriors.[48] Finally, the prevalence of

---

[44] The average height of Semitic males is given as between five feet and five feet six inches by Victor H. Matthews, *Manners and Customs in the Bible* (rev. ed.; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991), 3; and Hays, "Height," 710-11; and as five feet to five feet two inches by Ziony Zevit, *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches* (London: Continuum, 2001), 279. For archaeological support see J. Lawrence Angel, "Skeletal Change in Ancient Greece," *AJPA*, 4/1 (1946): 69-97, who lists Greek males of the period roughly corresponding to Iron-Age Israel at an average of five feet six inches. The suggestion by Matthews and Zevit appears to be that ancient Semitic males would be slightly shorter than their Mediterranean counterparts.

[45] On the relief at Medinet Habu and the descriptions of the Philistines there see Yigael Yadin, *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), 333-45.

[46] K. Galling, "Goliath und seine Rüstung," in *Volume du Congrès: Genève* 1965 (VT Supp. 15; Leiden: Brill, 1966), 150-69; Israel Finkelstein, "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late-Monarchic Perspective," *JSOT* 27/2 (2002): 142-48; and Azzan Yadin, "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory," *VT* 54/3 (2004): 373-95.

[47] Though Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 406-07, thinks that some of the Egyptian reliefs may be depicting bronze helmets.

[48] Philip J. King, "David Defeats Goliath," in *"Up to the Gates of Ekron": Essays on the Archaeology and History of the Eastern Mediterranean in Honor of Seymour Gitin* (ed. Sidnie White Crawford; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 2007), 350; and Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 404-10.

bronze in Goliath's armor makes it more at home in an eleventh or tenth century setting than a seventh century setting.[49]

However one dates the historical background of this story, it is evident that there was a widespread phenomenon of depicting these types of single combat events, or μονομαχία, as it is crystalized in the Greek tradition, in a very similar fashion across a broad range of cultures.[50] It is certainly in this tradition of μονομαχία that the translators would have understood the narrative of David and Goliath and likely effects their translation. This broader tradition must be kept in mind as we understand the translators' handling of this key scene, especially how they understand the image of Goliath in his armor.

The presentation of Goliath in all his armored glory, especially in the Greek, is actually strikingly similar to the Homeric type scene of arming the hero.[51] There are two major differences. The first is that in the Homeric scenes the hero is depicted in the process of arming himself from bottom to top, whereas Goliath is depicted as already being fully armed and his armaments are described from top to bottom. Thus, the reader's eye moves down Goliath from his great height to his feet, all of which are armored, to view this champion in

---

[49] Cf. Alan Millard, "The Armor of Goliath," in *Exploring the* Longue Durée: *Essays in Honor of Lawrence E. Stager* (ed. J. David Schloen; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 337-43.

[50] See Philip F. Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia in the Light of Cultural Anthropology: The Case of David and Goliath," in *The Idea of Man and Concepts of the Body: Anthropological Studies on the Ancient Cultures of Israel, Egypt, and the Near East* (ed. Anjelika Berjelung et al; Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2011), 3-37. He specifically notes the similarity between the David and Goliath narrative (1 Samuel 17) and the story of Titus Manlius and a Gaul in Livy 7.9.6-10.14, two cultures which very probably did not share any literary interaction (see esp. Ibid., 29-34). See also de Vaux, "Single Combat," 122-35; Harry A. Hoffner, Jr., "Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions," *CBQ* 30/2 (1968): 220-25; and G.A. Wainwright, "Some Early Philistine History," *VT* 9/1 (1959): 79; and Millard, "Armor of Goliath," 339-40. In a recent article Serge Frolov and Allen Wright, "Homeric and Ancient Near Eastern Intertextuality in 1 Samuel 17," *JBL* 130/3 (2011): 451-71, have argued that the story in 1 Samuel 17 fits much closer with ancient Near Eastern parallels than with Greek parallels. While this may be true, their study shows that 1 Samuel 17 doesn't fit any parallels perfectly and we should probably speak of 1 Samuel 17 as being part of a more general tradition.

[51] On the arming the hero scenes in Homer see, James I. Armstrong, "The Arming Motif in the Iliad," *AJP* 79/4 (1958): 337-54 and H. Patzer, "Artistry and Craftmanship in the Homeric Epics," in *Homer: Critical Assessments* (ed. Irene J.E. De Jong; London: Routledge, 1999), 171-80. For further comparison of this Homeric type-scene with Goliath's armaments see John Pairman Brown, *Israel and Hellas* (BZAW 231; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 163-70; and idem, "Peace Symbolism in Ancient Military Vocabulary," *VT* 21/1 (1971): 1-23.

all his metallic glory. The second is that one of the key elements of the Homeric military panoply is the sword, which is conspicuously absent from Goliath's description. Goliath's sword, though absent at the beginning of the narrative, will play a significant part in the narrative to follow.

Table 3: Goliath's Armor and Homeric "Arming Scenes"

Text	Item	MT	LXX	Homeric Equivalent (references from *Iliad*)
17:5	helmet	כובע נחשת	περικεφαλαία	κυνέη (Paris, 3.336; Agamemnon, 11.41; Ajax, 15.480; Patroclus, 16.137); τυφάλεια (Achilles, 19.380)
17:5	mail armor	שריון קשקשים	θώραξ	θώραξ (Paris, 3.332; Agamemnon, 11.20; Patroclus, 16.133; Achilles, 19.371)
17:6	greaves	מצחת נחושת	κνημῖδες χαλκαῖ	κνημίς (Paris, 3.330; Agamemnon, 11.17; Patroclus, 16.131; Achilles, 19.369)
17:6	javelin/ shield	כידון נחשת	ἀσπις χαλκῆ	σάκος (Paris, 3.335; Ajax, 15.479; Patroclus, 16.136; Achilles, 19.373); ἀσπίς (Agamemnon, 11.32)
17:7	spear	חנית	δόρυ	ἔγχος (Paris, 3.338; Ajax, 15.481) δόρυ (Agamemnon, 11.43; Patroclus, 16.139)
17:7	shield	צנה	ὅπλον	ἀσπίς (Agamemnon, 11.32)
17:51	sword	חרב	ῥομφαία	ξίφος (Paris, 3.334-5; Agamemnon, 11.29; Patroclus, 16.135; Achilles, 19.372-3)

In the Hebrew, Goliath is depicted wearing a "bronze helmet" (כובע נחשת).[52] The OG translates this with περικεφαλαία, which, while not the Homeric equivalent in these scenes of

---

[52] See Edward Sapir, "Hebrew 'Helmet,' a Loanword, and Its Bearing on Indo-European Phonology," *JAOS* 57/1 (1937): 73-77; and Brown, *Israel and Hellas*, 164.

arming the hero,[53] is a term used by Polybius.[54] What is not represented in the Greek is the fact that it is a "bronze" helmet. Conybeare and Stock suggest that the term περικεφαλαία may imply a helmet of metal, and so specifically stating that it was bronze was not necessary,[55] but that is somewhat surprising because in v. 38 קובע נחשת is rendered by the translator as περκεφαλαίαν χαλκῆν ("bronze helmet"). In v. 4 the term "bronze" (נחשת) is repeated three times in the space of two lines and it is thus likely that an extra "bronze" was added in or a reference to "bronze" fell out and too much should probably not be made of this.

Goliath's next armament is described by the Hebrew term שריון, which is a common term in Biblical Hebrew to describe "body armor."[56] The descriptive term קשקשים, elsewhere only used of fish "scales" (Lev. 11:9, 10, 12; Deut. 14:10; Ezek. 29:4), is readily understood as meaning some sort of "chain mail."[57] Elsewhere the LXX translators translate קשקשת ("scales") as λεπίς ("scales") but here, the translator has correctly translated the term according to its context, rendering the phrase שריון קשקשים ("scaled armor") as θώρακα ἁλυσιδωτὸν ("chain mail"), a term that is again an appropriate contemporary description.[58] The last line of v. 5 gives the weight of Goliath's "mail armor." In the Hebrew it is five thousand shekels of bronze (נחשת) but in the OG it is five thousand shekels of bronze *and iron* (χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου). This breaks the consistency from the Hebrew, which depicted

---

[53] The Homeric scenes use κυνέη for Paris (*Il*. 3.336), Agamemnon (*Il*. 11.41), Ajax (*Il*. 15.480), and Patroclus (*Il*. 16.137); and τυφάλεια for Achilles (*Il*. 19.380).

[54] Brown, *Israel and Hellas*, 164. E.g. *Plb*. 3.71.4; and 6.23.8.

[55] Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, 253.

[56] See E.A. Speiser, "On Some Articles of Armor and Their Names," *JAOS* 70 (1950): 47-49; and King, "David," 352-53.

[57] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 292; Galling, "Goliath und seine Rüstung," 161-62; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 443. On this armor see Yadin, *Art of Warfare*, 196-97.

[58] Brown, *Israel and Hellas,* 164. E.g., *Plb*. 6.23.15.

Goliath's defensive armor with bronze and his offensive weapon with iron.[59] It has been suggested that perhaps the LXX intended to communicate some form of alloy.[60] However, it seems very plausible that a scribe or translator's eye could have gone from שקלים נחשת in v. 5 to שקלים ברזל in v. 7 (which, in 4QSamᵃ is on the next line) and unintentionally added ברזל (or σιδήρου) into 17:5.

The next item on Goliath's defensive list is his greaves. The Hebrew word מצחה is *hapax*, and is likely used in an effort to describe an element of armor that the Israelites were unfamiliar with.[61] Whatever the unfamiliarity of this word in Hebrew, the LXX translators had no problem with it, understanding it as the armor upon his legs,[62] and rendering it with the standard Greek word κνημίς, a common armament in the Aegean world and part of the standard armor of the heroes of the *Iliad*.[63]

Having surveyed Goliath from top to bottom, the narrator now turns to describe what is slung between his shoulders. The Hebrew term is כידון, and has been variously interpreted as a javelin,[64] some type of sword,[65] or a curved scimitar.[66] The interpretation of the scimitar

---

[59] Wellhausen, *Samuelis,* 108; Driver, *Samuel*, 139.

[60] Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 317; and P.A.H. de Boer, "1 Samuel XVII: Notes on the Text and Ancient Versions," *OTS* 1 (1941): 83.

[61] Ariella Deem, "'. . . And the Stone Sank Into His Forehead': A Note on 1 Samuel XVII 49," *VT* 28/3 (1978): 350. See further King, "David," 353.

[62] The Hebrew word used here for legs is רגל, which generally means "feet" but is broad enough to include the leg (cf. *HALOT*). The LXX very consistently translates this word with πούς ("foot"), as in 1 Rgns. 14:13; 23:22; 25:24; and 25:41. Rather than automatically render the Hebrew רגל with the standard equivalent, the translator has understood contextually that it must mean the leg, at least from the knee down, rather than just the foot and translated it with σκέλος ("leg"), a translation that is only used twice (Ezek. 1:7; 16:25). This is another example of the translator of 1 Reigns allowing context to intelligently inform his translation.

[63] Tsumura*, Samuel*, 443; Brown, *Israel and Hellas*, 164-65; and L. Krinetzki, "Ein Beitrag Zur Stilanalyse der Goliathperikpe (1 Sam 17, 1-18,5)," *Bib* 54 (1973): 191.

[64] H. Bardtke, "Die Kriegsrolle von Qumran übersetzt," *TLZ* 80 (1955): 401-20; King, "David Defeats Goliath," 353.

[65] J. Carmignac, "Précisions Apportées au Vocabulaire de l'Hebreu biblique par la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres," *VT* 5 (1955): 357-59; and J. van der Ploeg, "La Règle de la Guerre," *VT* 5 (1955): 403.

[66] G. Molin, "What Is a *Kidon*?" *JSS* 1 (1956): 334-37.

seems to be a common interpretation today,[67] but there is no clear consensus on this.[68] If the scimitar interpretation is correct, then this may be a reference to the otherwise key missing element in Goliath's armaments: his sword. It may indeed be that כידון is a specific term for a type of sword, which, later in v. 51 is referred to with the generic term חרב ("sword").[69] What is clear is that it is some sort of offensive blade. However, none of these attempts to understand the Hebrew term really help us to understand the LXX translators' rendering of it.[70]

1 Reigns translates כידון as ἀσπίς, which, in a military context, as here, means "shield." It may be that the translator did not know what כידון meant and so made a contextual guess based on its location, which is where the shield of a Homeric hero would be slung.[71] However, the fact that translators of Joshua and Jeremiah knew that a כידון was some sort of javelin or spear, translating it with γαῖσος (LXX-Josh. 8:18) and ζιβύνη[72] (LXX-Jer. 6:23), makes it seem likely that the translator of 1 Reigns would at least know that this was some sort of offensive weapon. If they knew it was an offensive weapon, then, based on the location one would presume that they would have conjectured it was the otherwise missing sword and translated it ῥομφαία ("sword"). There must be another reason that led the translator to use ἀσπίς here.

---

[67] E.g., Galling, "Goliath und seine Rüstung," 163-67; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 292; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 175-76; and Millard, "Armor of Goliath," 338..

[68] Cf. Firth, *Samuel*, 196; and King, "David," 353.

[69] So McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 294; and Molin, "*Kidon*," 337.

[70] Though Molin, "*Kidon*," 337, suggests that the curved nature of the scimitar could have led the LXX translator to render it with ἀσπίς, which means "asp" or "serpent." However, this seems unlikely in light of the fact that elsewhere in the LXX the term כידון was understood as some sort of spear or javelin and translated accordingly (LXX-Josh. 8:18; LXX-Jer. 6:23).

[71] Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 317. Cf. *Il.* 3.334-35; 15.479; 16.135-36.

[72] Probably a variant spelling of σιβύνη (see Judg. 1:14). The variant spelling of ζιβύνη is attested in some Greek writings (*Ph.Bel.* 92.44; *Porph. ap. Euz.PE* 3.12), see *LSJ*.

So how do we explain the translator's choice of ἀσπίς to translate כידון? First, as we will note below, in v. 7 the translator rendered the reference to Goliath's large shield (צנה) as a general reference to "arms" (τὰ ὅπλα). Thus, it would be apparent that the champion needed a shield.[73] Second, it seems probable to suggest that the translators were familiar with the way in which a heroic warrior was armed as typified in the Homeric type scenes. As such, it is likely that they were aware that the two things that would be described as being ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὤμων αὐτοῦ ("between his shoulders") would be either a sword or a shield. Thus, it seems likely that the translators chose to render כידון as ἀσπίς because that would be appropriate for Goliath as a typical champion.

But why did they not translate כידון as a sword? It is possible that, knowing it was either a sword or a shield, they simply picked one. However, judging by how כידון has been translated elsewhere it seems likely that the translators knew that this was some sort of weapon, but not necessarily a sword, perhaps a javelin or spear.[74] Another possibility is that the translators chose ἀσπίς for narrative reasons. If the translators knew that כידון was a weapon but not a sword, they may have noted this serious deficiency in the Goliath's otherwise impressive and complete armaments and read it as an intentional narrative "gap."[75] Reading the absence of a sword as an intentional narrative gap means that the text leads the reader to ask: where is Goliath's sword? This anticipation about the absence of the sword foreshadows the importance of the sword, which will not be revealed in the narrative until it

[73] Cf. Brown, *Israel and Hellas*, 164, though Brown thinks the translator's choice of τὰ ὅπλα in v. 7 is due to ignorance of the meaning of צנה.

[74] Though Job 39:23 does translate כידון as μάχαιρα ("sword").

[75] By a "gap" I mean an element that is missing from a narrative which gives the reader interpretive license to ask about the absence of that information. Thus, in this instance the lack of a sword may be read as a "gap" and the reader is justified in asking: "where is the sword?" On gaps in biblical narrative see Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 186-229.

is in David's hand (v. 51).[76] It seems entirely possible, then, that the translators rendered כידון

as ἀσπίς in order for Goliath's armaments to be consistent with what was expected of a heroic

warrior, and in order to maintain a narrative feature that treats his sword as a narrative gap.

This explanation is, of course, not in keeping with a minimalist view of the role the

translators played in translating their texts. However, it is important to remember that the

translators were not translating in a vacuum, but rather were translating within their

interpretive tradition.[77] Furthermore, we have consistently seen elements that suggest that the

translator was operating within their own narrative reading of the text and occasionally

making adjustments to the Greek text accordingly. Thus, I want to remain open to the

possibility that the translator's own reading of the text was a motivating factor for some of

their translational decisions.[78]

The final description of the champion's armaments is the detailed description of his

spear. We are given descriptive information about the type of spear and a note about its

weight. The weight is described as being "six hundred shekels of iron" (ἑξακοσίων σίκλων

σιδήρου). In the Hebrew the weight is clearly the weight of the spearhead: להבת חניתו ("the

blade[79] of his spear"). The Greek translates this as: ἡ λόγχη αὐτου ("his spear/spearhead"),

which *NETS* translates as "his spear." While λόγχη can mean spear, it is also not uncommon

for it to mean "spearhead."[80] This seems to be a place where what is intended by the

---

[76] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 178; Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 21. In light of the thoroughness of the descriptions of Goliath's armor the suggestion that Goliath's sword was not mentioned because it was hidden (Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 149; and Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 404) seems implausible.

[77] Cf. Johann Cook, "On the Role of External Traditions in the Septuagint," in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* (ed. Johann Cook; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 17-36.

[78] For a similar narrative analysis of translation decisions see Larry Perkins, "The Septuagint of Jonah: Aspects of Literary Analysis Applied to Biblical Translation," *BIOSCS* 20 (1987): 43-53.

[79] The Hebrew להב is literally "flame" (*HALOT*), but in this context seems probably to be a descriptive way to refer to the blade of the spear.

[80] See *LSJ* and cf. *Hdt.* 7.69 and *Xen. Hunt.* 10.3. Though this seems to be the only place in the LXX where λόγχη would specifically mean "spearhead."

translation is clarified by looking at the Hebrew and it is thus not inappropriate to understand the weight as referring to "his spearhead."

The description of the type of spear is more difficult. In the Hebrew the spear is described as being כמנור ארגים ("like a weaver's beam"). What is meant by this? The comparison of Goliath's spear to the מנור ארגים could be intended to convey either 1) its great size, comparing it to the size of a "weaver's beam;"[81] or 2) its unique feature of a throwing loop, known from the Greek world.[82] The descriptions of Goliath's armor are filled with references to weight, so it would be odd to use the complex and difficult imagery of the "weaver's beam" if weight is the point of the comparison. It seems more likely that this description is meant to convey some particular type of spear, so option 2 seems the most plausible reasons for this reference.

The difficulty is understanding how the translators understood this phrase. The OG reads καὶ ὁ κοντὸς τοῦ δόρατος αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ μέσακλον ὑφαινόντων ("and the shaft of his spear was like a μέσακλον of weavers"). The question is: what is a μέσακλον? The lexica, suggest "weaver's beam, beam of a loom" (*LEH, LSJ*) or "heddle-rod" (*GELS*) as the meaning of μέσακλον based solely on the evidence of this passage. This does not seem to be a word that was used in compositional Greek,[83] and so the meaning of "weaver's beam" is purely conjectural based on this one text.[84] The only other instances of the translation of מנור in the LXX are unfortunately in the *Kaige* portion of Reigns in 2 Rgns. 21:19; and in LXX-1Chron. 11:23 and 20:5, though each of these consistently translate these as ἀντίον ("loom").[85] The

[81] Smith, *Samuel*, 154; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 149; Krinetzki, "Stilanalyse," 191; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 443; Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 402-03.
[82] Yigael Yadin, "Goliath's Javelin and the מנור ארגים," *PEQ* 86 (1955): 58-69; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 292-93.Cf. Galling, "Goliath und seine Rüstung," 158-61; Firth, *Samuel*, 196.
[83] A *TLG* search finds this word only here and in Nicetas Seides Scr. Eccl. *Conspectus librorum sacrorum* 11.122.22, which is clearly referencing this passage.
[84] *BdA*, 296.
[85] On the meaning of ἀντίον see *LSJ* and G.B. Caird, "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. I," *JTS* 29/2

various manuscripts are struggling with this reference as well. The Antiochene texts read

ἀντίον (boc₂e₂ z[txt]), the hexaplaric group reads μεσαντιον (dlpqt),[86] and the versions read

ἀντίον (Aq Thdt). Perhaps the most important variant tradition is the group that reads

μεσακνον (ahijbsvb₂ w z[mg]),[87] perhaps from κανών, which can mean "weaver's rod."[88]

The Greek term for the throwing javelin that Yadin suggests is communicated by מנור

ורגים is μεσάγκυλον.[89] The similarity between μεσάγκυλον and the otherwise unattested

μέσακλον suggests that the OG may have intended μεσάγκυλον which was corrupted to

μέσακλον. If this is the case then the translator has partly abandoned the comparison to a

"weaver's beam" and instead used the technical name for the type of spear. However, the

translation does not abandon the metaphor entirely. Instead, this appears to be something

similar to Joosten's mixed category for translating idioms, whereby the translator rather than

translating an idiom either word for word or freely, instead mixes the two and translates

partly word for word but also partly freely to get at the meaning.[90] Furthermore, the

comparison is not totally abandoned because the word μεσάγκυλον, while the technical name

for a throwing javelin, literally would mean something like "middle loop" or "middle thong"

and the translation could mean on the surface "like the middle loop of a weaver" while at the

same time referencing the technical name for a javelin which was thrown with a loop.

Having finished the actual description of Goliath and his armor, the narrative notes

that he is preceded by "his armor[91] bearer going before him" (ὁ αἴρων τὰ ὅπλα αὐτοῦ

(1968): 460.

[86] On the group dlpqt see Brock, *Recensions*, 17.

[87] Brock, *Recensions*, 20, notes that this group is important where the OG group (Bya₂ Eth) is corrupt.

[88] See *LSJ*.

[89] Yadin, "Goliath's Javelin," 65-66. On the μεσάγκυλον see E. Norman Gardiner, "Throwing the Javelin," *JHS* 27 (1907): 249-73.

[90] Jan Joosten, "Translating the Untranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms," in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect* (ed. Robert J.V. Hiebert; SBLSCS 56; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 63.

[91] MT reads נשׂא הצנה ("the one carrying his shield"). A צנה was a large shield covering the whole body

προεπορεύετο αὐτοῦ).[92] It is often noted that Goliath's armor bearer is mentioned to put an exclamation mark on just how indestructible he appears.[93] However, it also could be pointed out that in biblical narrative for a hero to have an armor bearer with them may be normal practice (cf. 1 Rgns. 14:1-17; 31:4-6). Some have suggested there may be a hint of a picture of a warrior so overburdened with his own armor that he cannot carry it all and so needs an armor bearer to help him.[94] This interpretation seems problematic, as we will explore further below, because excessive armor would very likely never be seen as a *handicap* in ancient warfare.

The reference to an armor bearer also reminds the reader that there is someone in the Israelite ranks who also has an armor bearer. We noted that in 16:21 Saul made David "his armor bearer" (αἴρων τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ). Goliath has now been described by several elements that recall descriptions of Saul. He is a giant in terms of height as is Saul (9:2; 10:23), he possesses superior military technology as does Saul (13:22), and he has an armor bearer as does Saul (16:21). To use Bakhtinian terminology, the *character zones* of Saul and Goliath

(*HALOT*). The Greek term ὅπλον can be used for the famous Greek shield carried by the "hoplite" warrior, but it can also be used as a generic term arms or armor (*LSJ*). The function of the shield bearer is not a Greek practice (King, "David Defeats Goliath," 354). Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 401, has suggested that the LXX omits the reference to the "armor" bearer in 17:41, because the confrontation was supposed to be one-on-one combat. Similarly here, the translator is faced with a practice that he is probably unfamiliar with in a context where it doesn't seem to fit and thus translated it in a way that he understood—not as a carrier of the large body-covering shield, but as a basic armor bearer, who would not be part of the combat. It is worth noting that when the Hebrew clearly intends a generic "armor bearer" and uses the term נשׂא כלי the Greek correctly renders this with the generic ὁ αἴρων τὰ σκεύη (1 Rgns. 14:1, 6-7, 12-14, 17; 16:21; 31:4-6). In 17:7 the translator has used a word that lexically can match צנה, but in using a neuter plural form suggests "arms" rather than "shield." This suggests that the translation was not motivated by a lack of understanding of the meaning of the term צנה (contra Brown, *Israel and Hellas*, 164).

[92] Note how the translator has translated the Hebrew accurately but freely. The Hebrew הלך לפניו could have been rendered in a word-for-word manner by translating πορεύετο ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (cf. 1 Rgns. 2:35; 12:2 and LXX[L] in the present passage: προεπορευετο αυτου εμπροσθεν).

[93] Klein, *Samuel*, 176; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 444.

[94] Peter D. Miscall, *The Workings of Old Testament Narrative* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983), 60. Cf. the reading of the David and Goliath scene proposed by Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, 8-13; and Kim, *Identity and Loyalty*, 79-80.

are beginning to overlap, and the reader is perhaps led to see the character of Goliath in light of the character of Saul and vice versa.[95]

The action now continues with two consecutive narrative verbs: καὶ ἀνέστη καὶ ἀνεβόησεν ("and he stood and he called out"). The verb ἀνίστημι is not the standard equivalent for the Hebrew עמד, and so very subtly communicates an extra sense of "up-ness," contributing to the psychological effect of Goliath's size.[96] Similarly, the standard equivalent for קרא is καλέω, but here the use of ἀναβοάω makes for two consecutive verbs prefixed with ἀνά, and perhaps adds a sense of intensity to Goliath's cry.[97] By this shift of verb forms, the translator has subtly added an extra element to the poetics of this narrative and drawn the reader's eye "upwards" toward this giant Foreigner.

The champion then delivers his challenge. He asks the ranks of the Israelites why they have come out for war before the Foreigners.[98] He says to Israelite ranks: ἐγώ εἰμι ἀλλόφυλος,

---

[95] For a definition of *character zone* as the narrative territory and sphere of influence of a character see M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogical Imagination: Four Essays* (ed. Michael Holquist; Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981), 434. For an example of an analysis of biblical narrative using this category see Bodner, "Eliab and the Deuteronomist," 10-24.

[96] Many manuscripts read ἔστη (ANadglnvxzb₂c₂e₂) in place of ἀνέστη. Rahlfs-Hanhart prints ἔστη in the main text. This strikes me as backwards. The verb ἀνίστημι is the standard equivalent for the Hebrew קום (e.g., 1 Rgns. 1:9; 3:8; 9:26; 13:15; 16:13; and frequently), while the verb עמד is most regularly translated by ἵστημι (e.g., 1 Rgns. 6:14; 9:27; 14:9; 26:13; etc.). It seems more likely that later scribes would correct the original text to the standard equivalent, rather than insert an irregular equivalent. Thus, the reading in LXX^B seems more likely to reflect OG here.

[97] In 1 Reigns the only two other places where ἀναβοάω is used to translate קרא are 20:37, 38, where Jonathan calls out to his servant about the arrows. Typically, ἀναβοάω is used to translate זעק/צעק ("cry out") as in 4:13; 13:4; 14:20; 28:12. It is suggestive that LXX^L removes ἀνά from the verb and simply uses βοάω. The LXX translators did occasionally use verbs with the same prefix for rhetorical effect. See James K. Aitken, "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch," in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (ed. J.K. Aitken, K.J. Dell, B.A. Mastin; BZAW 420; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 514.

[98] The phrase ἐξ ἐναντίας ἡμῶν ("from before us") is an LXX plus. McCarter, *Samuel*, 287; and *BdA*, 297, suggest that this phrase was added on the basis of v. 2. If this is the case it makes a nice parallelism between Goliath's speech (v. 8) and the reality of the situation as depicted by the narrator (v. 2).

καὶ ὑμεῖς ’Εβραῖοι καὶ Σαούλ; ("am I not a Foreigner,[99] and you Hebrews and Saul?"). There are two textual issues in this challenge.

The first is what Goliath calls the Israelites. In the Hebrew he refers to them as עבדים ("servants"). In the Greek he refers to them as ’Εβραῖοι ("Hebrews"). First of all, it must be stated that this type of interchange between עברים and עבדים, which comes down to the difference between ד/ר, is a common variant (cf. 1 Sam. 13:3).[100] In terms of the narrative, a couple of factors make the MT the more likely original reading. First, though עברי ("Hebrews") is not an uncommon term in 1 Samuel, occurring 8 times, it would be surprising in the construction, עברים לשאול ("Hebrews [who are] to Saul").[101] Second, the existence of the term עבד ("servants") here plays into Goliath's speech very well because it hinges on the term עבד in v. 9.[102] Third, it seems very plausible to assume that a translator, having just read Goliath's statement that he is a Philistine, could assume that the intended contrast would be to the ethnicity of the opposing ranks as Hebrews.[103] Therefore, it seems plausible to suggest that the LXX has interpreted (whether intentionally or unintentionally) the key contrast between the identity of the champion as a Foreigner and the identity of the Israelite ranks, as ethnic Hebrews.

The final textual difficulty is discrepancy between LXX[B], which reads ’Εβραῖοι καὶ Σαούλ ("Hebrews *and* Saul"), and the rest of the Greek manuscript tradition which reads

---

[99] The MT reads הפלשתי ("*the* Philistine"). Scholars sometimes suggest that the article here makes Goliath the representative of the Philistines. I am wary of making too much of this in light of the broad usage of the Hebrew article (cf. the usage of הארי, "*the* lion," and הדוב, "*the* bear" in 17:34; and James Barr, "Determination and the Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew," *JSS* 34/2 [1989]: 307-55). It seems probable that the article crept into the MT because of the consistent later designation of Goliath as הפלשתי (McCarter, *Samuel*, 287).

[100] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 58-59; 136. Cf. Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 275.

[101] Cf. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 318; McCarter, *Samuel*, 287; and Klein, *1 Samuel*, 171.

[102] Firth, *Samuel*, 196.

[103] Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 318.

Ἑβραῖοι τοῦ Σαούλ ("Hebrews *of* Saul").[104] Lestienne states that the "LXX thus represents an intermediate state between the MT and the Haggadah, which shows Goliath provoking Saul to single combat."[105] Thus *BdA* subsequently translates as "et vous, des Hébreux, et Saül aussi?" The other translation projects follow Rahlfs-Hanhart in translating Ἑβραῖοι τοῦ Σαούλ, *LXX.D*: "Sauls *Hebräer*;" *NETS*: "Hebrews of Saoul." It is easy to understand the reading Ἑβραῖοι τοῦ Σαούλ as a correction to the MT since it both reads more naturally and is a faithful rendering of the presumed *Vorlage*: עברים לשאול. The complexity of this variant makes it difficult to make a judgment on and perhaps too much should not be made in terms of narrative intentionality. However, we may cautiously note the narrative effect of the reading in LXX^B as one which, by having Goliath especially single out Saul, offers a greater critique of the Israelite king when he remains afraid with his men (v. 11).

Goliath tells the ranks of Israel to "choose (ἐκλέξασθε) a man for yourselves and let him come down to me."[106] As will be clarified later (esp. v. 10), Goliath's challenge here is a challenge to μονομαχία ("single combat"). He is offering the ancient Near Eastern version of "throwing down the gauntlet," an action which will bring grave dishonor upon the opposing side if the challenge is not met.[107]

---

[104] Rahlfs-Hanhart prints this in the main text and it is witnessed by A dlpqt vz Eth boc₂e₂.

[105] *BdA*, 297: "La LXX représente ainsi un état intermédiaire entre le TM et la Haggadah qui montre Goliath provoquant Saül en combat singulier." He also notes that some manuscripts of *Targum Jonathan* suggest a similar interpretation. See Alexander Sperber, *The Bible in Aramaic* (Leiden: Brill, 1959), 2:127.

[106] MT reads ברו, which appears to be an imperative form of ברה, which means "eat," though *HALOT* suggests a second meaning that means to "enter into a בְּרִית with someone: commission him as your representative" (citing Johannes Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten: in seinem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam* [Straßburg, Austria: K.J. Trübner, 1914], 44-45; so also Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 318). McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 287, suggests reading this as an imperative from ברר, which can mean "select" but appears only to have this meaning in participial form, thus the suggested emendation to ברו (so also Klein, *1 Samuel*, 171; and Auld, *Samuel*, 196). Many scholars suggest emending the Hebrew to בחר ("choose") on the evidence of the context and the LXX, which translates ἐκλέγω ("choose"), which is the standard translation equivalent for בחר (so Driver, *Samuel*, 140; Smith, *Samuel*, 155). However we arrive, etymologically, at the meaning "choose," it is clearly the meaning demanded by the context and the Greek translators have rendered it accordingly.

[107] Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 21. On the importance of the theme of honor and shame in the David narratives, though without mentioning this text, see Gary Stansell, "Honor and Shame in the David

Scholars note two different types of single-combat: one, a contest of two representative champions wherein the whole military engagement hangs on the outcome, and another, simply a duel between two champions wherein much honor is at stake, but a military action will follow.[108] Though it is possible to see these as two separate phenomena,[109] in light of the similarities between these two types of engagements, and the fact that what starts out as one type may turn to another, in this narrative at least, it seems advisable to view these as two different types of the same phenomenon, which can be referred to as μονομαχία.[110]

The champion of the Foreigners makes it clear that what he intends is a type of μονομαχία upon which the whole military engagement hangs. He offers terms for the outcome of the contest, which hinge on the concept of servitude. He offers two scenarios. The first scenario: καὶ ἐὰν δυνηθῇ πρὸς ἐμὲ πολεμῆσαι καὶ ἐὰν πατάξῃ με, καὶ ἐσόμεθα ὑμῖν εἰς δούλους ("and if he is able to fight me and strike me, then we will be your slaves"). The Greek makes two stylistic variations to its *Vorlage* here. First, the translator does not follow the word order in the first part of the protasis. Whereas the Hebrew places the infinitive verb immediately on the heels of the main indicative verb (יוכל להלחם), the Greek splits the two verbs with πρὸς ἐμέ, perhaps in order to put the verb πολεμῆσαι ("fight") at the end of the clause.[111] The second stylistic change is introducing both parts of the protasis with καὶ ἐάν. The Hebrew begins the first part of the protasis with אם and the second half with a simple *weqatal* verb.

Narratives," *Semeia* 68 (1994): 55-79.

[108] See Hoffner, "Hittite Analogue," 220.

[109] Hoffner, "Hittite Analogue," 220; Yadin, "Goliath's Armor," 379-80. Yadin thinks that the representative type of single combat is "known almost exclusively from the Greek epic tradition."

[110] De Vaux, "Single Combat," 122-35; Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 8.

[111] In general the LXX follows the Hebrew word order. It is difficult to surmise why the translator varied the word order here. Generally in Greek, closely related elements in a sentence, such as the verb δύναμαι and its complementary infinitive, remain in close proximity unless there is a reason for their separation (*BDF* §473). Perhaps, the relationship between the πολεμῆσαι ("to fight") and πατάξῃ ("strike") caused the translator to move the infinitive to the end of the clause.

Perhaps to make for smoother Greek, the translator has combined both elements of each

clause and put them together, thus beginning each clause with καὶ ἐάν.

The second scenario: "but if I am able, and I strike him, you will be our slaves, and

you will serve us." The Hebrew includes an explicit object for the initial verb: אוכל־לו ("I

prevail *against him*"), which is not included in the Greek. The sense is retained because the

object of the next verb is present.[112]

Goliath's terms begin with the imagined scenario where the Israelites prevail and the

Foreigners serve them. He ends with the imagined scenario where he prevails and the

Israelites serve the Foreigners. He begins by offering hope, only to dash that hope. This is

rhetorically brought home by the repeated reference to the servitude of Israel, which forces

the reader (and the Israelites) to dwell on the idea of Israelite servitude twice as long. It is not

necessary in the context, it is simply rhetorical punctuation: *you will serve us!*

Having offered his terms, Goliath continues his challenge. The narrative structurally

divides the following part of the speech from the previous part by the interruptive feature of

inserting "and the Foreigner said" (καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἀλλόφυλος) into the speech.[113] By reintroducing

Goliath's direct speech, the narrative may also subtly communicate a pause, wherein the

reader may imagine that the Israelites are offered a moment to respond, but, of course, none

do.[114]

Goliath's taunt continues in v. 10 with an emphatic: Ἰδού ("Behold!"). This does not

have a direct equivalent in the Hebrew. The Hebrew begins with the personal pronoun אני

("I"), which seems to be emphatic.[115] Simply translating the initial אני would have

---

[112] De Boer, "1 Samuel XVII," 85.
[113] See Revell, "Repetition," 91-110.
[114] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 179.
[115] See Takamitsu Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1985), 47-59.

communicated some degree of emphasis in the Greek,[116] but it appears that the translators wanted to make the emphatic nature of this statement more explicit and introduced the element: Ἰδού.[117]

The emphatic content of his taunt is: Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ὠνείδισα τὴν παράταξιν Ἰσραὴλ σήμερον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ("Behold! I reproach the ranks of Israel today, in this day"). Though the typical word for challenge in a Greek context, προκαλέω ("to call out to fight, challenge"), is not used in this context, Esler notes that the Greek word ὀνειδίζω effectively communicates the idea of a challenge.[118] It seems, however, that the term ὀνειδίζω and its underlying Hebrew term חרף communicates slightly more than a simple challenge. As de Vaux remarked, "this is only one step short of hurling insults."[119] In the context of Goliath's taunt it seems that the gauntlet was thrown in v. 8. Here the challenge is intensified to the level of open rebuke.[120]

There is a sense of urgency in Goliath's challenge because he declares that "today, this very day" (σήμερον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ) he defies the ranks of Israel. This phrase seems overly redundant and is more than is necessary to translate the Hebrew היום הזה ("this day"). The Hebrew phrase היום הזה is variously translated in 1 Reigns.[121] In the present verse LXX^L and multiple other manuscripts read εν τη ημερα ταυτη.[122] While it may be possible to read the phrase in LXX^B as natural Greek it seems much more likely that this is a doublet reflecting two traditions, one reflecting σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ and one reflecting ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ, which

---

[116] *BDF* §276; Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 321-22. Cf. Runge, *A Discourse Grammar*, 269-73.

[117] Cf. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 318.

[118] Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 22.

[119] De Vaux, "Single Combat," 123. Cf. also McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 293; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 445.

[120] In the narrative of the Rabshakah's challenge to Hezekiah, the Rabshakah's words are described as a חרף ("reproach," 2 Kings 19:4, 16, 22, 23), which is translated each time in the Greek with ὀνειδίζω ("reproach").

[121] E.g., τη ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ (5:5; 8:8; 12:2; 14:45; 28:18; 29:3; 29:8), ἐν ταύτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (17:46; 24:11), σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ (25:32; 26:24) and σήμερον (17:46; 24:11; 30:25).

[122] In addition to boc₂e₂, Ne-jmnsvwb₂.

were combined in LXX[B] into σήμερον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ.[123] However, though this reading

likely reflects a complex textual history, in its current form it does add some urgency to

Goliath's challenge.

The champion finishes his challenge with "give me a man and we will fight together

in single combat (μονομαχήσομεν ἀμφότεροι)." If there was ever a doubt that this is a

challenge to a μονομαχία this last statement puts it to rest. The verb μονομαχέω is used only

here and in Ps. 151:1, which references this verse. Every other use of לחם ("to fight") in 1

Samuel is translated with πολεμέω ("to fight"). This is a clear contextual adjustment to

communicate that what is meant by "fighting together" in this narrative is the "single

combat," known in Greek as a μονομαχία.[124]

Goliath's challenge is now ended. He has proven himself to be a formidable opponent

in physical size, military equipment and rhetorical ability.[125] The narrative has thus far

proceeded at a fairly slow pace. The reader's sense of anticipation is piqued and they are now

waiting for Israel's response. The scene is set, the gauntlet is thrown. How will the ranks of

Israel respond to this challenge?

2.3. Reaction: Israel, Saul and David (vv. 11, 32)

The narrative reports that "Saul and all Israel heard the word of this Foreigner." For the

second time Saul is being included in a phrase that presumably could have just referenced the

ranks of Israel. Why does the narrative continue to keep Saul in view? First, it must be

recalled that Israel demanded a king so that the king could "go out before us and fight our

---

[123] Contra Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, 254. They compare the phrasing of *Epict. Dis.* 1.11.38, Ἀπο τῆς σήμερον τοίνυν ἡμέρας ("from this day then. . . ").
[124] Auld, *Samuel*, 197, also notes that the Hebrew here is unique and the LXX has chosen a contextual rendering.
[125] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 179.

battles" (8:20). Second, Saul is head and shoulders taller than anyone in Israel (9:2; 10:23). He is the giant of the land and there is no one like him in all Israel (10:24). If there is anyone in Israel that can answer the giant's challenge it is Saul. This is his moment.[126] By reminding the reader that Saul is in the midst of the Israelite ranks, we are perhaps led to hope for the Saul of chapter 11, who destroyed Nahash. But the reader also knows the Saul of ch. 13, who acted rashly because the people were abandoning him, and the Saul of ch. 14, who stood by while his son won the victory, and the Saul of ch. 15, who won the victory but lost divine approval. Which Saul will be present in this narrative?

The reaction of Saul and all Israel is given in two aorist verbs, καὶ ἐξέστησαν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα ("and they were dismayed and greatly afraid"). The Greek ἐξίστημι ("be alarmed, surprised," *LEH, LSJ*; "be astonished, amazed," *GELS*) is used to render the Hebrew חתת ("be shattered, dismayed, terrified," see *HALOT*). The Hebrew word חתת is not a common word and is used only one other time in 1 Samuel.[127] The word ἐξίστημι was used in a similarly "fearful" context in 16:4. Whether intentionally or not, it seems likely that the translation at 16:4 has influenced the translation here in 17:11. With the exception of the present passage, the word ἐξίστημι is used exclusively in 1 Reigns to translate חרד ("to tremble, worry"). It seems that for the translators of 1 Reigns, the reaction of Saul and Israel to Goliath's challenge called to mind the reaction of the elders in response to the arrival of Samuel (16:4).

But Saul and the Israelites are not just "dismayed," they are "greatly afraid" (ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα). This is an embarrassing and shameful response on behalf of Saul and

---

[126] Cf. Alter, *The David Story*, 103; and Firth, *Samuel*, 196.

[127] 1 Sam. 2:10 (4QSamᵃ): יהוה יחת מריבו ("Yhwh will dismay/shatter his enemies"), MT: יהוה יחתו מריבו ("Yhwh! His enemies will be shattered/dismayed"). See *DJD* 17, 34. LXX translates this as Κύριος ἀσθενῆ ποιήσει ἀντίδικον αὐτοῦ ("The Lord will make his adversaries weak"). חתת is elsewhere translated as δειλιάω ("be afraid," Deut. 1:21; 31:8; Josh. 8:1; 10:25) or φοβέω ("to fear," Josh. 1:9).

102

Israel.[128] This reaction is especially condemnatory for Saul, who is clearly having trouble

with fear. He was told by Samuel to fear the Lord (12:14, 24), and has already been

reprimanded for fearing the people (15:24). Now he is greatly afraid of the champion of the

Foreigners. Saul's moment has come and he has failed it.[129] Instead of going out and fighting

Israel's battles (8:20), he, the king, the largest man in Israel (9:2; 10:23), one of two people

who have a sword and spear (13:22), joins the people in their fear. Thus, as Alter has noted,

"the stage is set for his deplacement[sic] by David."[130]

As soon as the reader hears of the "great fear" of Saul and all Israel, David speaks up.

David has not been mentioned since 16:23 where he is playing the lyre to ease Saul from the

tormenting spirit. We thus get the picture that he is a permanent fixture of Saul's court. It is

perhaps an ironic narrative moment when the court musician, not the king or his warriors, is

the one who speaks up and volunteers to confront the giant. He directly addresses Saul and

says Μὴ δὴ συμπεσέτω[131] ἡ καρδία τοῦ κυρίου ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν ("Let not my Lord's heart fall upon

him").[132] This is slightly different than the MT, which reads אל־יפל לב־אדם עליו ("Let *no man's*

heart fall upon him").[133] The textual difference between these two readings is very slight, אדם

in the MT and אדני in the presumed *Vorlage* of the LXX, so accidental corruption is a strong

possibility for the existence of this variant.[134]

[128] Cf. Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 22-23.

[129] Cf. Hendel, "Plural Texts," 110, who notes the contrast between Saul's reaction to Goliath's challenge with Menelaus' reaction to Paris' challenge (*Il.* 3.19-20).

[130] Alter, *David Story*, 103.

[131] LXX[B] reads συνπεσέτω, which is presumably a spelling error/variation. Na₂ read συμπεσέτω, which is correct. Rahlfs-Hanhart print this in their text.

[132] The Hebrew אל־יפל לב־אדם עליו likely means "let not the heart of any man fall *on account of* him." The preposition "him" here would be referencing Goliath (e.g., *NRSV*). The Greek phrase ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν would probably not suggest the meaning "on account of him," and instead requires the preposition "him" to be referring to Saul (cf. *NETS*). It appears that the prevalence of the Hebrew verb נפל to be followed by על has led the translator to translate here with a form of πίπτω followed by ἐπί (the standard equivalent of this Hebrew formulation), even though it communicates something slightly different.

[133] Syr is one of the few witnesses to follow MT: ܠܐ ܢܦܠ ܠܒܗ ܕܐܢܫ (*lʾ npal lbh dʾdm*, "let *no one's* heart fall").

[134] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 106; Driver, *Samuel*, 144; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 330; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 287; and

We noted that the issue of the heart was a key issue in ch. 16 and is a key issue for the Lord's chosen agents.[135] Now, in response to this challenge, the issue of the heart is being brought out again. This makes the reading of the LXX significant. On the one hand, David's reference to "the heart of my lord" is probably simply formulaic deferential language. On the other hand, in the complex of references to the heart of the Lord's chosen agents the reader is led to hear in David's response a subtle critique of Saul. David is offering to do what Saul should be doing and functionally taking his place.[136] Rhetorically, to the reader's ear, this is fairly a strong critique.[137]

David, however, offers more than a subtle critique of Saul's inaction. He offers to remedy the situation by acting himself: ὁ δοῦλός σου πορεύσεται καὶ πολεμήσει μετὰ τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου τούτου ("your servant will go and fight with this Foreigner"). On one level, this offer is a response to Goliath's challenge, in which he asked Israel why they have "come out" (ἐκπορεύομαι, v. 8) and asked if anyone is able "to fight" (πολεμῆσαι) him. On another level, this response echoes Saul's duty as king: to go out before the people and fight their battles (8:20: καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν, καὶ πολεμήσει τὸν πόλεμον ἡμῶν). One could read this as David fulfilling the role that Saul is expected to play.[138]

In the LXX version of the story, these are David's first words in the biblical text. In the MT, David has already spoken and asked about the rewards for the one who slays this Philistine who has insulted the ranks of the living God (17:26), and scholars often make much of these initial words on the principle that a character's first words are a very important

_____

Klein, *1 Samuel*, 171, prefer the LXX reading as original. The MT reading is defended by de Boer, "1 Samuel XVII," 93; van der Kooij, "David and Goliath," 124; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 457.

[135] See above ch. 2; and Johnson, "Heart," 460-67.

[136] Cf. *BdA*, 302. Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 145, notes that the MT reading makes David seem more the hero.

[137] Cf. Hendel, "Plural Texts," 110.

[138] Cf. Firth, *Samuel*, 198-99. The reading of "my lord" further allows the play on the reversal of roles since David the servant, is taking the place of Saul, the lord. Cf. Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 285.

moment of characterization.[139] However, in the LXX version, David's first words occur here, in response to Saul's lack of action. David's first words put him in direct contrast to Saul. Saul is afraid, but David is willing to go out and fight. David's first words establish him as someone who is willing to do what Saul should do. In this contrast we have a hint of the fact that this narrative is not really about David and Goliath, but about David and Saul.

2.4. Debating David's Daring (vv. 33-37)

Saul responds to David by telling him he is unable to fight the champion: "You are not able (δύναμαι) to go to the Foreigner to fight (πολεμέω) with him." Saul's words to David echo the challenge of Goliath, and likely echo the fear of the whole camp, that no one will be able (δύναμαι) to fight (πολεμέω) the champion (see v. 9).

The reason Saul believes that David is not able to fight Goliath is that David is a but a "boy" (παιδάριον), while Goliath has been "a man of war from his youth (ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ)." Surprisingly, Saul's objection is not David's size compared with the giant, but his youth and inexperience.[140] The use of the term παιδάριον (the standard equivalent for the Hebrew נער in 1 Reigns) is probably meant to communicate not a "little boy," but a "youth" or "young man."[141] In the majority of instances in 1 Reigns, the word παιδάριον is used to refer to a "servant."[142] So, contrary to many popular depictions, David is not depicted here as a little boy, but a relatively untried and untested young warrior, who, according to Saul, is not ready

---

[139] See Alter, *David Story*, 105; and Bodner, "Eliab and the Deuteronomist," 63-65.

[140] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 293; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 457; Firth, *Samuel*, 199.

[141] See *LEH; GELS*, s.v. "παιδάριον b." G.R. Stanton, "Τέκνον, παῖς and Related Words in Koine Greek," in *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25-31 May, 1986* (ed. B.G. Mandilaras; Athens: Greek Papyrology Society, 1988), 476-77, notes that παιδάριον very frequently means "slave." This explains why this word is often used to render נער ("young man," "servant").

[142] *BdA*, 302. E.g., 1 Rgns. 9:3, 5-8, 10, 22; 10:14; 14:1; 16:11, 18. On the double meaning of the Hebrew נער as "youth" and "attendant" both here and in the broader biblical context see Diana Vikander Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah* (JSOT Supp. 121; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 130; and John MacDonald, "The Status and Role of the Na'ar in Israelite Society," *JNES* 35/3 (1974): 147-70.

to face the battle hardened and formidable champion. Instead, of listing Goliath's great height

or formidable military equipment as a deterrent to David's offer, Saul lists military experience

as the main inequality between the two fighters. As the tallest man in Israel (9:2; 10:23), and

the only person with comparable military equipment to Goliath (13:22), he may well may not

want to draw attention to those aspects of Goliath's formidability, lest people draw the

conclusions that the reader is likely drawing.[143]

David, then, speaks up for himself and offers a rhetorically powerful resumé.[144] He

begins with a periphrastic construction, ποιμαίνων ἦν ὁ δοῦλος σου ("your servant was

shepherding"), which sets the scene in something like a perfective past time,[145] and is a good

rendering of the Hebrew periphrastic construction, רעה היה ("was shepherding").[146] Perhaps

clued in by this periphrastic construction, the translator of 1 Reigns successfully recognizes

the iterative nature of the Hebrew *weqatal* forms and translates them as imperfects (ἤρχετο . .

. ἐλάμβανεν . . . ἐξεπορευόμην).[147] These Greek forms have the same iterative force as the

Hebrew.[148] The sense is that lions or bears "*would come . . .* and *would take . . .* and [David]

would go after them." The translator has shown himself capable of rendering the Hebrew

---

[143] Barbara Green, *How Are the Mighty Fallen? A Dialogical Study of King Saul in 1 Samuel*, (JSOT Supp. 365; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2003), 289.

[144] See Anthony R. Ceresko, "A Rhetorical Analysis of David's 'Boast' (1 Samuel 17:34-37): Some Reflections on Method," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 58-74. Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 207-08, note that David's boast is surprising here. In a context where David's dependence upon the Lord is emphasized it is surprising to see boast of Herculean strength.

[145] See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 648; and *BDF* §353. Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, §72, note that this construction is very common in the LXX. Chrys C. Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2004), 155-56, notes that this usage becomes more frequent in post-Classical Greek.

[146] On the Hebrew periphrastic construction היה + ptc, see *Joüon–Muraoka*, §121f; and *Waltke–O'Connor*, §37.71b. Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 457-58.

[147] Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 136, notes this skillful use of the Greek imperfect.

[148] On the iterative use of the Greek imperfect see *BDF* §325; and Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 546-48. On the iterative force of the Hebrew *weqatal* verbs see Jan Joosten, "Biblical Hebrew *weqatal* and Syriac *hwa qatel* Expressing Repetition in the Past," *ZAH* 5 (1992): 1-14; idem "The Disappearance of iterative weqatal in the biblical Hebrew Verbal System," in *Biblical Hebrew in its Northwest Semitic Setting* (ed. S.E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 135-47; and J.P. Fokkelman, "Iterative Forms of the Classical Hebrew Verb: Exploring the Triangle of Style, Syntax, and Text Grammar," in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer* (ed. K. Jongeling et al.; Leiden, 1991), 38-55.

verbs thus far, which leads us to question his translation choices in the remaining portions of David's boast. The verbal variations in these verses are presented briefly below:

Table 4: Verbal Variation in David's Boast (vv. 34-36)

qotel + qatal	רעה היה	Ποιμαίνων ἦν	Pres Ptc + Impf
weqatal	ובא	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο	καὶ + x + Impf
weqatal	ונשא	καὶ ἐλάμβανεν	καὶ + Impf
weqatal	ויצאתי	καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην	καὶ + Impf
weqatal	והכיתו	καὶ ἐπάταξα	καὶ + Aor
weqatal	והצלתי	καὶ ἐξέσπασα	καὶ + Aor
wayyiqtol	ויקם	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο	καὶ + x + Impf
weqatal	והחזקתי	καὶ ἐκράτησα	καὶ + Aor
weqatal	והכתיו	καὶ ἐπάταξα	καὶ + Aor
weqatal	והמיתיו	καὶ ἐθανάτωσα	καὶ + Aor

This pattern seems especially puzzling because the translator has switched from imperfect to aorist verbs despite the consistent chain of *weqatal* forms in the Hebrew. I suggest, that, similar to the phenomenon we saw in vv. 1-8, the verbal patterns in the OG conform to a pattern of usage seen in other Greek literature, whereby imperfect verbs function to create a "narrative framework" for the main action often depicted with aorist (or "historical" present) verbs.[149]

Analyzing the verbal patterns in 1 Rgns. 17:34-35 from this perspective yields the following result.[150] The narrative begins with a periphrastic participial phrase setting the scene: ποιμαίνων ἦν ὁ δοῦλος σου ("your servant was shepherding"). The narrative proper

---

[149] See Albert Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2006), 11; idem, "The Discourse Function of the Imperfect," in *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner* (ed. A. Rijksbaron et. al.; Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1988), 237-54; Sicking, "Aspect Choice," 70; and Alviero Niccacci, "Dall'aoristo All'imperfetto O Dal Primo Piano Allo Sfondo: Un paragone tra sintassi greca e sintassi ebraica," *LASBF* 42 (1992): 85-105.
[150] For a fuller presentation of this argument see Appendix I.

begins with a series of imperfect verbs: καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο . . . καὶ ἐλάμβανεν . . . καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην ("whenever they would come . . . and they would take . . . then I would go out"). On the one hand, this is backgrounded information that sets up the narrative for the actions that will be the main events that carry the narrative forward. On the other hand, as Rijksbaron noted, the imperfect forms create a sense of anticipation:[151] what would happen when a lion or bear would come and take a sheep? What would happen when David went out after them? The scene is set for David's action. The narrative then continues with what would be considered the *foregrounded* or main line narrative with David's actions, depicted with a quick succession of aorist verbs: καὶ ἐπάταξα . . . καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I struck . . . I pulled out").

The narrative then sets a new scenario: καὶ εἰ ἐπανιστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ ("and if it turned against me"). This clause adds new background information that is essential to understand the action that follows. When David would deliver a lamb from the lion or bear, if the beast turned on him: καῖ ἐκράτησα . . . καὶ ἐπάταξα . . . καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν ("and I seized . . . and I struck . . . and I killed it").

David then explains that just as he "slew" (ἔτυπτεν) both lion and bear, so it "will be" (ἔσται) with this Philistine. Thus, the reality of David's actions against the lion and the bear are the background information that prepare for the actions that will happen to Goliath: πορεύομαι καὶ πατάξω . . . καὶ ἀφελῶ ("I will go and I will strike . . . and I will remove"). The action of these verses can thus be outlined as follows:

Table 5: Verbal Variation Outlined

Scene Setting	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο ("whenever they would come")	Impf
	καὶ ἐλάμβανεν ("and they would take")	Impf
	καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην ("then I would go out")	Impf

---

[151] Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 11. Cf. Sicking, "Aspect Choice," 70.

Main Action	καὶ ἐπάταξα ("I struck")	Aor
	καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I pulled out")	Aor
Scene Setting	καὶ εἰ ἐπανιστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ ("and if it turned against me")	Impf
Main Action	καῖ ἐκράτησα ("and I seized")	Aor
	καὶ ἐπάταξα ("and I struck")	Aor
	καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αυτον ("and I killed it")	Aor
Scene Setting (what has happened)	ἔτυπτεν ("slew")	Impf
What will happen	πορεύομαι ("I will go")	Fut
	καὶ πατάξω ("and I will strike")	Fut
	καὶ αφελῶ ("and I will remove")	Fut

Thus, in response to Saul's statement to David that he is not able to fight with the Foreigner, David tells a story that details the following in the main action: "I struck . . . I pulled out . . . I seized . . . I struck . . . I killed . . . I will go . . . I will strike . . . I will remove."

Putting these actions on the foreground of David's narrative about his qualifications enhances the rhetorical power of David's response to Saul, and effectively foreshadows what will happen between David and Goliath. This foreshadowing is further enhanced in the Greek version of the story by the LXX plus in v. 36b.

Table 6: 17:36 – MT/LXX[B]

גם את־הארי גם־הדוב הכה עבדך	καὶ τὴν ἄρκον ἔτυπτεν ὁ δοῦλός σου καὶ τὸν λέοντα,
והיה הפלשתי הערל הזה כאחד מהם	καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀλλόφυλος ὁ ἀπερίτμητος ὡς ἓν τούτων·
--	οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι
--	καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν,
--	καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον ὄνειδος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ;
כי חרף מערכת אלהים חיים:	διότι τίς ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος ὃς ὠνείδισεν παράταξιν θεοῦ ζῶντος;

In the Hebrew, David merely states that the Philistine will be like one of the lions or bears that David has so heroically dispatched. In the Greek the three future verbs that further detail what David will do, are pluses in the LXX. Thus, between the foregrounded verbs in David's speech and the plus in 17:36, the foreshadowing of David's action with Goliath is further emphasized:

Table 7: David's Boast and David's Actions

What David Did (aorist verbs)	What David Will Do (LXX Plus)	What David Does
V. 35 (2x) καὶ ἐπάταξα ("I struck")	V. 36 καὶ πατάξω ("I will strike")	V. 49 καὶ ἐπάταξεν ("he struck")
V. 35 καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I pulled out") / καῖ ἐκράτησα ("I seized")		V. 51 καὶ ἔλαβεν ("he took")
V. 35 καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αυτον ("I killed it")		V. 51 καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν ("he killed")
	V. 36 καὶ αφελῶ ("I will remove")	V. 51 καὶ ἀφεῖλεν ("he removed")

McCarter tentatively accepts that this plus was original and that the MT has suffered haplography, where the scribe's eye has skipped from (כאחד מהם) הערל הזה to כי חרף based on the similarity of some of the letters of כאחד מהם and כי חרף.[152] Other scholars suggest that the LXX plus is a secondary expansion based on the almost identical phrasing in v. 26.[153] However, it would be surprising, as McCarter points out, to see a secondary expansion based on a part of the text that is part of the large LXX minus.[154] I am inclined to see this LXX plus

[152] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 287.
[153] Smith, *Samuel*, 161; and Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 331.
[154] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 287.

as a secondary expansion, not on the basis of the antecedent text in v. 26 but as an expansion based on the antecedent text in v. 35 and the subsequent text in vv. 49 and 51 (see Table 6).[155]

With this last element of his boast David turns from his own personal resumé to the key theological point of his speech: the saving power of the living God. Thus far in the narrative, the only reaction to Goliath's challenge has been "dismay and fear" (v. 11). But in David's rhetorical question: "for who is this uncircumcised one who reproaches the ranks of the living God?" we see the theological significance of Goliath's challenge. This is not just a military challenge, or a challenge of honor, this is a theological challenge.[156] Goliath has reproached the ranks of the living God and by inference reproached the living God himself.

Thus far in his speech David has extolled his own exploits. However, in 17:37 he says,[157] "The Lord who delivered me from the hand of the lion and from the hand of the bear. . . ." In telling of his exploits in the previous two verses David has left no hint that any power other than his own was involved, allowing his own image to be built up. But here, in the finale of his speech he forces a reinterpretation of his resumé and reveals the real reason for his success, that the Lord is with him in a special way.[158]

---

[155] Cf. Stefan Ark Nitsche, *David Gegen Goliath: Die Geschichte der Geschichten einer Geschichte Zur fächerübergreifenden Rezeption einer biblischen Story* (ATM 4; Münster, Germany: LIT, 2002), 94.

[156] George, "Constructing Identity," 397; Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 411-15; André Wénin, "David roi, de Goliath à Bethsabée: La figure de David dans les livres de Samuel," in *Figures de David à travers la Bible* (ed. Louis Desrousseaux and Jacques Vermeylen: Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1999), 84.

[157] The MT reintroduces David's speech here ויאמר דוד ("and David said"), an element that is lacking in LXX[B], similar to the phenomenon we saw in Goliath's speech in v. 10. Numerous scholars maintain the MT has the original reading, e.g., Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 107; Driver, *Samuel*, 145; Smith, *Samuel*, 161; Ceresko, "David's Boast," 65-66; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 458. McCarter however suggests that the MT has added this element to "re-identify the speaker of an unusually long speech" (McCarter, *Samuel*, 287-88; cf. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 171). There is rhetorical power in each version. The reintroduction of direct speech is in keeping with Hebrew idiom and it nicely matches the same phenomenon in Goliath's speech. Furthermore, as Ceresko has noted, it allows David's name to be framed by "living God" and "Yhwh" (Ceresko, "David's Boast," 65-66). In the Greek, however, a narrative that has not yet mentioned God, it adds a fair amount of pious power so that the "Lord" (Κύριος) follows immediately on the heels of "the living God" (θεοῦ ζῶντος), punctuating *his* past and future deliverance of David.

[158] Cf. Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 130.

Having reinterpreted his past actions, David now explains the implications for his chances in confronting the giant: "he will deliver me from the hand of this uncircumcised Foreigner." This is the second time in two verses that the Greek text has had an additional reference to the Foreigner as "uncircumcised" (ἀπερίτμητος). Lestienne explains this as a feature due to the context of the translators, which he sees as being in the midst of the Hellenistic controversies.[159] In light of the fact that the translator has rendered the name Philistine as Foreigner, and has inserted a reference to their "uncircumcised-ness" here, this seems a likely explanation. The translators appear to be reading the confrontation of David and Goliath as a confrontation between Israel and the quintessential pagan (Hellenistic) "other."

David's rhetoric appears to have convinced Saul, because Saul responds: Πορεύου, καὶ ἔσται Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ ("Go, and the Lord will be with you"). In terms of translation, there is one transformation in this phrase worthy of note. That is the translation of יהיה, a Qal *yiqtol* verb which appears to have a jussive sense, with ἔσται, a future indicative.[160] Lestienne suggests that the Greek represents an affirmation whereas the MT represents a hope.[161] This is perhaps an overstatement. First of all, though it appears likely in the context that יהיה is meant in a jussive sense, it is not certain. After all, היה has a jussive form that the author could have utilized here. So, a number of scholars read the Hebrew here as a simple *yiqtol*, without the jussive meaning.[162] Second, it is not uncommon for the translator of 1 Reigns to translate a Hebrew jussive with a future indicative.[163] Third, even if we read the verbs in

---

[159] *BdA*, 303.

[160] The Greek also reflects a different word order, perhaps reflecting a *Vorlage* ויהיה יהוה (Tov, "Composition," 358), instead of the MT's ויהוה יהיה.

[161] *BdA*, 303.

[162] Klein, *1 Samuel*, 179; Edelman, *King Saul*, 130.

[163] According to an Accordance search, of the 78 instances in 1 Samuel of a verb that is jussive in form and meaning or in meaning only, 26 of those are rendered by the translator of 1 Reigns as a future indicative. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 121-22, 283, notes a similar phenomenon in the Greek Pentateuch.

either Greek or Hebrew in a simple future sense, in the context, it is hard to view this statement by Saul as anything other than a hope. He is persuaded by David's theological rhetoric and understands that if David is to prevail in the upcoming battle he needs the Lord to be with him.[164]

What is significant, in terms of the narrative, is the simple existence of this statement on Saul's lips. The reader knows that the spirit of the Lord has rushed upon David (16:13) and abandoned Saul (16:14), and that Saul's servant believed the Lord to be with David (16:18), and clearly David believed it as well (17:37). Thus, for Saul to admit or to hope that the Lord will be with David is a remark of significant narrative irony.[165]

2.5. Arming and Disarming the Hero (vv. 38-40)

Having been convinced to allow David to face the giant, Saul seeks to contribute to this endeavor by arming the would-be hero.[166] Many elements of this arming scene recall the description of Goliath's armor. The description of this scene is fairly straightforward in the Greek. Saul gives David 1) a garment, 2) a helmet, and 3) a sword. In the Hebrew, the description is more complicated. Saul gives David 1) a garment, 2) a helmet, *3) a coat of mail*, and 4) a sword.

The Hebrew description is difficult to understand for two reasons: 1) the syntactically difficult[167] pattern of *wayyiqtol . . . weqatal . . . wayyiqtol*;[168] and 2) the chronological

---

[164] Cf. Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 246.

[165] Cf. Krinetzki, "Stilanalyse," 216-17; and Ceresko, "David's Boast," 67. Cf. Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope," 407.

[166] Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 209, note that this scene creates suspense, by delaying the combat.

[167] Calling this formulation "syntactically impossible" (so McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 288), seems an overstatement.

[168] For attempts to explain this see Robert E. Longacre, "*Weqatal* Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose: A Discourse-Modular Approach," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. Robert D. Bergen; Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 75. Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 459; and idem, "Literary Insertion (AXB Pattern) in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 33/4 (1983): 468-82. These explanations seem to put emphasis on the *weqatal* phrase of placing the helmet, when I see no reason that this would be emphatic.

absurdity of having Saul put a helmet on David *before* putting on his mail. It seems likely that these two difficulties could be explained as follows. The use of the *weqatal* form (ונתן) could be used to break the chronological progression of the *wayyiqtol* chain.[169] After the reference to the garment, the Hebrew text follows the pattern of the description of Goliath's armor, which proceeds from top to bottom: helmet followed by mail (v. 5). This works when Goliath is being described fully armed, but it is nonsensical to describe someone arming themselves first with a helmet, then putting on mail or a breastplate.[170] Thus, the use of a *weqatal* form could be a narrative way to break the chronology while still referring to the armor in the same order as was mentioned in the description of Goliath.

It seems likely that the translator of 1 Reigns was faced with a text similar to MT, and couldn't make sense of it as it stood, and has thus made a few adjustments. First, recognizing the odd pattern of *wayyiqtol . . . weqatal . . . wayyiqtol,* the translator has omitted the offending *weqtal* verb.[171] Second, recognizing that it does not make sense to put on a coat of armer after a helmet, the translator has removed the phrase that references the coat of armor.[172] Though these omissions are fairly substantial, the Hebrew text, as it was likely understood by the translator, was in need of repair.

Though, David, even with his kingly armor, does not have as extensive a panoply as Goliath, in v. 39 we are told he does have one element not mentioned in Goliath's panoply, a

---

[169] Some argue that the verb may have originally read ויתן which was corrupted to ונתן (Smith, *Samuel*, 288; *GKC*, §112tt).

[170] In the Homeric arming scenes the sequence of the arming is never varied, it always proceeds: greaves, breastplate, sword, shield, helmet, spear. The sequence, though part of a type-scene, is actually quite logical. (see Armstrong, "Arming Motif," 344). Cf. Gary A. Rendsburg, "Confused Language as a Deliberate Literary Device in Biblical Hebrew Narrative," *JHebS* 2/6 (1999): 12-13, who also notes that Saul arms David in absurd order, but argues that it reflects the fact that Saul is so flustered that he is incapable of arming David properly.

[171] Cf. de Boer, "1 Samuel XVII," 96; Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 150. The phenomenon of the translator not fully understanding his *Vorlage* is explored by Emanuel Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 203-18.

[172] Cf. de Boer," 1 Samuel XVII," 96. Numerous Greek MSS (boc₂e₂, gz[mg]) include και ενεδυσεν αυτον θωρακα ("and he clothed him with mail").

sword. That Saul gives David his sword here is likely significant for a number of reasons. First, as we have repeatedly noted, Saul and Jonathan are the only Israelites to possess swords (13:22). Thus, Saul's sword is specifically mentioned as something only the two *royal* warriors have. Second, as we noted above, despite his exhaustive list of armaments, Goliath's sword is never mentioned. This is the first reference to a sword in the narrative and it is ironically being strapped to the character who, though he will not use it in the fight, will use it in the end to behead his enemy. Third, it is perhaps an interesting bit of narrative foreshadowing that Saul will arm his rival with his own sword, only to die upon that sword by his own hand (31:4).[173]

This ends the description of Saul arming David. The reader cannot help but notice the ironic role reversal in this scene. Saul, the champion of Israel, afraid to face the champion of the Foreigners, becomes armor bearer to his own armor bearer who has stepped up to the role of champion of Israel.[174] Furthermore, Saul, the current king, has now adorned his rival, the Lord's anointed, with his own royal armor. Saul himself has effectively made the first symbolic gesture of making David his replacement.

David now attempts to test Saul's armor. However, what happens when he does is fraught with textual difficulty. In the Greek David tries to walk and wearies himself: καὶ ἐκοπίασεν περιπατήσας ἅπαξ καὶ δίς ("and he grew weary walking time and again"). This is not quite an accurate rendering of the Hebrew: ויאל ללכת כי לא־נסה, which most obviously would mean something like "and he was willing to walk for he had not tested [them]."

The first issue in this sentence is the verb ויאל. The above translation is based on the assumption that the MT's וַיֹּאֶל should be read as a Hiphil form of the root יאל ("to be willing,

---

[173] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 200.
[174] Edelman, *King Saul*, 131.

to decide"). Contextually, this makes the sentence very difficult to understand. The most obvious way to solve this difficulty is to look to the LXX's καὶ ἐκοπίασεν and suggest that its *Vorlage* likely read וילא ("and he wearied").[175]

Contextually, however, it is a little difficult to understand why he grew weary because he had not tested them. Thus, Driver has proposed reading וַיֹּאֶל not as a Hiphil form of the root יאל but as an otherwise unattested use of אלה, meaning "to hesitate."[176] While this is slightly conjectural, it does make sense in the context. Conversely, Tsumura has suggested reading ויאל as a form of the root יאל, but understanding it in the sense of "to undertake," thus translating "and he undertook to walk."[177]

So what is David doing here? Ultimately, all options are fairly conjectural and difficult to resolve. The meaning of the Greek, however, is fairly clear: καὶ ἐκοπίασεν περιπατήσας ("and he wearied himself walking"). Either the translator's *Vorlage* read וילא ("and he wearied") or the translator, coming across the odd usage of ויאל assumed, much like many modern text critics, that the text should read וילא and translated accordingly.[178]

The second issue is a variant for why David could not use the armor. The Hebrew gives a reason why David wearied himself (or whatever he did) in trying Saul's armor, with a כי clause: כי לא־נסה ("for he had not tested [them]"). In other words, he was not practiced with that kind of armor and could not manage it somehow. The Greek text of LXX[B] does not

---

[175] So Driver, *Samuel*, 146; Klein, *Textual Criticism*, 79; idem, *1 Samuel,* 171-72; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 288; Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 246. Κοπιάω translates לאה in Isa. 16:12 and 47:13, and is used to translate עיף ("to be weary") in 1 Rgns. 14:31.

[176] G.R. Driver, "Studies on the Vocabulary of the Old Testament. V," *JTS* 34 (1933): 33. Driver's evidence is the Arabic cognate ʾalaᵂ. *HALOT* has adopted this reading and the meaning "to hesitate" under III אלה, citing 1 Sam. 17:39 as evidence.

[177] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 459. Tsumura lists *BDB* as evidence here, and though *BDB*, s.v. "יאל" lists this as an option they appear to suggest emending ויאל to וילא in 1 Sam. 17:39.

[178] Similar kinds of translational activity are observed by Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 162-71; and idem, "Did the Translators Always Understand?" 210-13.

reflect this element of the sentence and instead reads ἅπαξ καὶ δίς ("once and twice").[179] It is clear that ἅπαξ καὶ δίς is not a corruption of כי לא־נסה, thus some scholars suggest that the LXX[B] reading reflects a *Vorlage* that read פעם ופעמים ("a time and times").[180] It seems that a likely scenario for the current state of the text is that something similar to the MT was the original text. The translator, rendering ויאל as וילא (καὶ ἐκοπίασεν) was forced to emend the following text for it to logically fit, for as Driver noted, how "and he wearied himself" is logically caused by "he had not tested [them]" is difficult to imagine.[181] Thus, the translator dropped the element that no longer fits in the context (כי לא־נסה) and inserted the element ἅπαξ καὶ δίς to imply that David tried the armor again and again and grew weary.[182] This kind of activity, where a transformation (intentional or not) in the translation forces the translator to emend other aspects of the text is noted by Tov.[183] This reading explains the existence of both the MT and the LXX[B] text, making it the likely OG reading, with the rest of the Greek tradition attempting to harmonize between the two readings.

After attempting to practice with Saul's armor again and again, David turns to Saul and tells him that he is unable to walk in this armor because he is not experienced with it.[184] Saul had said to David that he was not able to go (Οὐ μὴ δύνῃ πορευθῆναι) fight Goliath

---

[179] Nabe–jmnsvwyz(mg)b₂ boc₂e₂ add οτι απειρος ην ("for he was inexperienced").

[180] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 288; *CATSS*. Cf. 1 Rgns. 20:25. McCarter suggests that the reading כי לא־נסה crept into the present context by influence of the following part of the verse, in which David says: כי לא נסיתי ("for I have not tested [it]"). Though it is possible to view כי לא־נסה as an interpolation based on a later part of the text, it is not uncommon in the narrative to have something said by the narrator immediately repeated by a character, (e.g., 16:14 = 16:15; 17:2 = 17:8).

[181] Driver, "Vocabulary," 33.

[182] Cf. Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 151.

[183] See Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 168-71.

[184] The Greek text ὅτι οὐ πεπείραμαι ("for I am not experienced"), is an accurate translation of כי לא נסיתי. The above textual issue surrounding the phrase כי לא־נסה was apparently not because the translator was unable to accurately translate that phrase.

because he was a youth (17:33). David, however, says that it is Saul's armor that renders him

unable to go (Οὐ μὴ δύνωμαι πορευθῆναι, 17:39).[185]

They then remove (ἀφαιροῦσιν) the armor from upon him. The verb ἀφαιρέω ("to take

away") has and will continue to be used in significant ways in the narrative. David uses it

when he tells Saul that he will remove (ἀφαιρέω) the reproach from Israel (v. 36). It is used

here when Saul's garments are removed (ἀφαιρέω) from David. And it will be used twice in

reference to David removing (ἀφαιρέω) Goliath's head (vv. 46, 51).[186] Furthermore, the

connection of this act with the act of removing the reproach from Israel (v. 36) and removing

Goliath's head (vv. 46, 51), further connects Saul and Goliath, as each appear to be something

that David needs to *remove*.

Saul has attempted to provide David with arms that will enable him to face the giant.

However, as David will note later, the arms that are necessary in this conflict are not the

conventional ones that Saul provides, but the armor of the God of Israel (17:46-47).

If Saul's clothing David in his armor is symbolically significant, then the removing

Saul's armor may be as well.[187] But what is the significance of David removing Saul's armor?

The relationship between David and Saul in 1 Samuel is one of transition in that David is the

future king and Saul is the rejected king, and the story is about going from the reign of the

rejected ruler to the reign of the chosen ruler.[188] Furthermore, as we have noted, this narrative

---

[185] Wénin, "David roi," 85.

[186] The connection between these four statements is brought out in the Greek version because each uses the verb ἀφαιρέω. This is not true of the Hebrew. The statement about David removing the reproach from Israel in v. 36 is an LXX plus. The act of Saul's armor being removed from David uses the word סור ("to turn aside"), as does David's statement that he will remove Goliath's head (v. 46). The actual act of cutting off Goliath's head uses the verb כרת ("to cut off," v. 51).

[187] I am not inclined to make interpretive significance in the differing readings of MT and LXX[B] in this instance. In MT David himself removes his armor: ויסרם דוד, whereas in LXX[B] his armor is removed for him: καὶ ἀφαιροῦσιν αὐτά. As numerous scholars have recognized the original reading was probably ויסרם which was read as singular by LXX[B] and plural by MT. In either case, Saul's armor must be removed from David. See Smith, *Samuel*, 162; Driver, *Samuel*, 146.

[188] See Johnson, "The Heart," 466.

repeats the motif of David as the "remover." He will remove the reproach from Israel, he removes Saul's armor, and he will remove Goliath's head. The comparison between Saul and Goliath is significant in this regard. In a way, Saul as the rejected king who has rejected the word of the Lord (15:23, 26) is also a reproach in Israel and thus needs to be removed. The instance of David removing Saul's armor from upon him may be another symbolic gesture, like the tearing of Samuel's cloak in 15:27-29, that Saul is rejected and David is chosen.[189]

David then turns in v. 40 to choose his own weapons. First, he takes his staff in his hand. Both βακτηρία and מקל are fairly generic terms for "staff" or "rod."[190] However, given what we know of David's pastoral origins, and the fact that included with his staff is a shepherd's bag (τῷ καδίῳ τῷ ποιμενικῷ), it is difficult to view this as anything other than a shepherd's staff.[191] Though David appears to be a permanent member of Saul's court, he has not escaped his pastoral origins.

David then choses five stones from from the river. The MT describes them as חלקי־אבנים ("smooth stones") but LXX[B] describes them as λίθους τελείους ("perfect stones"). Virtually all other Greek manuscripts read λείους λίθους (cdlpqtxz) or λίθους λείους (Ny[b] [rell] Arm Boh Sah) and many scholars see the LXX[B] reading as a secondary corruption.[192] Though the existence of the reading λίθους τελείους as due to an accidental scribal error cannot be ruled out, λίθους τελείους is an understandable contextual rendering of חלקי־אבנים. Furthermore, λείους appears to move positions in the rest of the Greek tradition. Thus, there is

---

[189] Cf. Gunn, *Fate of King Saul*, 79; Fokkelman, *The Crossing Fates*, 176; Ora Horn Prouser, "Suited to the Throne: The Symbolic Use of Clothing in the David and Saul Narratives," *JSOT* 21/3 (1996): 37; George, "Constructing Identity," 405; and Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 185.

[190] On βακτηρία see *LEH, LSJ* and *GELS*; on מקל see *HALOT*.

[191] Alter, *David Story*, 108; Firth, *Samuel*, 199.

[192] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 288; Rahlfs-Hanhart prints λίθους λείους in the main text.

sufficient reason to read the λίθους τελείους of LXX[B] as the original reading and the rest of the Greek tradition as a correction towards MT.[193]

Why David choses five stones has captured the imagination of interpreters throughout the centuries. According to Psuedo-Philo, David chose seven stones and wrote on them the names Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, his own name, and the name of the Lord (*Biblical Antiquities* 61.5). According to *Midrash Samuel* the five stones are selected in the name of God, Aaron and the three fathers (21.1).[194] A recent suggestion is that the five stones represent Goliath and the four giants killed by David's champions in 2 Sam. 22:21.[195] Despite the many creative attempts to understand the symbolism in David's choice of five stones, it may be nothing more than a biblical idiom for "a few," or especially in this instance as something like "a handful" (cf. 1 Sam. 21:4; 2 Kgs. 7:13).[196]

David places his stones into his "shepherd's bag which he had for gathering" (τῷ καδίῳ τῷ ποιμενικῷ τῷ ὄντι αὐτῷ εἰς συλλογήν). The first part of this phrase is a fairly close match to the Hebrew,[197] despite the use of the rare word καδίον, which is nevertheless a recognizable diminutive form of καδός ("vessel").[198] The last part of the phrase εἰς συλλογήν ("for gathering") is markedly different than the Hebrew which reads: ובילקוט ("and in the pouch"). The existence of the *waw* before בילקוט often leads scholars to delete it, though it is probably explainable as an example of a *waw-explicativum*.[199] More difficult, at least for the

---

[193] Cf. *BdA*, 304-05.

[194] See Louis Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1954), 4:87; and 6:251. See also *BdA*, 305.

[195] Charles David Isbell, "A Biblical Midrash on David and Goliath," *SJOT* 20/2 (2006): 259-63.

[196] Cf. Israel Abrahams, "Numbers, Typical and Important," in *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd edition; London/New York: Thomson Gale, 1972), 15:335; and Pope, "Number, Numbering, Numbers," 3:565.

[197] Driver, *Samuel*, 146, suggests that the *Vorlage* of 1 Reigns here may have read אשר היה לו. However, this is unnecessary since it is not uncommon for the translator of 1 Reigns to insert the verb εἰμί to render a Hebrew verbless אשר-clause (e.g., 9:10; 10:5; 14:2; 29:8).

[198] Cf. *LEH, LSJ, GELS*. For further discussion see *BdA*, 305.

[199] David W. Baker, "Further Examples of the *Waw-Explicativum*," *VT* 30/2 (1980): 129. So also Tsumura, *Samuel*, 460; and *WHS* §434.

translator, was the word יִלְקוֹט, which most modern scholars agree means some sort of shepherd's pouch, but is only explicated by understanding the previous phrase כְּלִי הָרֹעִים as a gloss to explain the *hapax* יִלְקוֹט.[200] The Greek translator apparently did not know this word and thus appealed to the root לקט ("to gather, glean"), which elsewhere in the LXX is translated with συλλέγω, and thus rendered it συλλογή.[201]

After David has gathered his stones, the reader is informed that David also took "his sling in his hand" (σφενδόνην αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ).[202] At the beginning of this verse the reader was informed that David took his staff in his hand, now the reader learns what is in his other hand: his sling. The reader is told first about the most obvious item, the staff, and only informed about the sling after hearing about David choosing his stones. Perhaps, this subtle narrative structuring clues the reader that the first thing someone viewing David will see will be the staff, but the most important thing is his sling.

With the mention of David's sling, the reader is reminded perhaps of David's pastoral origins. The sling could well be a weapon used by a shepherd, but the only previous biblical mention of a sling is the mention of the expert Benjaminite warriors, who were slingers (σφενδονήτης, Judg. 20:16). It is certainly ironic that David, a Judahite, is using a weapon for which Saul's tribe is famous.[203]

Despite many popular depictions to the contrary, scholars often note that the sling is actually a common and formidable weapon in the ancient Near East.[204] It is true that slingers

---

[200] See Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope," 409.

[201] Cf. *BdA*, 305.

[202] The accusative form of σφενδόνη is frequently corrected to the nominative. Mss deflmpstw read σφενδονη and MSS cgxz boc₂e₂ read η σφενδονη. The difficulty here is that this is a nominal clause in Hebrew, which causes problems in Greek (cf. the various renderings of Hebrew nominals clauses in Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 86, 119, 121, 123, 132). It seems likely that the use of the accusative in LXX^B is treating the sentence elliptically, perhaps assuming ἔλαβεν from the beginning of the verse, and the rest of the Greek manuscript tradition is attempting to correct towards the MT by having σφενδόνη be the subject of a verbless clause.

[203] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 185.

[204] E.g., Smith, *Samuel*, 162; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 179; McKenzie, *King David*, 77; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 460.

were a common military feature in the ancient Near East, and that the sling was likely a fairly

formidable long range projectile weapon.[205] However, for Halpern to claim that "David may

as well have pulled out a sten gun,"[206] is surely anachronistic and certainly misleading.[207]

David may have shrewdly chosen a weapon that gave him a fighting chance, but the narrative

has been at pains to point out that Goliath is armored from head to toe, and Goliath himself

has a mid range projectile weapon in his spear.[208] Before we accuse David of bringing a gun

to a knife fight, we would do well to recall Xenophon's comments about the effectiveness of

the slinger:

> For in conjunction with other forces there are occasions when the presence of slingers
> is of very effective assistance, but by themselves alone not all the slingers in the world
> could stand against a very few men who came into a hand-to-hand encounter with them
> with weapons suited for close combat.[209]

David, it seems, is making a bold gamble and risking it all on one good shot.

Sling, stone and staff in hand, David is now ready to face Goliath. So he goes and

approaches the man, the Foreigner.[210]

---

[205] See Yadin, *Art of Warfare*, 9, 64, 296; Ovid R. Sellers, "Sling Stones of Biblical Times," *BA* 2/4 (1939): 41-44; and John W. Wevers, "Sling," in *IDB* 4:391-92; Manfred Korfmann, *Schleuder und Bogen in Südwestasien: von den frühesten Belegen bis zum Beginn der historischen Stadtstaaten* (Antiquitas 13; Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1972), esp. 17-20; W. Kendrick Pritchett, *The Greek State at War* (Vol. 5; Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1974), 1-65, esp. 56-60.

[206] Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, 13.

[207] Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 402, notes the ineffectiveness of a sling in this context.

[208] This assumes the reference to his spear being "like a weaver's beam" is meant to communicate that it is a certain type of throwing spear. See above pp. 92-93.

[209] *Xen. Cyrop.* 7.4.15: σὺν μὲν γὰρ ἄλλῃ δυνάμει μάλα ἔστιν ἔνθα ἰσχυρῶς ὠφελοῦσι σφενδονῆται παρόντες, αὐτοὶ δὲ καθ᾽ αὑτοὺς οὐδ᾽ ἂν οἱ πάντες σφενδονῆται μείνειαν πάνυ ὀλίγους ὁμόσε ἰόντας σὺν ὅπλοις ἀγχεμάχοις.

[210] The reference to Goliath as "the man" (τὸν ἄνδρα) is a LXX plus. *CATSS* suggests the *Vorlage* may have read האיש. Whatever the case, it has an interesting effect on the narrative in that it recalls the two other epithets that Goliath has been labeled the "mighty man" (ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς, v. 4) and the "man of war" (ἀνὴρ πολεμιστὴς, v. 33).

3. Single Combat: *μονομαχία* **(17:42-51a)**

The narrative has finally reached the point to which it has been leading: the confrontation

between David and the giant. The geography of the confrontation has been closely mapped

out, the antagonist has been painstakingly described, the hero has overcome the obstacle in

his path, and is now appropriately armed for battle. The reader's sense of anticipation is

piqued, awaiting the inevitable climactic confrontation. However, the final battle will have to

wait a little longer, for the confrontation begins with a battle of words that will lead to the

battle of arms. The champions will have a chance to match wits and words before they match

weapons and wounds.

3.1. David vs. Goliath: A Battle of Words (vv. 42-47)

The confrontation begins when Goliath sees David. The MT includes two verbs for seeing

here: ויבט הפלשתי ויראה את־דויד ("And the Philistine looked and saw David"); LXX[B] has

only one: καὶ εἶδεν ("and he saw"). Numerous Greek manuscripts correct towards the MT

here,[211] but the OG likely had the shorter reading. McCarter viewed the MT plus here as lost

to the Greek by simple haplography, the scribe's eye skipping from הפלשתי at the end of v. 40

to הפלשתי at the start of v. 42, since, according to McCarter, v. 40 immediately preceded v. 42

in the translator's *Vorlage*.[212] However, the MT's reading could also be construed as

repetitively redundant, and an editor that was willing to excise larger redundancies could well

include these two words along with the omission of the previous verse.[213] The Greek reading

also saw the need to reintroduce Goliath here by name.[214] However, its secondary nature is

---

[211] A-glmtwxz <236> boc₂e₂ Arm Sah read και επεβλεψεν ο αλλοφυλος (j lacks ο αλλοφυλος).

[212] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 288.

[213] De Boer, "1 Samuel XVII," 98, suggested that the translator rendered הפלשתי as Γολιαδ and rendered the two Hebrew verbs נבט and ראה as a single verb: ὁράω.

[214] Cf. *BdA*, 306.

evident by the fact that the insertion of Goliath misses the rhetorical force that is found in the

MT's five consecutive uses of הפלשתי as the subject (vv. 41-43).[215]

In either reading the reader is asked to "see" David again, this time through Goliath's eyes. The reader recalls the significant theme of seeing in ch. 16, especially as it pertained to seeing David. We recall that the Lord saw David for a king (16:1). Samuel, "the seer," is corrected from seeing Eliab as the Lord's chosen and the reader is reminded that the Lord sees into the heart (16:7). Then Saul requests for someone to see/find a musician for him (16:17), when his servants have already seen David (16:18). Now Goliath sees David, and his assessment of David makes for an ironic contrast to previous assessments of David (16:18).[216]

Goliath's reaction to seeing David is that "he disdained him" (καὶ ἠτίμασεν αὐτόν). Goliath's opinion of David is described with the same term that is used to describe those "worthless sons" in 10:27, who disdain Saul and did not believe he was up to the task of saving them.[217] Just as Saul proved to be up to the task of delivering Israel in that instance, David will prove to be so here.

The stated reason for Goliath's disdain is given in an explanative ὅτι-clause: ὅτι αὐτὸς ἦν παιδάριον καὶ αὐτὸς πυρράκης μετὰ κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν ("for he was a youth and he was ruddy with beautiful eyes").[218] The reader is once again given a physical description of David, this time from the point of view of Goliath, and we see exactly what it is that he disdained: his youth, his ruddiness, and his beauty. These are exactly the terms used to describe David in 16:11-12. He is one of the "youths" (παιδάρια) of Jesse. He is "ruddy" (πυρράκης) with "beautiful eyes" (κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν). It is certainly significant that Goliath notices the same

---

[215] Furthermore, the MT only mentions Goliath by name in the two verses that introduce him (17:4, 23).

[216] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 179; Edelman, *King Saul*, 131-32; Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 186.

[217] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 186.

[218] The Greek has not literally translated יפה מראה ("fair of form"), but instead rendered it as κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν, likely so that it matches the description in 16:12, which translated יפה עינים with κάλλους ὀφθαλμῶν.

features that Samuel notices, for the reader remembers that Samuel was told that the external appearances are not what count (16:7).

Scholars often argue that the whole of the phrase "he was ruddy, with beautiful eyes," is a later expansion based on 16:12.[219] Stoebe specifically notes that it does not fit here because good looks are no reason for Goliath to scorn David.[220] However, the description of David is one that emphasizes his beauty with potentially feminine overtones.[221] Goliath, therefore, is offended at not being presented with a champion worthy of him. In the context of this μονομαχία, offering a pretty youth for Goliath to fight is a significant insult to the champion, which is why he "disdains" (ἀτιμάζω) David, a term which basically means to hold in no honor (see *LSJ*).[222]

Goliath responds to David's approach by hurling insults: Ὡσεὶ κύων ἐγώ εἰμι ("Am I like a dog?").[223] Goliath expresses his disgust at being challenged by David, and equates it to being treated like a dog, an animal generally despised in the ancient Near East; which is certainly an insult.[224] The dog imagery is rhetorically fitting because it addresses Goliath's insult at being challenged by David.

The likely impetus for Goliath's use of dog imagery is the fact that David comes to him with weapons one would likely use against a dog: ῥάβδῳ καὶ λίθοις ("a stick and stones").[225] The word ῥάβδος translates the Hebrew מקל, which had previously been translated

---

[219] So Smith, *Samuel*, 164; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 332; and McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 288-89.

[220] Stobe, *Samuelis*, 332.

[221] See above pp. 41-46.

[222] See Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 26. Cf. Avioz, "Motif of Beauty," 349-50.

[223] The Greek introduces this metaphor with ὡσεί ("like"), which is not present in the MT. Three times in 1 Reigns, the translator introduces a Hebrew metaphor with ὡς or ὡσεί when not demanded by the source text (1 Rgns. 17:43; 25:16, 37). Cf. *BdA*, 306. The translator also introduces the verb εἰμί, though this is not uncommon for the translator to render the Hebrew אנכי with ἐγώ εἰμί (1:15; 4:16; 9:19, 21; 17:8, 43; 22:22; 30:13).

[224] On the despised nature of the dog in the Old Testament and ancient Near East see D. Winton Thomas, "Kelebh 'Dog': Its Origin and Some Usages of it in the Old Testament," *VT* 10 (1960): 410-27.

[225] Note the translator's consistent use of ἐν to render the Hebrew ב (cf. also 17:45). The Hebrew preposition ב is quite comfortable being used instrumentally (see *WHS* §243), but this is not a natural use of the Greek preposition ἐν. This is an example where the translation technique is forcing the Greek to do something it would

by βακτηρία (v. 40). *LSJ* suggests that a ῥάβδος is lighter and smaller than a βακτηρία, being used at times for a horse switch (*Xen.Eq.* 8.4) or a shepherd's stick (cf. LXX Ps. 22). If this is the case it may be an interesting nuance by the translator communicating Goliath's disdain for David's "stick."[226]

In the Greek text Goliath mentions stones as well as his staff: ῥάβδῳ καὶ λίθοις ("stick and stones"). This OG plus is often lumped together with the following longer OG plus,[227] but I see no reason to treat them together. Gordon suggests that the insertion of a reference to stones here is meant to complete the reference to David's arsenal from v. 40. He argues that the translators missed the point of the Hebrew narrative, which is that the stones are not visible, thus giving David the element of surprise.[228] In the Greek text Goliath is aware that he is facing a slinger, which suggests that he assumed his extensive armor made him minimally vulnerable to a sling, and may also reflect a common ancient view that the slinger was among the lowest ranked soldiers in an army.[229] In the context of the μονομαχία, where honor is at stake, Goliath's disdain for a slinger is culturally understandable and, in fact, to be expected.

In the Greek text,[230] David is afforded an additional response to Goliath's quip about being treated like a dog. He replies: Οὐχί, ἀλλ᾽ ἢ χείρω κυνός ("No, but worse than a dog!"). It could be that the translator saw the need for David to respond to Goliath's charge about

---

not naturally do (cf. Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, 82-83). On this equivalent in the LXX see Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Widergabe des ‫ב‬ *instrumenti* im griechischen Pentateuch," in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 116-30.

[226] Cf. *BdA*, 306; Tov, "Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18," 345; and Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 182-83.

[227] See Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 332; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289.

[228] Gordon, *Samuel*, 157. So also Gooding, "Literary and Textual Problems," 68. Gordon further notes that the some Syriac MSS read "with a staff *and with a sling*."

[229] See Pritchett, *Greek State at War*, 53-54. He notes that Xenophon records Cyrus' opinion of the sling being the weapon he considered most appropriate for a slave: νομίζων τοῦτο τὸ ὅπλον δουλικώτατον εἶναι (*Xen. Cyrop.* 6.4.15).

[230] With the exception of the primary Hexaplaric group (Acx) and the Antiochene text (boc₂e₂), the rest of the Greek witnesses include this plus. Additionally, Josephus (*Ant.* 6.186) appears to utilize this plus as well. See Christopher Begg, "The David and Goliath Story According to Josephus," *Le Muséon* 112 (1999): 5.

being treated like a dog, which so belittles David,[231] or, it could be that a scribe or translator sought to remove this statement by David in order that "David not be portrayed in an unfavourable light."[232] Whichever reading was prior, the Greek text gives further emphasis to the quality of David as σοφὸς λόγῳ ("wise in words," 16:18).

In response to David's dog riposte,[233] Goliath curses David by his own Gods (ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς ἑαυτοῦ).[234] The use of the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ is both rare in 1 Reigns and unnecessary to render the simple Hebrew possessive pronoun.[235] It is frequently corrected to the simple personal pronoun αὐτοῦ in the rest of the Greek manuscripts.[236] Given that David is named here as the object of the cursing, the translators may have felt the need to clarify that Goliath is cursing him by the gods of the Foreigners and not by the God of Israel, but one would assume that the use of the plural θεοῖς ("gods") in Greek would have been sufficient to communicate that fact. However, the use of the reflexive in cases such as this is used especially when a contrast is intended.[237] Thus the translator may be intending to communicate the contrast between Goliath's own gods and David's own god, highlighting the theological aspect of this confrontation.[238]

---

[231] So Driver, *Samuel*, 146; Smith, *Samuel*, 164; *BdA*, 306. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 332, even suggests that this may be an interpolation modeled after the debates of a Greek hero. Gooding, "Literary and Textual Problems," 68-69, thinks this is an interpolation but views it as distasteful and poorly executed.

[232] Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 26. McCarter, *Samuel*, 289, attempts to find a reason for unintentional omission based on the similarity between במקל and מכלב, but even he remains unconvinced by this argument.

[233] Though in the MT this is just a continuation of Goliath's rant upon seeing David, since the MT has no interjecting statement by David.

[234] θεοῖς is piously replaced by εἰδωλοῖς in A.

[235] There are only four other occurrences of a reflexive pronoun in 1 Reigns (9:3, 11; 20:8; 24:3), only one of which is a 3rd person reflexive pronoun (24:3), which is being used instead of a personal name.

[236] The plural αὐτῶν is read by a, the rest of the Greek tradition reads αὐτοῦ Rahlfs-Hanhart prints αὐτοῦ in the main text.

[237] On this use of the reflexive pronoun in NT Greek see Patrick A. Tiller, "Reflexive Pronouns in the New Testament," *Filología Neotestamentaria* 14 (2001): 43-63, esp. 61.

[238] On the theological aspects of this confrontation see George, "Constructing Identity," 397-98. The very act of cursing in this context implies a theological element as Douglas Stuart, "Curse," in *ABD* 1:218, notes, "in ancient times that curses derived their power from the gods," which in this context implies a divine confrontation.

Though Goliath's cursing is not directly recorded,[239] his invitation for David to come and fight him is: "Come (Δεῦρο[240]) to me and I will give your flesh to the birds of the heavens and the animals of the earth!" To mutilate the corpse of a foe and to prevent its proper burial is a common motif in ancient literature, and communicates very clearly what is intended: grave dishonor.[241]

The Greek phrase τοῖς κτήνεσιν τῆς γῆς ("to the animals of the earth") is translating the Hebrew phrase לבהמת השדה ("to the beasts of the field"). This phrase is rare in the Hebrew Bible, found elsewhere only in Joel 1:20. It is more common to include הארץ ("the earth") in a merism with השמים ("the heavens"), as is the case in v. 46. It is likely that either the translator or his *Vorlage* adjusted this phrase to the more common pattern that matches up with v. 46.[242]

David responds by listing Goliath's assets for the coming confrontation: sword (ῥομφαία), spear (δόρυ) and shield (ἀσπίς).[243] Goliath's sword is here mentioned for the first time after being conspicuously absent in the full description of Goliath's armor (vv. 5-7).[244] The spear is the main offensive weapon mentioned in Goliath's panoply. As we noted above, the comparison to a weaver's beam suggests that this is a particular type of spear for throwing, and thus is likely the main threat to David's strategy for the upcoming fight. The

---

[239] Perhaps "out of decency." So Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 186.

[240] Héctor Avalos, "ΔΕΥΡΟ/ΔΕΥΤΕ and the Imperatives of הלך: New Criteria for the 'Kaige' Recension of Reigns," *EstBib* 47 (1989): 165-76, suggested that the use of δεῦρο to translate the imperative of הלך is more characteristic of the *kaige* portions of 1-4 Reigns. However, it is attested in 1 Reigns (9:5, 9, 10; 14:1, 6; 16:1; 17:44; 20:21; 23:27). It seems that δεῦρο and δεῦτε are used to translate הלך when they are understood as hortatives and used in conjunction with another verb, as here. See Eynikel and Lust, "δευρο and δευτε," 66-68.

[241] Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 462; Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 26. For ancient examples of this kind of treatment see *Iliad* 7; Sophocles' *Antigone*; and multiple passages in the Hebrew Bible: 1 Sam. 31:8-13; 2 Samuel 21; Ps. 79:2-3; Isa. 34:2-3; 66:24; Jer. 7:33-8:1-2.

[242] Cf. Smith, *Samuel*, 164; McCarter, *Samuel*, 289; *BdA*, 306; Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 156. *BHS* notes that multiple Hebrew manuscripts read הארץ along with the Vulgate. LXX[AL] render the phrase in v. 44 as τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς ("to the wild animals of the earth"), which matches exactly with the OG rendering of v. 46.

[243] Note that the translator has consistently translated כידון ("javelin, scimitar") with ἀσπίς ("shield). See 17:6.

[244] Perhaps David already has his eye on this weapon.

shield is Goliath's primary defensive weapon. The rhetorical point David is making is that these armaments will not prove to be effective: Goliath's shield will not protect him, his spear will never threaten David, and eventually his sword will be used to remove his own head.[245]

In contrast to Goliath's assets, David lists his own assets, though without reference to his sling.[246] Instead he lists his divine asset, offering a theological interpretation of the confrontation: "I come to you in the name of the Lord God Sabaoth of the ranks of Israel, which you have reproached today." The MT lists two titles for God: יהוה צבאות ("Yhwh Sabaoth" or "Yhwh of hosts") and אלהי מערכות ישראל ("God of the ranks of Israel"). In LXX[B], the placement of θεοῦ before σαβαώθ requires the name to be read as one title: "Lord God Sabaoth of the ranks of Israel" (Κυρίου θεοῦ σαβαὼθ παρατάξεως Ἰσραήλ). McCarter reads with the MT and suggests that LXX[B] reflects a different *Vorlage*.[247] Many Greek manuscripts read with MT: Κυρίου σαβαὼθ θεοῦ παρατάξεως Ἰσραήλ ("Lord Sabaoth, God of the ranks of Israel").[248] However, this seems likely to be a correction towards MT.[249]

By using the title the "Lord God Sabaoth of the ranks of Israel" David has included the Lord in Goliath's reproach. Goliath has reproached the ranks of Israel (17:10), but David has repeatedly identified the ranks of Israel with the God of Israel (17:36, 45). It is clear that for David to reproach the ranks of Israel includes reproaching the God of Israel as well. The theological weight of Goliath's challenge comes to the fore. Israel is honor bound, not just to

---

[245] This is obviously slightly different from the MT which lists three offensive weapons, with no mention of the defensive shield.

[246] Alter, *David Story*, 108, notes that, "David speaks almost as though he expects to prevail through a miracle of divine intervention . . . but in fact his victory depends on his resourcefulness in exploiting an unconventional weapon." This statement creates an unnecessary dichotomy, as if David's victory was either by the Lord's help or by his own cunning. As far as I can see, the narrative makes no such distinction and in fact is at pains to prevent such a distinction.

[247] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289.

[248] So ANdfilo[a?]pqtz boc₂e₂ Boh Sah. Rahlfs-Hanhart prints this reading in the main text.

[249] Cf. *BdA*, 306.

defend their own honor, but to defend the honor of their God. David is claiming now to be fighting on behalf of the God of Israel.[250]

The Greek includes the word σήμερον ("today") in this phrase, claiming Goliath has reproached the God of Israel today. The MT places the Hebrew היום הזה ("this day") in the following verse, which LXX[B] also includes, but in a different place in the verse. It seems likely that the translator saw the Hebrew phrase אשר חרפת היום הזה יסגרך יהוה בידי ("whom you have reproached today Yhwh will enclose in my hand"), and was not sure in which phrase to place היום הזה ("today"). The decision was to include this element in both phrases thus creating a doublet: ἣν ὠνείδισας σήμερον· καὶ ἀποκλείσει σε Κύριος σήμερον εἰς τὴν χεῖρά μου ("whom you have reproached today; and the Lord will enclose you today in my hand").[251] The narrative effect of this doublet actually works quite well for it emphasizes that the Lord is placing Goliath into David's hand *today* in response to Goliath's reproach of the Lord *today*.

The narrative is here reaching its theological climax. Speeches in this chapter have been nationalistic in character (Goliath, vv. 8-10), or perhaps boastful, though with hints of theological themes (David, vv. 34-37). In the present speech the theological import of this confrontation comes to the fore.[252]

David continues his theological exposition of this confrontation. He says καὶ ἀποκλείσει[253] σε Κύριος σήμερον εἰς τὴν χεῖρά μου ("And the Lord will enclose you today into

---

[250] See George, "Constructing Identity," 406; and Garsiel, "Valley of Elah Battle," 414-15.

[251] So marked by *CATSS*. Cf. Smith, *Samuel*, 164; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 332-33; and McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289.

[252] Cf. Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 190; and Firth, "That the World May Know," 30.

[253] The Greek καὶ ἀποκλείσει σε possibly reflects וסגרך in the *Vorlage*, despite the MT's יסגרך. It is possible that the Greek added the καὶ because it placed "this day" with the previous phrase, but it is also possible that the MT mistakenly read "this day" with the present phrase and was forced to emend וסגרך to יסגרך. So McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289; Smith, *Samuel*, 164. It is difficult to say based on the Greek text because both a *yiqtol* verb prefaced by היום הזה and a *weqatal* verb would likely communicate a future sense to the translator.

my hand"). This biblical idiom[254] communicates military victory. The result of the Lord

giving Goliath into David's hand is described by three actions by David: I will kill[255] . . . I

will remove . . . I will give. The reader will recall that these actions have several affinities

with David's actions in defense of his sheep (vv. 35-36) and the actions he will accomplish

against Goliath (vv. 49, 51).[256]

That David will "remove" (ἀφαιρέω) Goliath's head is particularly significant. The

reader recalls that David has said that he would "remove" the reproach from Israel (v. 36) and

he had Saul's armor "removed" from him (v. 39). Now he says that he will "remove" Goliath's

head, and the reader familiar with the story knows that he will do it (v. 51). For the reader

who is attentive to the flow of the narrative it is tempting to see all of David's acts of

"removing" as related.

Goliath invited David to come down to him so that he could give his body to the birds

of the heavens and the animals of the earth (v. 44). David now responds in kind. He will give,

---

[254] The standard biblical idiom for this context would be καὶ παραδώσει Κύριος ὑμᾶς εἰς χεῖρά μου ("and the Lord will *hand you over* into my hand"), which is translating the Hebrew ונתן אתכם בידי (e.g., Num. 21:2; Deut 2:24, 30; 21:10; Josh 2:24; 6:2; Judg. 7:9; 1 Sam 14:12). The phrase סגר ביד, which 1 Reigns translates almost exclusively with some form of ἀποκλείω or κλείω plus εἰς χεῖρα, is almost exclusive to 1 Samuel (17:46; 23:11, 12, 20; 24:18; 26:8; 30:15; cf. also Ps. 31:8; Lam. 2:7). This phrase appears to be used in the same way as the standard biblical phrase with נתן as can be seen by the fact that נתן (παραδίδωμι in 1 Reigns) is used in v. 47 (Cf. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 333).

[255] The Hebrew reads והכיתך ("and I will strike you"), while the Greek reads καὶ ἀποκτενῶ σε ("and I will kill you"). 1 Reigns has translated נכה ("to strike," though often by implication "to kill") almost exclusively with πατάσσω ("to strike"), e.g., 1 Rgns. 2:4; 5:9; 6:19; 7:11; 13:3; 14:14, 31, 48; 15:3, 7; 17:9, 35. It seems important for the Greek text here in v. 46 that David specify that he will "kill" Goliath not just "strike" him.

[256] Cf. Table 6 above, p. 109.

not only Goliath's limbs[257] to the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth,[258] but the limbs of

the ranks of the Foreigners as well. While the inclusion of the limbs of the ranks of the

Foreigners may be simply a rhetorical escalation of Goliath's boast,[259] it may also hint that

David is not going to be playing by the rules of the engagement. He has rejected Goliath's

offer of representative μονομαχία, wherein to the victor of the single combat goes the victory

of the whole military engagement.[260]

In what is certainly one of theological high points of David's speech, he describes the

result of his great victory over the giant of the Foreigners: "And all the earth will know that

there is a God in Israel" (καὶ γνώσεται πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ὅτι ἔστιν θεὸς ἐν Ἰσραήλ).[261] Though the term

land, ארץ in Hebrew and generally translated as γῆ in the LXX, can refer specifically to "the

Land" as in the promised land of Israel,[262] the use of the phrase "all the land" (πᾶσα ἡ γῆ or

כל־הארץ) and the use of the more specific "all this congregation" (πᾶσα ἐκκλησία αὕτη) in the

---

[257] The reference to Goliath's limbs (τὰ κῶλά σου) is not present in MT. The OG here likely represents a *Vorlage* that read נתתי פגרך ופגר מחנה פלשתים ("I will give your body and the body of the ranks of the Philistines. . ."). The MT has likely lost the initial פגר by haplography. So Smith, *Samuel*, 164; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 145; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289; though Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 333 and Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 108, prefer the MT, reading פגר as a collective. Wellhausen argues that the term פגר (body) cannot be meant as a singular (body) in one instance then be meant as a collective (bodies) in the very next phrase (Barthélemy, *Critique*, 191, also prefers MT here). Note also that κῶλον ("limb, member") is not quite an exact translation of פגר ("corpse"). *LEH* suggests "corpse" as a meaning for κῶλον but that is based solely on the evidence of LXX which, especially in the Pentateuch, uses κῶλον to translate פגר. *GELS* more accurately lists the meaning as "limb, member of a body." Cf. *BdA*, 307.

[258] Cf. this instance where θηρίοις τῆς γῆς translates לחית הארץ with v. 44.

[259] Cf. Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 26.

[260] Gordon, *Samuel*, 158.

[261] MT reads לישראל ("to/for Israel"). One Greek manuscript reads εξ (e₂) and some omit the preposition altogether (N*d SyrH). McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289, suggests that the Greek reading is preferable to MT, but Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 333, prefers MT. Tov, "Composition," 342, tentatively suggests that this may be an exegetical variant produced by the translator though he does not rule out the possibility of בישראל in the translator's *Vorlage*. Though ἐν is certainly the normal equivalent for ב it is not unprecedented for 1 Reigns to use ἐν to translate ל (see 1 Rgns. 12:16; 13:11; 15:8; 18:14; 22:19). In general the translation of prepositions is frequently fluid and determining original readings in these instances is difficult (see Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 161-62).

[262] E.g., Gen. 12:1-10; 28:15; 35:12; Ex. 6:8; 12:25; Josh. 11:23; 14:5; and frequently. Cf. W. Janzen, "Land," in *ABD* 4:143-54.

next verse, makes it difficult to avoid reading this phrase as a very theologically loaded claim: "All the *world* will know that there is a God in Israel."[263]

Verse 47 continues David's theological exposition of the reason for his upcoming victory. The reference to "all this congregation" (πᾶσα ἐκκλησία αὕτη) both parallels the claim that all the world will know that there is a God in Israel and specifies the claim to refer exclusively to Israel. The term ἐκκλησία in the LXX is, along with συναγωγή, a fairly stereotypical rendering of קהל (cf. *LEH*). Like the Hebrew term קהל it can have a very specific (cultic) setting,[264] and may refer specifically to the armies of Israel here.[265] However, like the Hebrew term קהל, the term ἐκκλησία in the LXX can be used in a very general way referring to gathered armies,[266] and may refer to the entire gathered host, both Israelite and Foreigner.[267] In light of the content of what will be known by the two parties it seems most plausible to read πᾶσα ἡ γῆ in v. 46 as an all inclusive, "all the earth," and πᾶσα ἡ ἐκκλησία αὕτη in the more restrictive sense as referring to "this assembly," i.e., the assembly of Israel. It is fairly common in the Old Testament that the acts of the God of Israel would lead toward the whole world or all the nations knowing that there is a God in Israel. The specific knowledge that Κύριος, which here is the translator's gloss for Yhwh, does not save by sword and spear, seems particular to the people of Israel, as we will explore below.

The content of what "all this assembly" will know is given in three parts: two ὅτι clauses followed by a simple καί clause. The first ὅτι clause is substantival, it is the main

---

[263] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 297; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 180; Brueggemann, *Samuel*, 132; Firth, "That the World May Know," 30-31; Christopher J.H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006), 228; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 463. Similar kinds of statements can be found frequently in the Old Testament, e.g., Josh. 4:23-24; 1 Kgs. 8:41-43; 2 Kgs. 19:19; Isa. 37:20; Ezek. 36:23.

[264] E.g., Neh. 5:13. See Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 152.

[265] So Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 182; Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, 257.

[266] E.g., Num. 22:4; Ezek. 16:40; 38:15. See J.Y. Campbell, "The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ," *JTS* 49 (1948): 130-42.

[267] So Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 249; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 463.

content of what the assembly will know. The second is causal,[268] it is the reason for the first

clause. The final καί clause is resultative in that it is the end result of the fact in the causal

clause. The substantival clause emphasizes how the Lord does not save: ὅτι οὐκ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ

καὶ δόρατι σώζει Κύριος ("for not by sword and spear does the Lord save"). The placement of

"sword and spear" at the front of the sentence puts the focus on these items,[269] which likely

are meant to represent the entirety of military might.[270] The focus thus being on how the Lord

does not save, suggests that this is meant to be put in comparison with how the Lord *does*

save.

However, rather than an explanation of how the Lord does save, David gives the

reason why the Lord does not save by sword and spear with a causal ὅτι clause: ὅτι τοῦ

Κυρίου ὁ πόλεμος ("for the battle is the Lord's").[271] The stated reason that the Lord does not

save by "sword and spear" is that the battle belongs to him. The point of this seems to be that

the outcome of a military engagement depends not on strength of arms, but on dependence

upon the Lord. This is the most explicit statement of a fact that the narrative has been hinting

at since the people's demand for a king: the people need to depend on the Lord for salvation,

not on the strength of their arms.[272]

In this statement, David is being more than a pious Israelite. In this statement, his

voice has blended with an authoritative, narratorial voice so that the words are David's but the

---

[268] On the use of ὅτι to introduce a causal clause in LXX Greek see Anneli Aejmelaeus, "OTI *Causale* in Septuagintal Greek," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (revised and expanded edition; Leven: Peeters, 2007), 11-29.

[269] Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 249. This is true of compositional Greek as well, see K.L. Dover, *Greek Word Order* (London: Cambridge at the University Press, 1960), 32-41; and *BDF* §472. Though Dover is wary of analyzing word order by means of "emphasis," preferring the category of "logical determinants," I think the category of "focus" is appropriate. Cf. Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 269-73.

[270] Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 249. On the word pair "sword and spear" see 1 Sam. 13:19.

[271] Though the preposition ל is not directly present in the translation, its possessive function (see *WHS* §270), is communicated by the possessive genitive τοῦ Κυρίου (see Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 81-83). This is an example where the translator has rendered his *Vorlage* not quite on a word-for-word basis, but has correctly interpreted the sense into good Greek.

[272] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 182.

message is an authoritative statement about the current state of the Lord's relationship with his people.[273] The people demanded a king like all the other nations who would go and fight their battles (8:19-20). They are granted their wish, they get a giant, a warrior king, taller than everyone else (9:2; 10:23), someone with whom there is no equal in all of Israel (10:24). He is fitted with sword and spear, which no other Israelite has (13:19-22). For a time this arrangement seems to work, and the king has numerous victories (chs. 11-15), but the attentive reader knows that there is a troubling subplot. Not everything is going quite as smoothly for this warrior king as the people would hope. Now, confronted with a host of Foreigners encroaching on the geographically significant Elah Valley, the champion and his army are struck by fear (17:11). Thus, David tells Goliath the lesson his people need to learn: depend on the Lord for salvation, not on sword and spear.[274]

David concludes his theological speech with: καὶ παραδώσει Κύριος ὑμᾶς εἰς χεῖρας ἡμῶν ("and the Lord will give you into our hands").[275] The use of the plural pronouns in this final clause is somewhat unexpected. The confrontation has thus far been conceived of exclusively as a μονομαχία, a single combat. David tells Saul that "your servant" will fight this Foreigner (v. 32). He further tells Saul, "As the Lord delivered *me* from the hand of the lion and from the hand of the bear, he will deliver *me* from the hand of this uncircumcised Foreigner" (v. 37). He tells Goliath: "The Lord has enclosed *you* (sg.) in *my* hand, and *I* will kill you, and *I* will remove *your* (sg.) head" (v. 46). So when David says, "The Lord will give

[273] This type of discourse, according to Bakhtin, "expresses simultaneously two different intentions: the direct intention of the character who is speaking, and the refracted intention of the author" (*The Dialogical Imagination*, 324). For further clarification on Bakhtin's often complex thought, see Barbara Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), esp. 27-65.

[274] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 183-84; and Dietrich and Nauman, *Samuelbücher*, 96, highlight the centrality of this statement.

[275] The Greek specifically names the subject as Κύριος, where the MT implies the subject from the first part of the verse. Κύριος is placed after ὑμᾶς in a₂ Arm, and omitted entirely by boc₂e₂ Sah. It seems likely that Κύριος is an addition in the OG, but it rhetorically emphasizes the Lord by including a direct reference to Κύριος in each clause of v. 47.

you (pl.) into *our* hands" (v. 47), the scope of the confrontation has been raised from an engagement between two champions to include the impact that this confrontation has for both parties. Again David shows that his interest in this contest is not limited to the aspect of single combat, but that his sights are aimed higher, at the socio-political and theological aspects of the confrontation. He also expresses the belief that the Lord will not only deliver him (v. 37) but will deliver all of Israel by putting all of the Foreigners into their hands.[276]

The battle of words is now over. David has had the last word, and it was a theologically loaded one. He has expressed his confidence that his coming in the name of the Lord is more powerful than Goliath's coming in military might (v. 45). He has claimed that the Lord will give Goliath into David's hands and that the whole world will know that there is a God in Israel as a result (v. 46). Finally, as a result of all of this Israel will know that they are to depend on the Lord for victory not on military strength (v. 47). His words will now be put to the test as the confrontation turns from a battle of words to a battle of arms.

3.2. David vs. Goliath: A Battle of Arms (vv. 48-51a)

The flow of the narrative thus far has been a slow and tension-building process. The build up to the confrontation took twenty verses, the initial meeting and exchange of pleasantries took six, the actual battle will take only three. After this slow pace, the climax of this story is about to happen at a rapid pace.

The MT begins the action with the phrase והיה כי־קם הפלשתי, where LXX[B] begins with καὶ ἀνέστη ὁ ἀλλόφυλος ("And the Foreigner arose").[277] The translation of this phrase is

---

[276] Cf. Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 249, Wénin, "David roi," 86.

[277] Despite the tendency of scholars to prefer the LXX reading here (so Smith, *Samuel*, 164; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 172), it seems more likely that the syntactically difficult MT was simplified by the translator of 1 Reigns, than that the syntactically simple reading of 1 Reigns was complicated by a later editor of MT.

complicated by the fact that the verb והיה (a *weqatal* form), is most often used to

communicate a future tense: "and it will be."[278] However, there does appear to be instances in

the Hebrew Bible where והיה is used in a similar way to ויהי (a *wayyiqtol* form), especially in

1 Samuel (see 1 Sam. 1:12; 10:9; 13:22; 25:20). Various attempts at understanding this

feature of biblical Hebrew narrative have been proposed. Perhaps the most standard attempt

to understand this feature sees it as a feature marking a climax.[279] Throughout 1 Reigns the

translator has proved adept at handling these introductory היה clauses, generally rendering

ויהי with καὶ ἐγενήθη and והיה with καὶ ἔσται.[280] Other than the present passage, those few

places where 1 Samuel uses והיה in a narrative sense similar to how ויהי normally functions,

the translator of 1 Reigns translates with καὶ ἐγενήθη (1:12; 10:9; 13:22; 25:20). However

modern scholars try to differentiate the nuance of והיה versus ויהי it appears that the translator

understood them to be used occasionally as similar statements.[281] The question remains, if

this translation option was open to the translator at 17:48, why did he not use it?

Trying to ascertain why a translator did something other than his standard practice is

always difficult. We have proposed to discuss what effect the translation has on the narrative

in these instances. If והיה functions, or was understood to function, as ויהי, as a marker of a

---

[278] The use of והיה here does make one wonder if something more has been lost from David's speech in vv. 45-47, for והיה would be a natural continuation of his speech. This is, of course, purely conjecture.

[279] So Longacre, "*Weqatal* Forms," 84-91; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 119, 464. For a critique of Longacre's view see C.H.J. van der Merwe, "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. Robert D. Bergen; SIL, 1994), 28-29.

[280] Cf. the similar handling of this Hebrew phenomenon in LXX-Joshua, Seppo Sipliä, "The Renderings of *wyhy* and *whyh* as Formulas in the LXX of Joshua," in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Olivier Munnich; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995), 273-89.

[281] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 39, suggested emending והיה to ויהי (so too Krinetzki, "Stilanalyse," 223). Driver, *Samuel*, 13, though he did not follow Wellhausen in this thought it a plausible option. The solution may lie somewhere in our imperfect understanding of Hebrew tenses. However we solve the problem in Hebrew, Wellhausen's intuition seems to have been anticipated by the translator of 1 Reigns.

new paragraph or narrative section,[282] then its omission ties the verbal exchange (vv. 42-47) closer with the martial exchange (vv. 48-51).

The next question is why Goliath needs to "arise" (καὶ ἀνέστη)? The use of καὶ ἀνέστη here is translating קָם (a *qatal* form). Though קוּם can be used in an inchoative or ingressive manner, meaning that it can be used in concert with other verbs to describe the beginning of an action,[283] in this military context it is likely that its use here is meant to convey the idea that Goliath is "mustering himself" for an attack (cf. Gen. 4:8; Judg. 16:3; 1 Sam. 17:52; 2 Kgs. 3:24).[284] The Greek use of ἀνίστημι has that same sense, and is used in a military context to mean "to rouse up" as in for battle.[285] The picture is then of Goliath rousing himself to begin his attack. The translator's use of καί followed by the aorist indicative of ἀνίστημι to render כִּי־קָם is probably in order to keep the action on the main line of narration.

Goliath then goes to meet David: καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς συνάντησιν[286] Δαυιδ ("And he went to meet David").[287] David previously approached (καὶ προσῆλθεν) Goliath, an action which began the battle of words (v. 40). Now Goliath approaches (καὶ ἐπορεύθη) David, an action

---

[282] On this use of ויהי see *GKC*, §111f-h; and Heller, *Narrative Structure*, 433-34.

[283] See Tsumura, *Samuel*, 464; and F.W. Dobbs-Allsopp, "Ingressive *qwm* in Biblical Hebrew," *ZAH* 8 (1995): 31-54.

[284] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 184.

[285] See *LSJ*. E.g., *Il*.7.116; 10.176, 179; 15.64; 23.635, 709.

[286] The Greek εἰς συνάντησιν, along with εἰς ἀπάντησιν, is a standard equivalent for the Hebrew לקראת (e.g., 1 Rgns. 4:1; 9:14; 13:10; 15:12; 17:48; 18:6; 23:28; 25:20, 32, 34; 30:21).

[287] LXX[B] does not reflect the verb ויקרב ("and he drew near") from the full Hebrew phrase וילך ויקרב לקראת דוד. Multiple other Greek witnesses including the Antiochene group (boc₂[sub ※]e₂), the two hexaplaric groups (Ax lpqtz) as well as some miscellaneous MSS (em^mg[sub ※ λ]w) read και ηγγισεν reflecting the Hebrew ויקרב. It is difficult to discern how this reading was lost or added into the tradition. Many scholars read with LXX[B] (e.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 172) though some prefer to see LXX[B] as a simplification of the Hebrew (de Boer, "1 Samuel XVII," 100). On the one hand, ויקרב is superfluous and unnecessary to convey the sense. On the other hand, the additional verb of action for Goliath does slow down the action and give the impression that he is moving slower next to David who "hastens" and "runs" (so Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 249; Krinetzki, "Stilanalyse," 223), though this response of David is missing in LXX[B]. It is also possible that ויקרב has dropped out due to *homoiarcton* since לקראת also begins with קר, and a scribe or translator may have expected to find one finite verb followed by the infinitive.

which will begin the battle of arms. The action that follows is told in almost slow motion. It takes five verbs to describe the action of David slinging his stone at Goliath.

As Goliath advances, David reaches out for his weapon, καὶ ἐξέτεινεν Δαυεὶδ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ κάδιον ("And David stretched out his hand to his pouch").[288] And he takes from there "a single stone" (λίθον ἕνα).[289] The use of the number ἕνα ("one") is unnecessary, since simply writing λίθον ("a stone") would communicate the same thing. The presence of ἕνα has the effect of emphasizing the fact that David will only need one single stone to take down the giant, perhaps emphasizing the divine assistance in David's feat, but perhaps also reminding the reader that David will likely only get one chance at this before the giant reaches him.

David's actual action against the giant is given in one verb: καὶ ἐσφενδόνησεν ("and he slung it"). Though David's action is described with only one verb, the effect of the action will require some detailed description.

The result of David's slinging is given in three verbal actions: καὶ ἐπάταξεν . . . καὶ διέδυ . . . καὶ ἔπεσεν ("and it struck . . . and it slipped through . . . and he fell"). The first result of David slinging the stone is that "it struck (ἐπάταξεν) the Foreigner in the forehead."[290] The reader recalls that in response to Saul's concerns that David would not be able to face

---

[288] Though the Hebrew phrase וישלח את־ידו ("and he stretched out his hand") is somewhat idiomatic in the Hebrew, the same idiomatic sense is present in the Greek καὶ ἐξέτεινεν την χεῖρα αὐτου ("and he stretched out his hand"). See *LSJ*; *Aesch.Lib* 9; *Plb* 1.3.6. Following the use in the Pentateuch (e.g., Gen. 3:22; 8:9; 19:10; 22:10) the use of ἐκτείνω in 1 Reigns is a fairly consistent translational choice for this idiom (e.g., 1 Rgns. 14:27) even though the standard translational equivalent for שלח in general is ἀποστέλλω. 1 Reigns further differentiates between the use of שלח יד (often followed by ב) to denote "raising one's hand against" by rendering שלח with ἐπιφέρω (e.g., 1 Rgns. 22:17; 24:6, 10; 26:11, 23). On the different uses of שלח יד see Paul Humbert, "Étendre la main," *VT* 12/1 (1962): esp. 387-88.

[289] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289, and Smith, *Samuel*, 164, prefer the reading of MT which has "a stone" (אבן). Ms c has the interesting variant reading of λιθους τρεις.

[290] Though some scholars have proposed that the Hebrew מצח is meant to convey "greave" rather than the traditionally understood "forehead", the Greek clearly understands this to be a reference to Goliath's "forehead," or more precisely the "space between the eyes" (μέτωπον). For the argument for "greave" see Deem, ". . . And the Stone Sank," 349-51; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 186; and Gregory T.K. Wong, "Goliath's Death and the Testament of Judah," *Bib* 91/3 (2010): 424-32.

Goliath, David responded that he "struck" (ἐπάταξα) the lion or bear that would take his

sheep (v. 35a), and that if it turned on him he "struck" (ἐπάταξα) it (v. 35b), and that he would

"strike" (πατάξω) the Foreigner (v. 36). David is now making good on his word and has

"struck" (ἐπάταξεν) the Foreigner.

The next verbal action describing the result of David's slinging is that "the stone

slipped through the helmet into his forehead" (καὶ διέδυ ὁ λίθος διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας εἰς τὸ

μέτωπον αὐτοῦ). Two issues stand out in this translation: 1) the LXX plus of διὰ τῆς

περικεφαλαίας and 2) what does it mean that the stone διέδυ (slipped? sunk? penetrated?)

through the helmet? First, where the MT reads ותטבע האבן במצחו ("and the stone sunk into

his forehead"), OG states that the stone went "through the helmet" (διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας).

Scholars generally note the secondary character of this plus. The reason for this insertion is

usually explained as attempting to explain how it is that Goliath was struck on the forehead

when he was wearing a helmet.[291]

The second issue is what the phrase καὶ διέδυ ὁ λίθος διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας is

communicating in the Greek. The apparent contradiction that Goliath was wearing a helmet

and yet was struck in the forehead appears to have required further comment on the part of

the translators.[292] The translations and explanations by scholars suggest that they most

frequently understand this phrase to communicate that the stone "pierced" through the

helmet.[293] However, it is not certain that this is what the Greek is communicating.

[291] Cf. De Boer, "1 Samuel XVII," 100; Similarly Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 333; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 145; and McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289. Firth, *Samuel*, 193, suggests that this reading was to avoid the ambiguity that מצח may be in reference to Goliath's greave.

[292] Deem, ". . . And the Stone Sank," 349, noted that most of the various types of helmets that one could conceive Goliath as wearing all appear to cover the forehead.

[293] *NETS* translates this phrase as "and the stone penetrated through the helmet." *LXX.D* translates as "*und der Stein drang durch den Helm.*" The use of the verb *dringen* would seem to suggest penetration. *BdA* translates as "*et la pierre s'enfonça à travers le casque.*" The verb *enfoncer* suggests forceable penetration. Smith, *Samuel*, 164, though recognizing that this is problematic still reads the Greek this way. Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 27, suggests that the fact that the stone penetrated through the helmet is evidence

140

The verb διαδύνω is used only here in the LXX. Its basic meaning is "to slip through" or "slip away" as in through a hole or a gap (*LSJ*). For example Thucydides uses this word to describe some of the men of Brasidas "slipping into" (διαδύντες) the city of Toronè undetected (*Thuc.* 4.110). It does not, as far as I can tell, imply forceable penetration in its natural Greek context, but rather the idea of slipping between two entities.[294] It seems, then, that in its natural Greek usage the phrase καὶ διέδυ ὁ λίθος διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας may suggest that the stone slipped through the helmet, or perhaps between two different parts of the helmet (through the eyehole?).[295]

The verb διαδύνω is being used in this instance to translate the Hebrew טבע, which has as its basic meaning "to sink" (*HALOT*). It is used frequently in poetic literature to depict the imagery of "sinking" in the mire, which explains the LXX translation of ἐμπήγνυμι ("to stick in, plant in") in each of these instances (Ps. 9:16; 68:3 [69:3 MT], 15; Lam. 2:9).[296] There is no other usage of טבע that quite parallels the usage here. However, the imagery of the stone "sinking" or "sticking" in Goliath's forehead is understandable. It is only when the problem of the helmet is noted that one might need another concept. This seems to be the reasoning behind the translator's usage of διαδύνω here. If the perceived problem of the translator was that Goliath was wearing a helmet that is not mentioned when the stone hits him, then the

---

of divine assistance. Several later Jewish interpretations suggest similar interventions by God. See Ginzberg, *Legends*, 6:251-52.

[294] The closest I can find to the meaning of "penetration" in a natural Greek context is in *Xen.Hell.* 4.4.11, οἱ μέντοι φυγάδες τῶν Κορινθίων νικῶντες τοὺς καθ᾽ αὑτοὺς διέδυσαν ἄνω, καὶ ἐγένοντο ἐγγὺς τοῦ περὶ τὸ ἄστυ κύκλου, which Brownson translates as "Meanwhile the Corinthian exiles, being victorious over the troops opposed to them, *pushed their way through* in the inland direction and got near the wall which surrounded the city" (*LCL*). Though one wonders if the translation of διέδυσαν as "pushed their way through" is necessary in the context.

[295] Rabbi David Kimḥi suggested that upon David's mention of the birds of the air, "Goliath raised his eyes skyward, to see whether there were any birds about. The upward motion of his head pushed his visor slightly away from his forehead, and in that instant the pebble aimed by David struck him on the exposed spot" (Ginzberg, *Legends*, 4:87-88).

[296] The Hebrew טבע is translated by πήγνυμι ("to fasten") in Job 38:6, where the context is "sinking" or perhaps fastening the foundations of the earth.

mention of the helmet with a verb that can mean "slip through" rather than "pierce" makes for a plausible solution.

The next result of David's slinging is that Goliath "fell upon his face (καῖ ἔπεσεν ἐπι πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ) upon the ground." This has resonances with the description of the fallen Foreigner god Dagon in 5:3, 4: "behold, Dagon had fallen upon his face (πεπτωκὼς ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ) before the ark."[297] Just as the apparent victory of the Foreigners in chapter 5 ended in their defeat with their god face first before the ark, the seemingly certain victory of the Foreigners in chapter 17 ends in their defeat with their champion face first before the ranks of Israel.

Having performed no direct action since his "slinging" in v. 49a,[298] David now rushes to action once again. He runs toward the giant and stands over him (καὶ ἐπέστη ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν).[299] The image of David standing over Goliath is not only an image of the victor standing over his defeated enemy, but is an act which is repeated nearly verbatim in 2 Rgns. 1:10 where Saul's servant stands over him and kills him: καὶ ἐπέστην ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν ("and I stood over him and I killed him"). Thus, the wording of David's defeat of Goliath foreshadows Saul's ultimate demise at the hands of his own servant.

Goliath's sword, which was conspicuously absent in the giant's initial description (17:5-7) but keenly noticed by David (17:45, 47), becomes vitally important because it is the weapon with which David will dispatch the Foreigners' champion.[300] David takes his sword

---

[297] E.g., Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 186; Gordon, *Samuel*, 158; Edelman, *King Saul*, 132-33; George, "Constructing Identity," 406-07; and Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 187.

[298] The MT includes additional action in the plus in v. 50. However, we will deal with this in ch. 6.

[299] The MT reads ויעמד אל־הפלשתי ("and he stood toward the Philistine"). The preposition אל is odd following עמד and regularly and probably correctly emended to על, which is what would be expected following the verb עמד (so De Boer, "1 Samuel XVII," 101; Krinetzki, "Silanalyse der Goliathperikope," 196; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 333; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 289). The Greek reading of ἐπί is the standard equivalent for על and makes the best sense in the context. See *BdA*, 294, on this and the similar occurrence in 17:3. The MT includes a reference to the הפלשתי where LXX[B] has only a pronoun.

[300] Isser, *The Sword of Goliath*, 34-37, suggests that the reason for the presence of the sword here is that it

and kills him and cuts off his head.[301] The action of finally dispatching Goliath is dramatically depicted by three indicative verbs: "and he took. . . and he killed . . . and he removed.[302] The theme of killing one's enemy with his own weapon would be well understood as an act of great heroism.[303] In the context of David's battle with Goliath, and in connection with Saul's pseudo-suicide in 2 Sam. 1:10, the reader may get the impression that the giant's defiance of the God of Israel has led him to a pseudo-form of suicide as he is slain by his own sword.[304] The implication may be then that defiance of Israel's covenant God is equivalent to suicide.

David, however, does more than kill the giant with his own sword, he beheads him (καὶ ἀφεῖλεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ). It is difficult to tell whether the killing and the beheading are to be viewed as two different actions or two descriptions of the same action,[305] though this is somewhat immaterial to the narrative. What is narratively important is that David does both kill the giant and behead him. In his verbal battle with the giant David declared that he would kill (ἀποκτείνω) him so that the whole world would know that there is a God in Israel (v. 46). Thus, the whole world knowing of the presence of God in Israel is predicated on David killing Goliath. It is also symbolically important that David "remove" (ἀφαιρέω) the head of Goliath. We previously noted that David promised that he would "remove" this reproach from Israel (v. 36), that Saul's armor "was removed" from upon him and that he

"must be an authentic detail from an underlying story" (36).

[301] MT reads ויכרת־בה את־ראשו ("and he cut off his head *with it*"). The additional בה is awkward with the verb וימתתהו ("and he killed him") between the preposition and the last mention of the sword. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 290, follows the reading of LXX[B], but this could just as easily be an omission by LXX[B] to make a smoother reading.

[302] The MT adds an additional action describing David drawing the sword from its sheath (וישלפה מתערה). Klein, *1 Samuel*, 172, plausibly suggests that this was accidentally omitted from the Greek tradition by haplography as "a scribe's eye skipped from αὐτοῦ καὶ—αὐτῆς καὶ)."

[303] Cf. 2 Sam. 23:20-21; and Sinuhe's killing of a brave of Retenu (*ANET*, 20). See De Vaux, "Single Combat," 129; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 181; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 465.

[304] Edelman, *King Saul*, 133.

[305] R.W.L. Moberly, "By Stone and Sling: 1 Samuel 17:50 and the Problem of Misreading David's Victory Over Goliath," in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (ed. James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 330, notes that the Hebrew can be read either consecutively ("he killed, then he cut off...") or epexegetically ("he killed, that is he cut off..."). The Greek καὶ can be read similarly (*BDF* §442 [10]).

would "remove" Goliath's head (v. 46). All of these uses of the verb ἀφαιρέω ("remove") converge to make this word symbolically significant. In removing Goliath's head, David has removed the reproach from Israel, and he has begun the process that will remove Saul from kingship. Again, we note the resonances between Goliath's death and Saul's death:[306]

Table 8: Goliath's Death and Saul's Death[307]

1 Rgns. 17:51	2 Rgns. 1:10
David stood over Goliath καὶ ἐπέστη ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν	Saul's servant stood over him καὶ ἐπέστην ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν
David killed Goliath καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν αὐτόν	Saul's servant killed him καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν
David removed Goliath's head καὶ ἀφεῖλεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ	Saul's servant took the crown[308] that was upon his head καὶ ἔλαβον τὸ βασίλειον τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ

David is now the victor, Goliath is now dead. The reproach of Israel has been removed, Saul's demise has been prefigured. David has now done what he said would show all the world that there is a God in Israel. All that remains is to see the aftermath of this μονομαχία.

4. Aftermath (17:51b-54)

4.1. Geography of a Victory (vv. 51b-52)

The vantage point of the narrative now changes. Since the end of verse 40 the action has centered on the two men between the two armies, David and the Foreigners' giant. Now we

---

[306] For a different set of resonances between Goliath and Saul's death see Klein, *David versus Saul*, 99.

[307] This comparison works slightly better in the Greek than the Hebrew because the Greek reads he stood "over him" (ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν) in both cases where the Hebrew reads stood "to the Philistine" (אל־הפלשתי) in 17:51 and stood "over him" (עליו) in 2 Sam. 1:10.

[308] Note that the Greek word here is βασίλειον which can mean crown, and does in this context, but can also mean "kingdom" or "royal authority" and so this act, like the removal of Goliath's head is fraught with symbolism.

144

see the response of the rest of the Foreigners when they see David standing over their champion with his head in his hand: "And the Foreigners saw that their mighty man had died, and they fled."

Other than David's inclusion of them in his taunt to Goliath (v. 46), we have not seen the rest of the Foreigners since the prologue to this narrative (vv. 1-3). Now here in the conclusion they appear and "see" Goliath's defeat at the hands of David. We noted that the concept of "seeing" was significant in chapter 16. In that chapter everyone was "seeing" David. In chapter 17, Goliath "sees" David and he disdains him and the Foreigners now "see" (ὁράω) Goliath's death at the hands of David and have a very different reaction.

According to the narrator the Foreigners see that "their mighty man had died" (ὅτι τέθνηκεν ὁ δυνατὸς αὐτῶν). The use of the title ὁ δυνατός for the giant recalls the use of this title in v. 4 ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς ἐκ τῆς παρατάξεως τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ("a mighty man from the ranks of the Foreigners").[309] The two times that this kind of title is used of Goliath, is in reference to the rest of the Foreigners. We see him coming from the ranks as the representative champion of the Foreigners and now, we see him fallen and decapitated from their point of view. The Foreigners had pinned their hopes on their champion, but now know that sword and spear do not save, only the Lord saves (see v. 47).

The result of the Foreigners' seeing their champion dead is given quite simply: "and they fled" (καὶ ἔφυγον). The only other occasion of the Foreigners fleeing thus far in the narrative came at the hands of Saul, after the initial gambit of Jonathan (14:22). Now, David, the young chosen one is the cause of the flight of the Foreigners. If one of the key roles of

---

[309] This connection is closer in the Greek than the Hebrew. The Hebrew refers to Goliath in v. 4 as איש הבנים ("a man of the in-between"), and in v. 51b as גבור ("mighty man"). Reigns translates both of these as δυνάτος.

being king is to fight the people's battles (8:20), then David has now fulfilled that function and sent the enemy fleeing.

The vantage point of the narrative now changes again, and the new subjects are the men of Israel and Judah. The men of Israel and Judah drew themselves up (ἀνίστημι) as Goliath did in v. 48 and gave a loud shout (ἀλαλάζω), presumably of victory. And they pursue the Foreigners (καὶ κατεδίωξαν ὀπίσω αὐτῶν[310]). This pursuit of the Foreigners leads to a massacre that extends from the battle field back to the enemy strongholds: to Gath and Ekron.

Just as the narrative set the scene for this confrontation with a dense set of geographical references, the story finishes with a dense set of geographical references. The first geographical reference is that the men of Israel and Judah pursued the Foreigners "unto the entrance of Gath" (ἕως εἰσόδου Γὲθ). This is different from the MT which reads עד־בואך גיא ("as far as Gai").[311] Though this could be read as a proper place name,[312] it is an otherwise unattested location and could be plausibly reconstructed to הגיא ("the valley") in reference to the Elah Valley mentioned in v. 2.[313] However, most commentators prefer to read this verse with the presumed *Vorlage* of the OG, which would have read גת ("Gath").[314] Given that the two locations גת and עקרון are used as the points of destination in the second part of v. 52 in

---

[310] It is possible that the *Vorlage* of the OG read וירדפו אחריהם, which is what would be expected from the prepositional phrase ὀπίσω αὐτῶν. The MT reads וירדפו את־הפלשתים, explicitly mentioning "the Philistines," where the Greek text simply reads "them" (αὐτῶν). Cf. the similar phenomenon in v. 51.

[311] The Hebrew phrase עד־בואך is a biblical idiom meaning "as far as" (*BDB*, s.v. "בוא"). The LXX renders this differently, sometimes following the grammar more literally and rending it τοῦ ἐλθεῖν (Judg. 6:4 Rahlfs) but it does elsewhere render this phrase as εἴσοδος (e.g., 1 Sam. 16:4).

[312] So JPS; and Yehudah Dagan, "Khirbet Qeiyafa in the Judean Shephelah: Some Considerations," *TA* 36 (2009): 79, who tries to identify this with a particular curve of Nahal Elah.

[313] This appears to be preferred by KJV, NASB, and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 466; A.F. Rainey, "The Identification of Philistine Gath: A Problem in Source Analysis for Historical Geography," *EI* 12 (1975): 69-70; and Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 33-34.

[314] Driver, *Samuel*, 147; Smith, *Samuel*, 165; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 286; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 172; C.S. Erlich, "Gai," in *ABD* 2:869; and Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 163.

seeming parallel with the first half of the verse it seems likely the OG retains the original

reading with Γεθ.[315]

In the Greek text the Foreigners are pursued unto the entrance of Gath and "unto the

gates of Ashkelon" (ἕως τῆς πύλης Ἀσκάλωνος). This is again different from the MT, which

reads ועד שערי עקרון ("and unto the gates of Ekron"). The variant reading of Ashkelon for

Ekron happens repeatedly in 1 Reigns (5:10; 7:14; 17:52) and most commentators prefer

Ekron as the original reading.[316] Geographically, Ekron makes more sense since this would

imply that the fleeing Philistines split into two groups one fleeing north to Ekron and one

continuing west to Gath. Furthermore, the second half of the verse gives the two destinations

as Gath and Ekron in both the MT and OG. So, text-critically the reading of Ekron should

probably be preferred. Nevertheless, in the version of the story told in the OG, the

destination in this instance is Ashkelon. In this version the first two destinations Gath and

Ashkelon could be read as detailing the extent of the Foreigners' defeat, since Ashkelon is

even further removed from the location of the battle. Thus we could read "and they pursued

after them unto the entrance of Gath even unto the gates of Ashkelon!" The mention of Gath

and Ekron, then, would describe not the extent of the pursuit but the fact that they pursued

Foreigners in two different directions.

The narrative also details that they pursued the Foreigners "on the way of the gates"

(ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ τῶν πυλῶν). This reference to "the gates" is a literal translation of the Hebrew

שערים, which could mean "gates" but is usually understood to be the proper name

"Shaaraim," or "place of the two gates." This reference to Shaaraim has received much

attention since the attempt to identify this city with the recently excavated Khirbet Qeiyafa.

[315] Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 211, suggest that the LXX reading could be an alignment with v. 53. Cf. also Barthélemy, *Critique*, 192.
[316] Smith, *Samuel*, 165; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 141; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 121, 290. Though cf. Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 163.

In the scholarly discussions that have followed, no clear consensus has emerged.[317] The location of Shaaraim remains somewhat uncertain.

The geography in the Greek and Hebrew traditions is somewhat fluid. The point of the reference to Shaaraim or "the way of the gates" is that it details the road upon which the Israelites pursued and slaughtered the Foreigners. Perhaps the most important fact is, as Beck noted, that "both Gath and Ekron [and in light of the LXX we may add Ashkelon] lie *outside* of the Elah Valley."[318] In other words, the Israelite victory is total. They have driven the Foreigners completely out of their territory.

4.2. To the Victor Goes the Spoils (vv. 53-54)

The last two verses of this narrative detail what is done with the enemy's possessions after the victory. Verse 53 details the actions of the men of Israel in regard to the spoils of the Foreigners and verse 54 details the actions of David with the spoils of Goliath.

The "men of Israel" (ἄνδρες Ἰσραήλ)[319] return from "turning aside after the Foreigners" (ἐκκλίνοντες ὀπίσω τῶν ἀλλοφύλων). The verb ἐκκλίνω, normally conveys the sense of turning away from something or turning aside, not generally pursuing something (see *LEH*, *LSJ*, *GELS*), as the context clearly implies here. It is furthermore an odd translation of the Hebrew מדלק, which has a basic sense "to burn" but in this usage means something like "hotly pursuing" (see *HALOT*). Patrick Skehan has made the plausible suggestion that the original reading was ἐκκαίω, which means "to burn" or in this context, like the Hebrew דלק, to hotly

---

[317] Yosef Garfinkel and Saar Ganor, "Khirbet Qeiyafa: Sha'arayim," *JHebS* 8/22 (2008): 1-10, identified Khirbet Qeiyafa as Shaaraim. This has been disputed and other proposals have been offered such as Gob (Nadav Na'aman, "In Search of the Ancient Name of Khirbet Qeiyafa," *JHebS* 8/21 [2008]: 1-8; and idem, "Shaaraim—The Gateway to the Kingdom of Judah," *JHebS* 8/24 [2008]:1-5) and Adithayim referenced in Josh. 15:36 (Dagan, "Khirbet Qeiyafa," 68-81).

[318] Beck, "Story of Place," 329, italics original.

[319] Only here and 1 Rgns. 11:8 is בני ישראל translated as ἄνδρες Ἰσραήλ, though in 1 Rgns. 11:8 it could be to match the ואיש יהודה which follows.

pursue (see *LEH, GELS*).[320] Since this is the only usage of דלק in 1 Reigns, and since

ἐκκλίνω is used elsewhere in 1 Reigns to translate the more obvious equivalents, נטה, "to

stretch out" (8:3; 14:7; 25:14), and סור, "to turn aside" (12:20; 15:6), the corruption from

ἐκκαίοντες to ἐκκλίνοντες, is a plausible explanation for an otherwise puzzling translation

choice.[321]

In either reading, whether the men of Israel are "turning aside after" or "burning after"

the Foreigners, the context demands that we see them as pursuing them as the previous verse

stated to the gates of Gath and Ekron (and perhaps even Ashkelon). Upon their return to the

site of the battle they trample the camps of the Foreigners. The translator's use of καταπατέω

("to trample upon," or "destroy") here is not an obvious equivalent for the Hebrew שסס (a

variant form of the verb שסה—"to plunder," see *HALOT*). Tov and Polak in the *CATSS*

database suggest that the *Vorlage* of the Greek may have read וישפו, from שוף which could

mean "to trample" (cf. Gen. 3:15; Ps. 131:11; Job 9:17). While the graphic similarity between

וישסו and וישפו make the explanation offered by Tov and Polak seem valid, the fact that every

usage of the verbs שסס or שסה in 1 Samuel is translated in 1 Reigns as καταπατέω (14:48;

17:53; 23:1)[322] makes it seems likely that καταπατέω was the original reading. For some

reason the OG translator saw καταπατέω as an appropriate equivalent for שסה/שסס. Why this

translational equivalent may have been chosen is unclear, but it appears to have been

---

[320] Patrick William Skehan, "Turning or Burning: 1 Sam 17:53 LXX," *CBQ* 38/2 (1976): 193-95. Cf. also *BdA*, 308. Though no Greek manuscript contains this reading, Skehan points to a marginal reading from Old Latin in the Léon Gothic codex: *comburentes* ("burning up"), as the only manuscript evidence for the original reading.
[321] Auld, *Samuel*, 207
[322] Though admittedly, 23:1 contains a doublet. Where the MT reads שסים ("plundering") the Greek reads διαρπάζουσιν, καταπατοῦσιν ("plundering, trampling"), an obvious example of a doublet where two variant readings are included.

preferred by the translator of 1 Reigns. Thus, in the Greek the Israelites put an exclamation mark on their victory by destroying the camp of the Foreigners.

Verse 54 details David's actions with his victory trophies. David first takes the giant's head to Jerusalem. Scholars have frequently pointed out that the reference to David taking the giant's head to Jerusalem is problematic because 1) in the MT he is holding the head again in his hand (17:57), and 2) the city of Jerusalem is in the possession of the Jebusites until David conquers the city (2 Sam. 5:6-9). This is not simply an anachronism, as some claim,[323] because the text of 1-2 Samuel itself is aware of this contradiction, both because the final text of 1-2 Samuel (or Reigns for that matter) include 1 Sam. 17:54 and 2 Sam. 5:6-9, and because the internal consistency of 17:54 is odd if it is meant to be read in a straightforward chronological statement because wherever David's tent is it is likely not in Jerusalem.[324] Therefore, the reader must come up with another explanation for how to understand this.

Most strategies for understanding this odd reference to Jerusalem have been to view it as some sort of literary device foreshadowing events to come.[325] Thus, some have argued that this reference to Jerusalem implies a tradition which held that Goliath's head was eventually brought to Jerusalem, perhaps as some kind of relic.[326] Others suggest that this is foreshadowing David's ultimate destination.[327] That this reference to Jerusalem involves some sort of literary foreshadowing seems the most plausible explanation. However, while scholars often note the literary foreshadowing in v. 54a, they often view it in isolation from v. 54b.

[323] E.g., Klein, *1 Samuel*, 181.

[324] Despite Tsumura's valiant attempt to defend a straightforward reading of this verse by arguing that 'Jerusalem' could refer to a suburb of Jerusalem where David took Goliath's head (*Samuel*, 468-69).

[325] Though cf. James K. Hoffmeier, "David's Triumph Over Goliath: 1 Samuel 17:54 and Ancient Near Eastern Analogues," in *Egypt, Canaan and Israel: History, Imperialism, Ideology and Literature* (ed. S. Bar; D. Kahn, and J.J. Shirley; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 87-114, who argues that it is an understandable ancient Near Eastern strategy for David to announce his victory over the Philistines while also putting the Jebusites on notice that "Jerusalem's demise was only a matter of time" (p. 108). Cf. Robert D. Bergen, *1, 2 Samuel* (NAC; Nashville, TN; B&H Publishing Group, 1996), 197-98.

[326] So Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 153; Willis, "Redactional Joints," 302-06; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 294; Gordon, *Samuel*, 158; Polzin, *Samuel*, 162-62; and Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 211.

[327] Campbell, "Structure Analysis," 89-90; and Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 257.

Therefore, we will hold off our interpretation of the reference to Jerusalem until we have also considered the reference to David's tent.

Following the description of the destination of Goliath's head, the narrative continues and gives the destination of his armor: "and his armor he placed in his tent." Scholars sometimes note that in the longer MT version of the story, a simple reference to David's tent would not make sense, since David is depicted as a first time visitor to the camp.[328] In the shorter OG version it is perfectly plausible that David, as a member of Saul's court, would have had his own tent. It may be that the reference to David bringing the armor of Goliath back to his tent is nothing more than a typical action done by the hero of a μονομαχία.[329] However, the obviously difficult reference to Jerusalem and the parallelism between the two parts of v. 54 suggest that there may also be something further going on here.

If we view the two halves of verse 54 together how should we understand the reference to Jerusalem and David's tent? It is revealed later in the narrative that Goliath's sword, at least, will end up in Nob and will play a crucial part in the story (1 Samuel 21), so David's tent is not the final resting place for the armor. The parallel between David's tent and Jerusalem may suggest the way to understand these two geographical references. It is no surprise to current readers of this story, nor would it have been to the original readers of this story, that David's destiny leads to Jerusalem. The city of Jerusalem will become identified with David in a special way, and will be referenced as the "city of David" (2 Sam. 5:7, 9; 6:10; 1 Kgs. 3:8; 8:1; etc.). If the reference to Jerusalem and David's tent are to be understood together then I propose that they be understood as a narrative technique to draw an association between David's dwelling place (tent)[330] and Jerusalem. Even though the text says

---

[328] E.g., Firth, *Samuel*, 201-02.

[329] One thinks of Achilles bringing the body of Hector back to his tent (*Il.* 22-24).

[330] The phrase "tent of David" as a metaphorical reference to the Davidic dynasty is used in Isa. 16:5: MT אהל דוד; LXX σκηνῇ Δαυείδ.

that David brings Goliath's head to Jerusalem and his armor to his tent, the reader gets the impression that it is Goliath's head that begins to bring David to Jerusalem, where he will make his dwelling place.

In the Greek text, this part of the story ends here, with a reference to the victory of Israel in expelling the invading Foreigners and a mention of David's tent in parallel to Jerusalem. From here David's career will advance steadily toward the throne, and the final destination is already in the reader's mind.

5. Concluding Reflections

We have now come to the end of the story of David and Goliath.[331] The iconic confrontation is over. We are now in a place to offer some final reflections about the story.

5.1. Themes of 1 Reigns 17

The first significant feature of the narrative that the reader encounters is the extensive use of geography. Beck is certainly correct when he writes that the "story of David and Goliath is clearly a story of place."[332] The various geographical locations at the beginning of the story and the end of the story set the socio-political scope of the conflict. The encroachment of the Foreigners upon the significant valley between Socoth and Azekah (Elah Valley) is a serious national threat to Israel. The geographical references at the end of the story explain the extent of Israel's victory.

The geography of 1 Reigns 17 also plays a more literary role as well. The detailed description of the setting at the beginning of the story paints a picture of an already iconic

---

[331] The MT, of course, includes the additional scene of Saul and Abner watching David go out in 17:55-58.
[332] Beck, "Story of Place," 329.

confrontation: an army on one mountain, an army on the other mountain and a valley in between. This scenic use of geography brings all focus to the valley, where the two combatants will face each other. The scene is set for an epic confrontation. But the final geographical reference may be even more significant. The reference to Jerusalem points the direction where this story is going. A journey has begun which will end in Jerusalem.

If the geography of the confrontation highlights the political significance of the conflict, Goliath's challenge further highlights the other significant elements of the conflict: the honor of Israel and more importantly the honor of the Lord. The champion of the Foreigners offers the Israelites a challenge of single-combat, a μονομαχία, which carries with it a high level of honor and shame. The challenge is somewhat typical of this kind of combat and brings with it grave dishonor on the individual and the group if the challenge is not met.[333] The confrontation is thus significant on a political and military level, but even more so on the cultural-identity level of honor-shame. However, this national conflict is also a conflict of deities and a conflict of loyalties. Whose deity will prevail and, in the end, whom will Israel serve? Thus, the conflict is presented as a military challenge, a social-honor challenge, and a theological challenge.[334] It is a challenge of the utmost importance, and the reader anticipates the hero who will meet that challenge.

This challenge must be met. However, the first obstacle to meeting this challenge is the fear of Saul and the people (v. 32). As the champion of Israel, the one with whom there is no comparison (10:24), who is head and shoulders taller than anyone (9:2; 10:23), and the only one technologically equipped to face the giant (13:22), this is Saul's moment. That he is afraid with the people is a serious critique of him and his leadership. Instead, David, the court musician steps up and offers to function as the representative of the people in battle,

[333] Cf. Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia," 8.
[334] George, "Constructing Identity," 397.

153

something that was considered by the people to be the role of the king (8:20). The second obstacle to this challenge being met is Saul's refusal to let David face the giant. David must convince Saul that he is able. To do so, he lists his qualifications and his feats and in narrating his feats he brings out the theological implications of his success and his strategy for defeating the giant: the help of the Lord.

The slow pace of the narrative and the various obstacles to the challenge of the Foreigners being met, heightens the drama of this story. The reader is anxiously anticipating the great confrontation.

The confrontation itself begins with a battle of words. In this first battle the honor-shame aspect of the conflict is reiterated as the combatants trade insults. However, the theological aspect of the conflict is emphasized and the narrative reaches its key theological moment as David outlines his confidence in his victory and the reason for his victory: David comes not with sword and spear but in the name of the Lord (v. 46) and he will be victorious so that the whole world will know that there is a God in Israel (v. 46b). Then Israel will learn that their God is the one to whom the battle belongs, and it is in him that they should depend for their victories (v. 47).[335]

The theme that Israel must rely on the Lord for victory and not on conventional arms like the nations could be read as a direct response to Israel's desire for a king like the other nations. Saul is certainly portrayed as the kind of king a nation would want, but David is the kind of king that the Lord wants.

A final key theme that is evident in this narrative is the emergence of David. The reader was introduced to David in chapter 16, and from chapter 18 onward the story of David will be the story of Saul against David. However, in subtle ways that story starts in chapter

---

[335] Cf. Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 190; and Firth, "That the World May Know," 30.

17. David emerges as the one who fights Israel's battles instead of Saul. When Saul is afraid, David is confident that the Lord who delivered him from the lion and bear will deliver him from the giant. David removes the reproach from Israel by removing the giant's head. However, before he can do that Saul's armor must be removed from him. Saul appears to think that victory will be achieved by conventional military methods and tries to outfit David. David, however, understands that victory will be achieved by dependence upon the God of Israel. In David's first narrative act, we see him rising up above Saul. This is the trajectory that he will be on for the rest of the book. It is likely also significant that Goliath's death is told in similar fashion to Saul's death. In this way, David's defeat of Goliath foreshadows Saul's death.

5.2. Special Emphases of the Greek Text

If we ignore the issue of the long MT pluses in chapter 17, 1 Reigns 17 is only moderately different from the version of the story in MT. However, it must be noted that the adjustment that is present, moderate though it may be, is literarily significant. The following are some of the more literarily significant adjustments between the Hebrew and Greek version of this chapter.

The first and most obvious element of adjustment is the translation of the Hebrew פלשתי with the Greek ἀλλόφυλος. The label of this particular group as "the Foreigners" makes them into the quintessential "other," the archetypal enemy of Israel.[336] Already the translators have marked the story with a certain ideological interpretation. Related to this ideological translation of פלשתי as ἀλλόφυλος, is David's speech to Saul where he twice refers to Goliath as "this uncircumcised one" (v. 36b: ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος; v. 37: τοῦ ἀπεριτμήτου τούτου),

---

[336] Cf. De Vaux, "Philistins dans la Septante," 192-93; Gordon, "The Ideological Foe," 165; and *BdA*, 74-76.

where the Hebrew has no equivalent. This additional labeling of the champion as uncircumcised, mentioned only once in the Hebrew version (v. 36a), further emphasizes to the giant as the prototypical non-Israelite.

Another element that adds extra emphasis in the Greek version is David's appeal to Saul: "let not my lord's heart fall upon him" (v. 32), where the MT reads "let no one's heart fall on account of him." The key difference between "my lord's" and "one's" is textually difficult, but narratively significant. Though the Greek reading quite possibly reflects a different *Vorlage*, the difference it makes to the current narrative must be noted. In a key moment the key theme of the heart is identified with specific reference to Saul. This reading strengthens one of the key narrative themes we noted above: the critique of Saul as the representative leader.

Other adjustments in the Greek text include a literary sensitivity in the translation. These adjustments include everything from small translational shifts to the introduction of additional elements. Examples of literary sensitivity in small translational adjustments include the elements which suggest the translators were reading this story with the Greek tradition of μονομαχία in mind. Thus, the Hebrew כידון is rendered as ἀσπίς commensurate with what the Homeric hero would have "between his shoulders" (v. 6). Also, Goliath's challenge that Israel send a hero so that they may "fight together" (ונלחמה יחד) is contextually rendered in the Greek as καὶ μονομαχήσομεν ἀμφότεροι, "and we will both fight in single combat" (v. 10), using the explicit term for single combat, when the Hebrew used the simple verb meaning to fight.

Another example of literary sensitivity in a moderate adjustment is the use of verbal tense in David's boast to Saul.[337] We noted that the Greek verbal structure did not follow the

[337] We saw a similar phenomenon in the use of the historic present tense in the introduction (vv. 1-2) and the conclusion (v. 52). Cf. Appendix I.

156

Hebrew *Vorlage* but used a verbal structure that highlighted David's past actions with the lion and bear, which foreshadowed his future actions with the Giant.

There are also examples of adjustment that appear to attempt to remove difficulties. One example is that the translator has appeared to leave the phrase "and he clothed him with mail" (v. 38) untranslated because it appeared to make Saul put mail on David after putting on his helmet, making the chronology of the action nonsense. Another example is the description in v. 49, "and the stone *slipped through his helmet* into his forehead" (καὶ διέδυ ὁ λίθος διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας εἰς τὸ μέτωπον αὐτοῦ). The translator appeared to be aware of the problem that Goliath was wearing a helmet and sought to explain it by altering the translation of the verb with διαδύνω ("slipped through") and inserting the phrase διὰ τῆς περικεφαλαίας ("through the helmet"), hinting at how Goliath could have been hit in the forehead even though he was wearing a helmet.[338]

A final example of adjustment due to literary sensitivity could be categorized as significant adjustment. This is the fact that David is afforded two extra speeches in the Greek text. The first is an extra part of his boast to Saul. Where the Hebrew simply reads: "And this uncircumcised Philistine will be like one of them for he reproached the battle lines of the living God" (v. 36), the Greek expands this to read: "and the uncircumcised Foreigner will be as one of them; *will I not go and strike him and remove the reproach from Israel today? For who is this uncircumcised Foreigner who* reproached the battle lines of the living God." We suggested that the OG plus was included in order to draw greater continuity between David's boast and the reality of his victory. The second speech is a response to Goliath's taunt. In response to Goliath's question of whether he is a dog that Israel would send someone against him bearing sticks and stones, David is afforded a response to the dog remark and he quips:

---

[338] The inclusion of καὶ λίθοις ("and stones") in v. 43 could be understood similarly, i.e., the translator was aware that David had his staff and his stones, and thus included the stones in Goliath's observation.

"No, but worse than a dog" (Οὐχι, ἀλλ᾽ ἤ χείρω κυνός). The effect on the narrative is that David's character is filled out a little. Perhaps this plus helps him to match the description of him in 16:18, as one who is "wise in word" (σοφὸς λόγῳ).

The adjustments in the translation of chapter 17 do not dramatically change the story. However, they are significant enough and prevalent enough to suggest that the translator approached his project with his own literary sensitivity. This does not mean that he was not faithful to his *Vorlage*, since the Greek still reads after all like a translation, filled with its Hebraic sounding turns of phrase. But it must be said that it appears that the translator was willing to assert his own literary sensitivity in cases which 1) did not require a major shift of his *Vorlage*, 2) were inconsistent with other parts of the narrative, or 3) could be successfully adjusted by small additions or omissions.

The story will now turn away from David and Goliath and toward David and Saul. While the following narrative is often not treated as substantially different between the MT and LXX, the differences that exist, small though they are, are difficult and make for a subtly different story in the two versions.

CHAPTER 4

THE LOVE OF DAVID: 1 SAMUEL 18 IN GREEK

1. Introduction

We come now to the final portion of the narrative under consideration. The previous chapter

dealt with 1 Reigns 17, the most iconic part of our text. It is also the chapter that is most well

known for having two different versions in the Greek and Hebrew tradition. In our analysis of

chapter 17 we attempted to read the Greek version as its own version of the story without

recourse to the major MT pluses. The same will be our intention here. However, the text of 1

Reigns 18 is in some ways more complicated than the text of 1 Reigns 17. Our intention is to

study the large MT pluses in the next chapter and so leave discussion of those portions out of

the present chapter, but chapter 18, with its numerous half-verse or even one clause minuses,

resists such easy distinction between small adjustments and the large versional difference

between MT and OG. Thus, we will attempt to contain our discussion to the smaller

adjustments, but it is difficult to understand what the translator is doing in some portions of

the text without reference to minuses that are often assigned to the large MT plus/OG minus.

2. The Love of the Women (18:6-9)

The previous scene ended with the men of Israel and Judah pursuing the fleeing Foreigners

(17:52) and then returning and trampling their camp (17:53). Then, a summary statement was

given about what David did with his spoils of war containing geographical references, which

likely pointed the reader toward the direction that David's career was moving. Now in 18:6,

some time later,[1] a group of dancers (αἱ χορεύουσαι) from all the cities of Israel come out to

greet David with song and music. The following table shows the major differences between

the Greek and Hebrew (brackets mark equivalents found elsewhere in the verse):

Table 9: 18:6

ותצאנה	הנשים	[]	מכל־ערי ישראל	לשיר[2]
Καὶ ἐξῆλθον	αἱ χορεύουσαι	εἰς συνάντησιν Δαυειδ	ἐκ πασῶν πόλεων Ἰσραὴλ	--

והמחלות	לקראת	שאול המלך	בתפים	בשמחה	ובשלשים
[αἱ χορεύουσαι]	[εἰς συνάντησιν]	[Δαυειδ]	ἐν τυμπάνοις	καὶ ἐν χαρμοσύνη	καὶ ἐν κυμβάλοις

    First, the subject of this clause in the Greek text is αἱ χορεύουσαι, evidently a group of

female dancers. In the MT the subject is simply הנשים ("the women"). The translator has

either read והמחלות as a noun ("and the dancers") or as המחוללות, a polel participle from חול

("to dance").[3] Either way it is likely that the translator was led by the odd use of the article to

---

[1] The MT plus in 17:55-18:6a, details two other scenes (17:55-58 and 18:1-5) as well as an opening transitionary statement in 18:6a that logically connects the present scene with the David and Goliath narrative: ויהי בבואם בשוב דוד מהכות את־הפלשתי ("And it happened when David was returning from slaying the Philistine. . ."). Numerous Greek manuscripts add και εγενηθη εν τω εισπορευεσθαι αυτους εν τω επιστρεφειν δᾱδ απο του παταξαι τον αλλοφυλον (Ax tz fmw ghv Arm; boc₂e₂ ghi read an Imp εγενετο instead of the Aor εγενηθη). This section of text in 18:6a is frequently included as part of the long MT plus/OG minus and so we will refrain from commenting on it until the following chapter.

[2] Following the *Qere*; *Kethib* reads לשור.

[3] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 110; Driver, *Samuel*, 151; Smith, *Samuel*, 170. Cf. Judg. 21:23 where a similar translation occurs. Wellhausen further suggests that המחללת could be a corruption from במחלות which would

equate this group with the women of the first half of the verse and thus transposed this subject to the first half of the verse and dropped the general reference to women.

Second, the purpose clause "in order to greet [Personal Name]" occurs in different places in the sentence in the Greek and Hebrew. The Greek reads "And the dancers came to greet [PN] from all the cities of Israel;" whereas the Hebrew reads "And the women came out from all the cities of Israel . . . and the dancers to greet [PN]." Numerous scholars prefer the syntactically simpler OG here.[4] However, Driver is right to note that if the Greek reading is to be preferred, the phrase "from all the cities of Israel" should logically and syntactically precede "to greet [PN]."[5] It seems then, that it is possible to view the OG as a secondary attempt to make sense of the Hebrew. The Hebrew can be read as a parallel structure:

<div dir="rtl">

ותצאנה   הנשים מכל־ערי ישראל   לשיר
            והמחלות   לקראת   שאול המלך

</div>

The main verb (ותצאנה) is written only in the first clause and the two subjects (הנשים // והמחלות) and two infinitives (לקראת // לשיר) are in parallel.[6] The translator of 1 Reigns, while recognizing the parallelism between "the women" and "the dancers" likely did not see the full structure of the verse and hence simplified the syntax by having only a single subject (αἱ χορεύουσαι) and a single infinitive idea (εἰς συνάντησιν).[7] This view seems to explain the variants in this verse (with the exception of the personal name, which we will

_____

make sense of the Hebrew text and explain why the Greek translator is struggling with the subject of this verse.

[4] E.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 310-11; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 185.

[5] Driver, *Samuel*, 151.

[6] See Tsumura, *Samuel*, 476 (see also pp. 55-59). Cf. idem, "Vertical Grammar – the Grammar of Parallelism in Biblical Hebrew," in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (ed. M.F.J. Baasten, and W. Th. van Peursen; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 487-497. The recognition of this poetic structure explains the observation by Stoebe that the MT as it stands forms an incomplete sentence (Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 344).

[7] The Greek preposition εἰς followed by the noun συνάντησις ("meeting") is, with a verbal form of καλέω, the standard equivalent of the Hebrew ל plus an infinitive form of קרא. E.g., 1 Rgns. 17:48; 18:6; 23:28; 25:20; and frequently throughout the whole of the LXX.

address shortly) better than if the OG is assumed to be prior and the MT introduces a doublet.[8]

The next major difficulty is just who these "dancers" are going out to meet. In the Hebrew they are going out to meet "Saul the king."[9] In the Greek they are going out to meet David. It may be that the original text read ותצאנה המחללות לקראת דוד מכל ערי ישראל, as we would suppose the *Vorlage* of the OG may have been, and a scribe confused מכל with המלך by metathesis, and then corrected דוד to שאול, since David is not yet king.[10] Or, perhaps more likely, it could be that the original text simply had a pronoun and each tradition has chosen a different person to whom the pronoun refers.[11] If the latter is the case, then it is an interesting narrative intuition by the tradition found in OG that the women are going out first and foremost to meet David. This may be a hint by the narrator (or translator) that David is becoming the focal point of this narrative, and begins to detail his growing esteem in the eyes of all the people.

Next, in verse 7 we are given more information about the manner in which these women come out to meet David. The two verb forms in the first part of v. 7 are Greek imperfects (ἐξῆρχον, ἔλεγον) and they are used to render Hebrew *wayyiqtol* forms (ותענינה, ותאמרן). Though the grammar of the Hebrew verbs does not call for it, the context suggests that these actions are continuous in nature ("they were beginning, they were saying") and likely suggested the imperfect form to the translator.[12]

---

[8] Contra McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 310-11.
[9] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 212, notes the rarity of the word order שאול המלך.
[10] Presumably McCarter's view, *1 Samuel*, 310-11.
[11] Klein, *1 Samuel*, 185. Cf. Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 156.
[12] Though it might also be possible to view the verbal structure here as another example verbal variation to structure the narrative in terms of foreground and background.

What the women "begin to sing"[13] and "say" is the well known poetic line: "Saul has struck his thousands and David his ten thousands." Though it would be easy to interpret this poem as intending to exalt David at the expense of Saul, and some do,[14] scholars are quick to note that this pattern is a standard poetic set (e.g., Deut. 32:30; Mic. 6:7; Ps. 91:7; 144:13) and does not necessarily mean to communicate that David is being elevated over Saul.[15] The poetic pattern of the two numbers may well be a standard couplet, but the change in subject from Saul to David, with David at the climax of the poetic line at least gives license to Saul's negative interpretation of the poem.[16] At the very least we can say that the song is open to interpretation. Perhaps even more important than the reader's interpretation of the motivation for this song is Saul's interpretation of the motive for this song, which comes in the next verse.

In response to this song, the narrator informs us in v. 8a that "the word appeared evil in the eyes of Saul concerning this saying." The relationship between OG and MT in v. 8 is anything but straightforward. The following table shows the differences between the two in v. 8a:

---

[13] The verb ἐξάρχω ("to begin") is used exclusively in the LXX to translate the Heb. ענה IV, "to sing" (Ex. 15:21; 32:18[3x]; Num. 21:7; 1 Rgns. 18:7; 21:12; 29:5; Isa. 27:2; Psa. 147:7[146:7 MT]). *LEH* suggests the meaning "to lead in songs" or "to begin to sing" (similarly *GELS*) While this is not its natural Greek usage (see *LSJ*), its use in parallel with λέγω, introducing a poetic line, and its exclusive use in contexts involving singing, means that a reader of the Septuagint could infer a meaning similar to what *LEH* and *GELS* suggest. Le Boulluec and Sandevoir, *L'Exode*, 324, however suggest that this use of ἐξάρχω is attested in Homer.

[14] Wolfgang, M.W. Roth, "The Numerical Sequence x/x + 1 in the Old Testament," *VT* 12 (1962), 303-04; and Alter, *The David Story*, 113. Gordon, *Samuel*, 160; and Firth, *Samuel*, 209, suggest this as a possibility. Firth, points to the category of intensifying parallelism in biblical poetry (see Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* [New York: Basic Books, 1985], 19). It is interesting that in Roth's study, of the thirty-eight examples of this pattern this is the only usage of this pattern that he identifies as antithetical parallelism.

[15] See Stanley Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963), 14-24; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 157; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 214-15; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 477-78.

[16] David Noel Freedman, "Review of Stanley Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*," *JBL* 83/2 (1964): 201-03.

ויחר	לשאול	מאד	וירע	--	בעיניו	הדבר הזה
--	[Σαοὺλ]	--	καὶ πονηρὸν ἐφάνη	τὸ ῥῆμα	ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Σαοὺλ	περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου [τὸ ῥῆμα]

The first phrase (ויחר לשאול מאד) in the Hebrew is a minus in the OG. Scholars frequently note that this phrase is superfluous and may be part of the MT's attempt to raise the tension between Saul and David.[17] But this may not necessarily be the case. In v. 6 we saw that the Hebrew was written in a poetic parallel structure that the translator did not fully grasp. A case can be made that a similar structure is being utilized here:

<div align="center">

ויחר   לשאול   מאד

וירע   בעיניו   הדבר הזה

</div>

Each of these lines are standard phrases in Biblical Hebrew denoting anger.[18] Each Hebrew line is introduced by a *wayyiqtol* verb followed by a prepositional phrase referencing Saul. The subject of both lines (הדבר הזה) is given only in the second line.[19] This explains the placement of הדבר הזה, which we would have expected before בעיני.[20] Thus, the case can be made that the initial phrase is not superfluous but parallel. The Greek text, not recognizing this parallelism has, like many modern scholars, omitted this phrase as superfluous and

---

[17] See Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 185

[18] On ויחר ל־ מאד see Gen. 4:5; 31:36; Num. 16:15; 1 Sam. 15:11; 18:8; 2 Sam. 3:8, etc. On וירע בעיני ־־ see Gen. 21:11; 38:10; 48:17; 1 Sam. 8:6; 18:8; Isa. 59:15; 1 Chr. 21:7.

[19] In Hebrew idiom, the phrase ויחר ל־ is technically passive and never given an explicit subject, i.e., should be understood to mean "and *it* angered x" (on the use of ל to mark the subject of a passive verb see *WHS* §273c). It is frequently translated as if it were active, i.e. "and x was angry." It is, however, always immediately preceded by the cause of the anger, or the understood subject of the verb חרה. Thus, in the parallel structure I am advocating הדבר הזה of the second line is the subject of ויחר even though in this idiom ויחר is never used with an explicit subject. The reason this works is that the two lines are technically grammatically parallel, and the subject explicitly mentioned in line 2 (הדבר הזה), is the understood subject (what came before) from the idiom in the first line. This also explains why the Hebrew text includes the demonstrative הזה when הדבר would have been adequate.

[20] When "the thing" (הדבר) that is displeasing in the eyes of the person is explicitly mentioned as the subject of the verb רעע, and not in a relative clause or prepositional phrase, it is always placed before בעיני (Gen. 21:11; 1 Sam. 8:6; 2 Sam. 11:27). See G.I. Davies, "The Uses of *R″* Qal and the Meaning of Jonah IV 1," *VT* 27/1 (1977): 106-7.

awkward. The rest of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew can be explained in this way.

The first phrase in the Greek, καὶ πονηρὸν ἐφάνη, translates the single Hebrew word וירע ("and it was evil"). The translator of 1 Reigns appears to have used the verb κακοποιέω ("to do evil"), when רעע is used to describe "doing evil" (12:25; 25:34; 26:21) and the adjective πονηρός when something *is* evil (8:6; 18:8). The subject is placed before the prepositional phrase in the Greek but after it in the Hebrew. McCarter suggests that the *Vorlage* of the Greek read וירע הדבר בעיני, which would be the standard phraseology.[21] However, the Greek contains a doublet with τὸ ῥῆμα preceding the prepositional phrase and the equivalent περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου following it. This must be explained. The phrase τοῦ λόγου τούτου, more obviously translates the MT's הדבר הזה. The existence and placement of τὸ ῥῆμα can be explained by noting two factors. First, in the standard phrase "the thing was evil in the eyes of x" the "the word/thing" precedes the prepositional phrase "in the eyes of x." Second in 8:6 the identical Hebrew phrase, וירע הדבר בעיני, is translated with καὶ ἦν πονηρὸν τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς.[22] Thus, the normal usage of this phrase in general and the exact use of this phrase in 8:6, has attracted τὸ ῥῆμα to the first half of the clause. The translator then, still trying to represent הדבר הזה where it is in the Hebrew text has turned it into a prepositional phrase (περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου).

The final difference is the inclusion of the proper name Σαουλ in the prepositional phrase (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς . . .). Since the Greek text has lost the initial phrase, which mentioned

---

[21] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 311.
[22] This is the reading in Rahlfs-Hanhart it is supported by numerous manuscripts and versions (Ac Nainv qt sw c₂e₂ Sah Eth Cyr). LXX^B (and y) instead reads καὶ πονήρον ("and [it was] evil"). If Rahlfs-Hanhart is correct that καὶ ἦν πονήρον ("and it was evil") is the original reading in 8:6, then the parallel rendering between 18:8 and 8:6 is very close.

Saul explicitly, the change in subject needed to be marked from v. 7 to v. 8 and so it was necessary to introduce the name Saul in the Greek text where the MT has only a pronoun.

Saul's response to the song is one of displeasure. He says: "To David they gave ten thousands but to me they gave thousands." Two things are striking about this second half of the verse. First, Saul has reversed the order of the song. Where the women in v. 7 sang of Saul then David, Saul references David and then Saul. It seems likely that this reversal word order reflects what stood out most to Saul: the fact that more was attributed to David than to him. Second, the translators have done their work of interpretation in adjusting the word order of Saul's song. The Hebrew is partially chiastic:[23]

<div align="center">

נתנו

לדוד

ולי

נתנו

</div>

The Greek places τῷ Δαυείδ in the first position in the first clause. The effect is that the parallelism is ABC::A'B'C' as it was in v. 7,[24] and the name Δαυείδ is now the first element in Saul's repetition of the song, emphasizing all the more how the song has aggrandized David in Saul's mind. In these beginning stages of Israel's monarchy where military success is a major part of the expectation of kingship (8:20-21; cf. 2 Sam. 12:28), the rising military success of another could rightly be seen as a significant challenge to Saul's kingship.

The question of whether Saul is a good interpreter of this song or he is engaging with this song as a reader-response critic and creatively investing it with his own meaning may not be entirely answerable. On balance it appears that a reasonable case can be made that in using

---

[23] The chiasm is imperfect and follows the pattern ABC::B'A'C', with the C element (the number) occurring last in each line. However, the verb and indirect objects are arranged chiastically.

[24] That making perfect parallelism was important to the translator in this verse can be seen in the fact that the translator articulated both μυριάδας ("ten thousands") and χιλιάδας ("thousands"), where the Hebrew articulates אלפים ("thousands"), but leaves רבבות ("ten thousands") unarticulated. In the Hebrew of v. 7 both numbers were introduced with the preposition ב (though the *qere* suggests to read the preposition as articulated, בַ), and the translator translated them both as ἐν.

a fixed numerical idiom the song is presented as innocent, if naive, in intention.[25] However, the change in subject in the song from Saul to David suggests that the kind of reading Saul employs is acceptable and the song itself may be inviting the reader to make that very comparison.[26] Hertzberg suggests that Saul's response seems exaggerated, "but is nevertheless—within the context of all the Saul–David material—regarded as justified."[27] This seems to be the best reading of what is going on here. On the one hand, a generous reading of the women's song would suggest that Saul is succumbing to paranoia in his interpretation. On the other hand, the song at the very least leaves open the possibility for reading an intentionally damaging comparison of Saul to David and in the context of the story of Saul and David the reader knows that the rise of David over Saul is inevitable.

In the MT, Saul adds one more phrase in his analysis of this poem, "What more is there to him except the kingdom?" (ועוד לו אך המלוכה). Though numerous Greek manuscripts include an equivalent of this phrase: καὶ τί αὐτῷ πλὴν ἡ βασιλεία,[28] its absence in Ba Eth and N, suggests that OG did not have this reading. This phrase appears to be, as Wellhausen noted, an editorial comment making explicit what was already implicit.[29] However, this additional note, brings a key theme to the foreground, that may be otherwise missed.

Verse 9 is the final verse in this section and is a narratorial comment explaining Saul's attitude towards David as a result of this song: "And Saul was eyeing (καὶ ἦν Σαοὺλ ὑποβλεπόμενος) David from that day and onward." The verbal formulation καὶ ἦν plus ὑποβλεπόμενος is functioning periphrastically,[30] which suggests, along with the temporal

<hr>

[25] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 194-95; and Walter Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence and Theological Intentionality in 1 Samuel 18," *CBQ* 55 (1993): 229.

[26] See Alter, *David Story*, 112; Gordon, *Samuel*, 160; Edelman, *King Saul*, 138.

[27] Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 157.

[28] This reading is included in the primary Hexaplaric group: Acx Arm, the secondary Hexaplaric group dlpqtz, the Antiochene group: boc₂e₂, and the miscellaneous group: ghj.

[29] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111.

[30] The Hebrew phrase ויהי is frequently used as a paragraph marker and the standard LXX equivalent for this

reference to "that day and beyond," that this is a continuous state for Saul. The verb

ὑποβλέπω is used elsewhere in the LXX only in Sir. 37:10. There, as here, it appears to have

a negative connotation of "eyeing suspiciously," which is consistent with its usage elsewhere

in Greek literature (see *LSJ*).[31] The Hebrew term underlying this Greek word, עון, is the only

instance of this word in verbal form in the Hebrew Bible, though it is attested in later

Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac and Ugaritic (see *HALOT*). The obvious etymology and later

familiarity in Aramaic[32] likely made the sense of "seeing" obvious to the translator, while the

negative connotation in the context led him to the use of ὑποβλέπω.[33]

Following Saul's restatement of the women's song, we are left to infer as to the nature

of Saul's suspicion. David's popularity, especially regarding his military exploits, must be

worrying to Saul because of the nature of kingship at this point. After all, Saul was made king

by request of the people. Who is to say that at the request of the people another person may

not be made king? Furthermore, Samuel's words to Saul may now be lingering at the back of

his mind and it may be, as Robert Gordon suggests, that "Saul has discovered who his

'neighbour' (15:28) is."[34]

With the introduction to the concept of "seeing" or "looking suspiciously" in this

portion of the narrative we are introduced to a theme that will carry through the three sections

of this chapter—the theme of perspective. In the next sections David will be referred to as

being "before the face of. . ." different parties, and each will respond differently to David.

From Saul's perspective David is someone of whom to be suspicious. This is not the opinion

is καὶ plus a form of γίνομαι. In 1 Reigns it appears that the translator frequently used a form of καὶ plus εἰμί
when he understood this Hebrew construction to be used with the normal semantic value of the verb היה (e.g., 1
Rgns. 1:2; 2:17; 3:19; 6:1; 7:10, 14; 18:9, 14, 21; 19:7; 22:2; 23:26). For a detailed study of the use of
periphrastic tense in the Septuagint see Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 220-57.

[31] *BdA*, 312, is not certain of the exact nuance of ὑποβλέπω.

[32] See Jastrow, 1055.

[33] On the possible negative connotation of the verb in Hebrew see McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 312-13; Bodner, *1
Samuel*, 195.

[34] Gordon, *Samuel*, 160.

of the women who sing his praises and will not be the opinion for all interested parties in the episodes to follow.

3. The Love of All Israel and Judah (18:12-16)

The next section of this chapter begins in v. 12,[35] and gives further information about Saul's perception of David. In fact, this verse could be read as a conclusion of the previous episode in vv. 6-9 just as easily as it could be read as an opening to the present episode in vv. 12-16. However, the summative nature of v. 9 and the fact that the statement in v. 12 leads to the action of v. 13 encourages us to read v. 12 as an introduction to the following scene.[36] The point to note is that v. 12 suggests that the scene in vv. 6-9 is tied closely with the scene in vv. 12-16.

This narrative begins with the statement that "Saul was afraid from before David" (καὶ ἐφοβήθη Σαοὺλ ἀπὸ προσώπου Δαυείδ).[37] We have nothing to go on in the narrative as to why Saul went from "eyeing David suspiciously" in v. 9 to "fearing" him in v. 12, except the note in v. 9 that Saul's eyeing of David occurred "from that day onward," which suggests some passage of time. Thus, in the course of time Saul's disposition toward David goes from suspicion to outright fear. This fear leads Saul to his next course of action.[38]

---

[35] The MT includes the episode of vv. 10-11, which details the account of the "evil spirit from God" (רוח אלהים רעה) tormenting Saul and Saul's attempts to pin David to the wall. We will address this episode and the lack of it in the OG in the following chapter.

[36] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111-12, sees the three fearing verbs: ἐφοβήθη in v. 12, εὐλαβεῖτο in v. 15 and εὐλαβεῖσθαι in v. 29 as key structuring elements marking each of the three sections of this narrative. There is certainly something to this structure, but it is more clearly the case in vv. 15-16 and vv. 28-29, where in each case, the people's love is in parallel with Saul's fear. The threefold structure I am proposing allows each section to have an inciting incident, followed by Saul's reaction.

[37] The Hebrew מלפני ("from before") is regularly represented in the LXX with ἐκ/ἀπό πρόσωπου ("from the face," meaning "from before"). This is an example where the desire of the LXX to closely represent all the morphemes of a Hebrew word leads to understandable but non-idiomatic Greek (cf. *BDF* §217).

[38] The MT includes the explanatory gloss, "for Yhwh was with him but from with Saul he had turned aside" (כי־היה יהוה עמו ומעים שאול סר). Again we encounter a place in the narrative where a text which makes explicit that which is already implicit is present in the MT but absent in the OG. For the preference of the Greek reading see McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 311; Smith, *Samuel*, 170. It must be noted that if this clause is an insertion it is

Verse 13 notes Saul's first strategic action toward David: "And he turned him aside from him, and set him for himself as a commander of a thousand."[39] The first clause, that Saul set David aside (ἀφίστημι) from himself, likely refers to Saul removing David from his presence, or perhaps from direct involvement in his court.

The verb ἀφίστημι has been used significantly before.[40] In the narrative of David's coming to court in 16:14-23 the verb was used to frame the narrative and depict the movement of the spirits. In 16:14 the spirit of the Lord turned aside (ἀπέστη) from Saul and in 16:24 whenever David would play his lyre "the evil spirit would depart (ἀφίστατο) from him." The similarities between ch. 16, and 18:13, suggest that we should probe this parallel.[41] The spirit of the Lord comes upon David (16:13) and turns aside (ἀπέστη) from Saul in 16:14. This sets in motion a series of events that will bring David into Saul's presence. We presume that the spirit of the Lord accompanies David to Saul's court and Saul appears to enjoy the benefits of the spirit-filled David when the evil spirit comes upon the king (16:23). In 18:13, however, Saul turns aside (ἀπέστησεν) the very person who was mediating the positive aspect of the spirit of the Lord to him.[42]

---

masterfully done, because it creates a perfect chiasm with the first clause of the next verse and relates the departure of the Lord from Saul to the departure of David from Saul: A) ומעם (B שאול, C) סר :: C') ויסרהו (B' מעמו (A' שאול. Cf. Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 257.

[39] The MT mentions Saul explicitly here as the subject of the main verb. In the Greek this is unnecessary because Saul was the subject of the previous clause. The Hebrew of v. 12, however, included the explanatory statement about Yhwh being with David and so needed to reintroduce Saul here as subject.

[40] It is interesting to note that these two instances of ἀφίστημι in 16:14 and 23 both translate the Hebrew verb סור ("to turn aside"). In chapter 17 the Hebrew word סור is also used significantly but the translator of 1 Reigns consistently used ἀφαιρέω ("to remove") to render it (17:39, 46). This suggests 1) that the translator was willing to vary his lexical equivalence of a word for narrative purposes and 2) it appears that the usage of this concept in ch. 18 is more closely tied, in the translator's mind at least, to the usage of "turning away" from ch. 16, than in the idea of "removing" from ch. 17.

[41] Though it is interesting that the translator uses the second aorist form of ἀφίστημι in 16:14 (ἀπέστη) and the first aorist form in 18:13 (ἀπέστησεν). William D. Mounce, *The Morphology of Biblical Greek* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994), 101, notes that ἵστημι is the only μι verb that occurs in both a first and second aorist.

[42] Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 480.

In turning David aside in v. 13 Saul appoints him as a commander over a thousand. While this sounds like a lofty role, commentators frequently suggest that this was in fact a demotion.[43] He is removed from the royal court to be a battlefield commander, a position which comes with inherent risks.[44] It is of course not without narrative irony that Saul's move to stifle David's career has just the opposite effect.

There are two other ironic notes sounded in this phrase. The first is that Saul sets David up as a "commander of a thousand."[45] The number "a thousand" was the number attributed to Saul by the song of the dancers in v. 7. Saul complained that David was attributed tens of thousands, while he was attributed only thousands. By "attributing" to David a group of a thousand Saul may be putting him in his place.[46] The irony is that placing David over a "mere" thousand men will do nothing but increase David's military record such that even the enemy will know that "David has slain his ten thousands" (21:11[12MT]). Every step that Saul takes to hinder David's rise only succeeds in aiding it.[47]

The second irony is that Saul "set him *for himself* (ἑαυτῷ) as leader of a thousand." The Greek use of the dative form of ἑαυτός is translating the Hebrew לו ("to/for him").[48] Most major English translation translates the Hebrew וישמהו לו שר־אלף as "and he set him as a commander of a thousand" or something similar. Very few translations reflect both of the pronouns following שים.[49] Understandably, the phrase "set *for himself* captains over thousands" may be something like a biblical idiom (cf. 1 Sam. 8:11-12). However, the point

---

[43] E.g., Gordon, *Samuel*, 160; Firth, *Samuel*, 210.
[44] Smith, *Samuel*, 169; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 158; Edelman, *King Saul*, 139.
[45] The Greek χιλίαρχον is a one word rendering for the Hebrew phrase שר־אלף (ruler of a thousand). The Greek term is a technical title for a captain of a unit of a thousand troops (see *LSJ*, e.g., *Xen. Cyr.* 8.1.14) and is a standard rendering in the LXX.
[46] Cf. Auld, *Samuel*, 216.
[47] Cf. Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 231.
[48] The Greek frequently uses the dative case to translate the Hebrew pronoun ל.
[49] Two exceptions are the NASB and NKJV.

is likely that the captains are representatives of the king's authority, and derive their authority from the king who appointed them. The translator of 1 Reigns, with his tendency to represent every Hebrew word in his translation, has captured something most modern translations miss.[50] That is, while Saul placed David in this military position *for* himself, in reality he places David in this military position *instead of* himself, as we shall see presently.[51]

The result of David's appointment is given in the second half of v. 13: "he was going out and coming in before the people" (καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο καὶ εἰσεπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ λαοῦ). The description of David coming in and going out is meant to convey military leadership (cf. 1 Sam. 29:6; 2 Sam. 3:25; Num. 27:17; Josh. 14:11).[52] However, it is significant that it is part of the description of the people's understanding of what a king will do for them (1 Rgns. 8:20). Thus, when Saul places David over a military unit and David begins to go out and come in before the people in war, he is taking up one of the key functions of a king, which the people will later recognize (2 Rgns. 5:2).[53]

In describing this action the translator uses two imperfect verbs (ἐξεπορεύετο and εἰσεπορεύετο) to translate the two Hebrew *wayyiqtol* forms (ויצא and ויבא), though the use of the aorist is probably the "default" for these kinds of forms.[54] We have had cause to comment on the translator's use of Greek imperfects to translate Hebrew *wayyiqtol* verbs elsewhere.[55] The reason for the use of the imperfect in this case could well be the overwhelming

---

[50] It is interesting that many translations give an equivalent of the Hebrew לו ("for himself) in 1 Sam. 8:11-12, but leave it untranslated in 18:13 (e.g., NRSV, NJPS, ESV, NET).

[51] I am not making an argument for the correct translation of the Hebrew preposition ל, nor the use of the Greek dative case here. Rather, I am pointing out that a play on the preposition "for" in Hebrew or a play on the use of the dative case in Greek allows for a further ironic reading of the interplay between David and Saul.

[52] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 313; Gordon, *Samuel*, 160; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 480.

[53] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 197; Firth, *Samuel*, 210.

[54] James Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987), 384.

[55] See especially Appendix I.

preference for the imperfect form of the verbs ἐκπορεύομαι and εἰσπορεύομαι in the LXX.[56] While the lexical constraints of these verbs likely suggested the imperfect form to the translator it must be noted that an imperfect verb fits the context much better than an aorist. The context suggests repeated action on the part of David. He would habitually go out and come in before the people. Thus the imperfect is the contextually logical choice here as well.

Following immediately on the statement about David going out and coming in before Israel, v. 14a reads like the result of that activity. It states that "And David was wise in all his ways."[57] The Greek periphrastic construction καὶ ἦν . . . συνίων is a grammatically faithful rendering of the Hebrew periphrastic construction ויהי . . . משכיל.[58] The Hebrew verb שכל most frequently conveys something like "be wise" or "have understanding." In a number of contexts the verb appears to convey idiomatically something like "be successful."[59] The rationale behind this is presumably the idea that wisdom and understanding lead to success (cf. Prov. 16:20).[60] The Greek word most frequently used to render שכל in all of its contexts is συνίημι ("to understand, be wise or prudent;" see *LEH*; cf. *GELS*).[61] Though συνίημι is

---

[56] The verb ἐκπορεύομαι is used only once in the LXX in an aorist form and that is in the *kaige* text of Reigns (2 Rgns. 19:8), as opposed to the 33 uses in the imperfect. The verb εἰσπορεύομαι is used twice in the aorist (Deut. 1:8; Josh. 10:9) and 27 times in the imperfect. The verb πορεύομαι, without any compounded preposition, though most common in the aorist, is not uncommon in the imperfect, being used 84 times.

[57] The Greek phrase ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ ("*in* all his ways") seems more natural than the Hebrew phrase לכל־דרכו ("*for* all his ways"). The preposition ל seems odd in this context and many scholars take their lead from the LXX and emend it to ב (e.g., Klein, *1 Samuel*, 185). The preposition ל can mean "with respect to" (see *WHS*, §273a; Driver, *Samuel*, 152, notes this meaning of ל, but prefers to emend to ב). The Greek either had a *Vorlage* which read ב, or, like so many modern commentators, understood the text to *mean* ב even though ל was written.

[58] On this periphrastic construction in Hebrew see *Waltke–O'Connor*, §37.7.1c; *Joüon–Muraoka* §121g. We noted earlier that when 1 Samuel appears to use the verb היה periphrastically, 1 Reigns translates it with a form of εἰμί; see above n. 30.

[59] *HALOT* lists Deut. 29:8; Josh. 1:7, 8; 1 Sam 18:5, 14, 15; 1 Kgs. 2:3; 2 Kgs. 18:7; Isa. 52:13; Jer. 10:21; 20:11; 23:5; Prov. 17:8; as examples of this usage. This predominantly occurs in the hiphil, but 1 Sam. 18:30 appears to be one exception where this meaning is conveyed by a qal form of the verb.

[60] Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 343; Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 253.

[61] This meaning of συνίημι is itself an idiom or metaphor. It means most naturally "to bring with," but even by the time of the Homeric writings had come to have a metaphorical meaning of "perceive" or "understand" (e.g., *Od*. 4.76) and eventually "be wise" or "intelligent" (e.g., *Thgn.Eleg.* 904; and frequently in LXX and NT). See *MM* for examples of this meaning in early papyri.

semantically equivalent to most of the uses of שכל it does not have the same idiomatic meaning of "have success" unless it is argued that it takes on this meaning as a special septuagintal nuance.[62] In a military context a reference to David being "wise" or "prudent" is understandable, but contextually awkward. It would be surprising that the translator of 1 Reigns would not know this particular nuance of שכל given the prevalence of this usage, but it may be that the desire to consistently render שכל with συνίημι has led to this contextually awkward phraseology in the Greek.

A Greek reader, especially a Greek reader aware of Jewish wisdom tradition could easily extrapolate that to refer to someone as "wise in all his ways" would imply, especially in this military context, that they were successful. However, it is also possible that the translator's use of συνίημι here recalls the description of David as an ἀνὴρ συνετός ("man of wisdom") in 16:18.

Following immediately upon the statement of David's "wisdom" is the statement καὶ Κύριος μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ ("and the Lord was with him"). Is the Lord's presence with David the *cause* of his wisdom and success in all his ways? Or is this just a reminder of this fact? The flow of the narrative may seem to suggest that David's wisdom and success is linked to the fact of the Lord's presence with him, but the ambiguous paratactical style of the narrative leaves the reader to infer exactly how the Lord's presence with David impacts the narrative.

Following Saul's appointment of David over a unit of a thousand men, we saw the result was David's wise dealings and, we may extrapolate, his success. Now, in v. 15, we see Saul's perspective on this turn of events: "And Saul saw how he was very wise" (καὶ εἶδεν

---

[62] So H.S. Gehman, "Peregrinations in Septuagint Lexicography," in *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers* (ed. H.N. Bream, R.D., Heim and C.A. Moore; Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1974), 233-34. It is interesting that *LEH*, which in other places is willing to offer definitions that are unique to the Septuagint, does not list "have success" as a meaning of συνίημι.

Σαοὺλ ὡς αὐτὸς συνίει σφόδρα). The Hebrew phrase includes the rare use of an אשר

complement clause: וירא שאול אשר־הוא משכיל מאד ("and Saul saw *that* he was very

successful"). The use of אשר in a context where כי would be much more normal is

grammatically possible in Hebrew but rare, occurring only three times in 1 Samuel (15:20;

18:15; 24:19).[63] The translator of Reigns most often renders אשר with a Greek relative

pronoun. However, in 18:15 the translator of Reigns, recognizing the oddity of אשר in this

context, has translated it with the conjunction ὡς. In the few instances where the translator of

Reigns does use ὡς to render אשר, the decision to do so appears always to be context

dependent (e.g., 8:7; 15:2; 16:7; 18:15; 20:42).[64] The word ὡς could be understood in one of

two ways in this context. It could be used comparatively, thus *NETS* translates this phrase as

"Saoul saw *how* he [David] acted very prudently." Alternatively, ὡς could be understood to be

an equivalent to ὅτι and so may be communicating that "Saul saw *that* he was very wise."[65]

In this verse we see once again Saul's perspective on David. The narrator has

informed the reader that "David was wise in all his ways" (v. 14). Now, in v. 15 we are given

Saul's perspective on this reality: "and Saul saw how he was *very* (σφόδρα) wise." That David

is wise is the opinion of the narrator. That David is *very* wise is the opinion of Saul. Once

again Saul has a particular interpretation of the situation, from which we may infer he is

afraid that David's wisdom and success is exceeding his own.

---

[63] See Robert D. Holmstedt, "Headlessness and Extraposition: Another Look at the Syntax of אשר," *JNSL* 27/1 (2001): 5. See also Driver, *Samuel*, 153; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 313, and the grammars, *WHS*, §464; *Waltke–O'Connor*, §27.3b; *Joüon–Muraoka,* §§157a, c-ca, 158l-m. and *GKC*, §157c.

[64] For a study of the struggle in the Septuagint to render the Hebrew relative clause see Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "The Rendering of the Hebrew Relative Clause in the Greek Pentateuch," in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija Sollamo; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987), 55-61.

[65] See *LSJ*. See further Takamitsu Muraoka, "The Use of ὡς in the Greek Bible," *NovT* 7/1 (1964): esp. 60-63.

Having seen Saul's perspective on David's wisdom, we now see Saul's response: καὶ

εὐλαβεῖτο ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ. How one should understand the use of the verb εὐλαβέομαι in

this context is difficult. In its natural Greek context the word means something like "to be

discreet, cautious, beware" (LSJ). In this context it is being used to translate the Hebrew word

גור, which in this context means "fear" and may denote an even stronger fear than that

depicted by ירא.[66] Both NETS and BdA have translated this phrase with a connotation of fear:

NETS: "and he was afraid from before him," BdA: "et il le redoutait," while the German

phrase in LXX.D, "und nahm sich in Acht vor ihm," conveys the idea of "take care" or "be

careful" or perhaps "watch out for."

As we noted, the Greek word εὐλαβέομαι means something like "to be cautious" or

"beware." It is used in such contexts as Hannibal being careful and strategic about his next

engagement lest his soldiers become disheartened (Plb. 3.111.1) or even of soldiers being

cautious or timid before battle (Plb. 18.23.5). However, in the immediate context of 1 Reigns

18:15, the idea of fear is not far removed. Verse 15 states that Saul εὐλαβεῖτο ἀπὸ προώπου

αὐτοῦ but a few verses prior in v. 12 it was stated that ἐφοβήθη Σαουλ ἀπὸ προσώπου Δαυίδ.

The parallel nature of these two statements, just a few verses apart, may suggest that

εὐλαβέομαι may imply caution or wariness to the point of fear. However, if it is correct to see

the Hebrew word גור as an intensification of the fear of Saul expressed in v. 12, then the

Greek's choice of εὐλαβέομαι does not reflect that.[67]

---

[66] Driver, *Samuel*, 153; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 480. Though this is the minority usage of this root, most frequently it means "to sojourn," *HALOT* lists a number of passages that use גור in this way (e.g., Num. 22:3; Deut. 1:17; 18:22; 32:27; 1 Sam. 18:15; Job 19:29).

[67] Though G.D. Kilpatrick, "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament," in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G.D. Kilpatrick* (ed. J.K. Elliot; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), 27-28, notes that φοβέομαι begins to replace εὐλαβέομαι in Koine Greek, so it appears that the use of εὐλαβέομαι was seen as not far removed from φοβέομαι in Hellenistic times.

So what can we say about the translator's choice of εὐλαβέομαι to render גור and how do we interpret it in this context? First, the verb גור is rare, especially when it means "fear," and is used nowhere else in 1 Samuel, so the translator of 1 Reigns may not have known its exact meaning. Second, the context of v. 15 in parallel with v. 12 may have suggested some context of fear, but v. 9 also speaks of Saul "eying David suspiciously," so that concept was also available. On balance, I am inclined to interpret the translator's choice of εὐλαβέομαι to suggest that Saul was "wary" of David (with *LXX.D*), with the understanding that Saul's fear of David is also present in the narrative (v. 12).[68]

What this means for the narrative is that the Greek translation has moved away from a chronological intensification of Saul's fear from v. 12 to v. 15 as reflected in the Hebrew, and shifted our understanding of Saul's opinions of David towards the idea of caution or, perhaps, cautious plotting and strategizing. This is a fitting shift given the narrative of Saul's plotting against David that will follow.

In v. 15 we saw Saul's perception of David, now in v. 16 we see the perception of all Israel and all Judah: "And all Israel and Judah loved David." Though modern translations understand the reference to love in this context in an indicative sense, the Hebrew uses a qal participle (אֹהֵב) to convey the idea of loving. The translator has used an imperfect indicative form of ἀγαπάω to translate this verb,[69] which likely suggests that the people's "love" for David was a continuous state just as his leading the people was a continuous action.

As we had cause to point out in our study of chapter 16, the idea of "love" can suggest much more than just an emotion or feeling. It is frequently noted that the idea of "love" can have a political meaning, whereby to "love" someone is to declare loyalty to that person, so

---

[68] Cf. the use of εὐλαβέομαι in Deut. 2:4 to translate שמר in warning the Israelites to "watch out" for the Edomites.

[69] E.g., Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 284, counts 38 instances of this match pattern in LXX-Genesis.

that a vassal may be said to "love" their lord, which means they are declaring their loyalty to him.[70] However, in the context of ch. 16 we suggested that perhaps the concept of loyalty may be a helpful way to think about love in this context.[71] Thus, we suggest that the people's love of David likely comes from their opinions of and regard for David, but that love has political implications.[72]

The reason that all the people love David is given in a causal clause:[73] "*for* he was coming in and going out before the people."[74] The MT reads יוצא ובא ("he was going out and coming in"). LXX[B], however, reads εἰσεπορεύετο καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο ("he was coming in and going out"), reversing the order.[75] Why the change in word order? This could be a simple case of metathesis, and the translator (or a scribe) simply reversed the word order. However, reversing the word order creates a chiastic bookend to this narrative that details the results of David's appointment: A) ἐξεπορεύετο, B) εἰσεπορεύετο :: B') εἰσεπορεύετο, A') ἐξεπορεύετο. Thus vv. 14-16a, which tells of David's wisdom, the Lord's presence with him, Saul's wariness concerning David and the people's love for him is chiastically framed by David's going out and coming in and his coming in and going out. David's military success and

---

[70] See Moran, "Ancient Near Eastern Background," 77-87; Thompson, "The Significance of the Verb Love," 334-38; and McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 313.

[71] Here the study of Kim, *Identity and Loyalty*, and his exploration of *ḥesed*-relationships is helpful (see esp. pp. 31-60, though he also mentions the love of David on p. 12).

[72] A very interesting parallel to this is Jesus' statement in Matt. 6:24 and Luke 16:13, which states that "No one can serve (δουλέω) two masters; for a slave will either hate (μισέω) the one and love (ἀγαπάω) the other, or be devoted to the one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and wealth." In the context of money, it seems that "love" here is being used both in the sense of "desire" and in the sense of "serve."

[73] On the distinctive use of ὅτι in causal constructions see Aejmelaeus, "OTI *Causale*," 11-29.

[74] The MT reads לפניהם ("before *them*"), where the OG reads πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ λαοῦ ("before *the people*"). It seems quite possible that the Hebrew originally read לפני העם ("before *the people*"). Cf. *CATSS*; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 311.

[75] MSS py and the versions Sah and Eth follow the order in LXX[B], MSS Alqtv Na[b]js c₂e₂ Arm and Chrysostom follow the order of the MT and Rahlfs-Hanhart prints it in their text. Since the tendency of the Hexaplaric witnesses and the Antiochene witnesses is to correct back toward the MT, it seems likely that the reading of ἐξεπορεύετο καὶ εἰσεπορεύετο can be explained in this way.

perhaps his fulfilling the function of king (cf. 8:20) is emphasized as the reason for Saul's concern about David and the people's love of him.[76]

Saul's fear of David (v. 12) led him to appoint him as a military leader (v. 13). Ironically, this led to David's rise in popularity and to his, in some sense at least, fulfilling the function of king. From this point on Saul will become all the more wary (v. 15) of David as we will see in the next episode.

4. The Love of Michal (18:20-29)

We come now to the final episode in this chapter. It began with the response of the dancing women to David's victory (v. 6), which led to Saul "eyeing David suspiciously" (v. 9). Saul's fear of David led him to appoint him as a military leader, which led to the people loving him for leading them in battle (v. 16). Now we are told of another person who has a very high opinion of David, Saul's daughter Michal.

This episode begins in v. 20 with the statement that "Michal the daughter of Saul loved David."[77] The first oddity of this statement is simply Michal's name, Μελχόλ. The Hebrew names her מיכל. It is an oddity and perhaps reflects dittography on the part of the translator (מלכל?), but it is consistent in the Septuagint.[78] The fact that is most notable is that Michal loved (ἠγάπησεν) David. The narrative has taken us from the whole nation's love of David (v. 16) to a single, albeit significant, person's love of David.

---

[76] Cf. Vermeylen, *Loi du plus fort*, 105.

[77] The MT includes the material in vv. 17-19 of Saul's offer of his eldest daughter Merab to David. We will address this material in the following chapter.

[78] See 1 Rgns. 14:49; 18:20, 27; 19:11-13, 17; 25:44; 2 Rgns. 3:13-14; 6:16, 20-21, 23; 1 Chrn. 15:29. The only exception comes from the *kaige* portion of 2 Reigns, and spells Michal μιχολ (2 Rgns. 21:8). I use the familiar English form of her name, Michal, in contradistinction from *NETS* which chooses to transliterate the Greek forms of names and spells her name Melchol.

There are a number of narratively significant factors about Michal's love of David. First, it is unique. Michal is the only woman in the narrative portions of either the Hebrew Bible or the Septuagint to be said to love a man.[79] Second, as we have noted, the love of David has become a significant theme. Saul loved David (16:21), all Israel and Judah loves him (18:16) and now Michal loves him (18:20).[80] Finally, and perhaps most significantly, we are never told whether Michal's love for David was reciprocated. The character of David in 1 Samuel (either the Greek or Hebrew text) is consistently left open to the reader as a matter of interpretation. Though we are frequently given the thoughts of other characters (especially Saul), David's thoughts and feelings are left hidden from us. The reader is left to infer David's character by his actions and speech.[81]

The fact of Michal's love for David now stated, the narrative relates how this reality was disclosed to Saul: "And Saul was told" (καὶ ἀπηγγέλη Σαούλ). This translation is a good rendering of the Hebrew, though it is not precisely grammatically accurate. The Hebrew reads ויגדו לשאול ("and they told Saul"). The verb ויגדו is a hiphil *wayyiqtol*, which has an active voice. However, in Hebrew a third person verb with no stated subject can be used to convey a passive voice.[82] It appears that the translators read the Hebrew in this way, perhaps suggested by the ל before Saul and translated the verb as an aorist passive. Having translated the verb as a passive, Saul was then made the subject of the verb rather than the object as in the Hebrew.[83]

---

[79] Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 148. See also Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 198; and Firth, *Samuel*, 211. However, note Song 1:7; 3:1-4. Adele Berlin, "Characterization in Biblical Narrative: David's Wives," *JSOT* 23 (1982): 70, regards this as one of Michal's "unfeminine" traits.

[80] Completing this theme even more is the narrative found in the MT plus at 18:1-6, where Saul's son Jonathan is said to love David.

[81] The recognition of this strategy for presenting David in this narrative was convincingly set forth in Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 143-58, but numerous literary scholars of this material have picked up on it since.

[82] See *WHS*, §160; *GKC*, §144b-i.

[83] Though numerous MSS correct this syntax toward the Hebrew adding τῷ before Σαούλ, marking it to be read as a dative (c z Nahjnvb₂ ems bc₂e₂).

This reference to Saul being told the news about Michal, with no reference to the agents doing the telling introduces a key feature in the following narrative: the feature of indirect discourse. The following narrative will be characterized by indirect discourse, either grammatically speaking, or narratively speaking as characters give messages through other characters.

The second part of v. 20 tells Saul's reaction to this news: "and it was straight in his eyes" (καὶ ηὐθύνθη ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ).[84] The Hebrew idiom of something being "straight in their eyes" (וישר בעיניו) means that the thing is pleasing to the person in question, i.e., it seems good to them. The translator of Reigns has rendered this phrase faithfully both in terms of grammar and semantics. However, in Greek, to say something is "straight in one's eyes" does not carry the same idiomatic sense as in the Hebrew. The translator has thus chosen to render the Hebrew idiom in terms of grammar and semantics instead of sense.[85] It is not a stretch to infer "rightness" from "straightness" in the Greek, since the term even in Classical Greek (without the influence of the Septuagint) could mean something like "govern" (e.g., *Soph.Ant.* 178) or "examine the conduct of" (e.g., *Plat.Stat.* 299a).[86] However, this particular turn of phrase would not have been familiar to a Greek reader (though perhaps to a *Jewish* Greek reader) and would have to be inferred from context. This is a different practice than that of the translators of the Pentateuch who generally translated this idiom with the adjective ἀρέστος ("pleasing"), thus translating according to the sense of the phrase rather than the grammar and lexical semantics (e.g., Ex. 15:26; Num. 23:27; Deut. 6:18).

[84] The Greek does not include an equivalent for the Hebrew הדבר ("the matter"). This is entirely logical since Greek terms typically used to translate דבר, λόγος and ῥῆμα, do not have the meaning of "the thing" or "the matter" as does the Hebrew דבר. Thus, in this instance, when "the matter" is clear, it makes sense for the Greek not to include an explicit reference to "the matter." Though most occasions of this Hebrew idiom can be understood if it is translated "word," there are occasions where this would not make sense (e.g., 1 Sam. 12:16), and the translator of Reigns is occasionally content to translate these instances with ῥῆμα.

[85] Cf. Joosten, "Translating the Untranslatable," 63.

[86] The logic of this extrapolation is likely what led to *NETS* rendering this phrase as "it was right in his eyes."

This phrase also sounds another key theme—the theme of perspective. In the previous two episodes we saw that a key aspect of the narrative was the disparate perspectives on David between Saul and the dancing women (vv. 6-9), and between Saul and the rest of Israel and Judah (vv. 12-16). Now the drama centers around Michal's perspective on David, i.e., her love for him. The narrative will turn on the different perspectives on this love. Both Saul and David will view this as "right in their eyes," but for different reasons.

In v. 20 we were told that Michal's love for David was acceptable to him, in v. 21 we are given an internal monologue of Saul and told why: "And Saul said [to himself], 'I will give (Δώσω) her to him, and she will be (ἔσται) a snare to him.'" The first verb (δώσω) translates a Hebrew *yiqtol* form (אתננה) and is correctly recognized as having a future sense. The second verb (ἔσται) translates a Hebrew verb that consonantally could be a *wayyiqtol*, but is pointed as a waw + *yiqtol* jussive form in the MT (וּתְהִי). The translator has inferred from context that this is not a *wayyiqtol* form, and recognized it as having a future sense, "she *will be* a snare[87] to him."[88]

This is the first time that we have seen explicit antagonism between Saul and David.[89] The narrative has been hinting that things are moving in that direction and it is possible to view Saul's placement of David to military leadership as one which would be dangerous, but we are not told explicitly that this was his intention. However, now in v. 21 we are given a window into Saul's thoughts which shows that his intentions are to ensnare David somehow.

---

[87] Though both מוקש and σκάνδαλον are often used in the Old Testament in a metaphorical sense to suggest moral entrapment, they both convey the basic idea of some sort of "trap" or "snare." On מוקש see *HALOT*. On σκάνδαλον see *LEH* and *GELS*.

[88] The Hebrew is a jussive form and one may expect a Greek optative or subjunctive. However, a future indicative is not an uncommon form used by the translators to translate a Hebrew jussive (e.g., 1 Rgns. 7:3; 10:8; 18:21; 20:13; 28:22). Cf. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 121-22.

[89] Though this is not the case in the MT, which has already told of Saul attempting to spear David (18:10-12).

The irony of Saul's intentions for Michal is that she will prove to be more of a snare for Saul than she will be for David (ch. 19).[90]

In v. 21b, the narrative leaves Saul's thought world and gives the narratorial comment that "the hand of the Foreigners was against Saul." The previous use of the Hebrew ותהי, was understood by the translator of Reigns as a waw + *yiqtol* form and rendered as a Greek future. Here, however, the same consonantal form is understood as a *wayyiqtol* and rendered as a Greek imperfect (ἦν). Consonantally, the Hebrew is ambiguous. The phrase ותהי־בו יד־פלשתים could be read as "and the hand of the Philistines *was against* him," in which case the antecedent of the pronoun would be Saul, or it could be read as "and *let* the hand of the Philistines *be* against him," in which case we are still in the thought world of Saul and the antecedent of the pronoun would be David. The masoretes have pointed the text to be read as the former, and the translator of Reigns has understood the text to mean the latter.[91]

Commentators frequently assume that the line of thought as presented in the MT from Michal's love to Philistine antagonism toward David is logical, and that Saul plans to offer Michal to David in order that the hand of the Philistines will be against him.[92] This is only possible in the longer MT version of the story, where the reader knows about the first offer of Merab to David, and Saul's request that he should "be for me a mighty son and fight the battles of Yhwh." The reason that Saul tells David to fight the battles of Yhwh is so that Saul will not have to harm David himself, but that the "hand of the Philistines will be against him" (ותהי־בו יד־פלשתים). This is the exact same phrase found in v. 21, and helps the reader

---

[90] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 199.
[91] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316, notes the ambiguity of the Hebrew. Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111, describes this as a clear example of the translator making explicit what was ambiguous.
[92] E.g., Klein, *1 Samuel*, 189; Firth, *Samuel*, 211.

understand how Saul can make the connection between Michal's love for David and the Philistine antagonism toward David.[93]

However, since this portion of the story is absent from the OG version, the explicit connection between Michal's love and the antagonism of the Foreigners is lacking. This is possibly what led the translator of Reigns to interpret the grammatically ambiguous Hebrew phrase: ותהי־בו יד־פלשתים as καὶ ἦν ἐπὶ Σαουλ χεὶρ ἀλλοφύλων. In this way the phrase reads as a narrative aside. This is logical as well, because this extra piece of narrative information gives a reason for why Saul would ask for one hundred foreskins as a bride-price in v. 25. The translator is then offering a sensible reading of the text given the context of the short version of the story.[94]

Having decided on a course of action, Saul initiates that action in v. 22[95] by ordering his servants: "And Saul commanded his servants" (καὶ ἐνετείλατο Σαοὺλ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ).[96] The content of what Saul commanded his servants is introduced by the participle λέγων, which has no underlying לאמר in the MT.[97] It may be that the OG's *Vorlage* had לאמר here, but it could also be that the translator, recognizing that the direct speech of the servants (as

---

[93] Cf. Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 259.

[94] *BdA*, 314, suggests that the presence of the narratorial comment in v. 25b allowed for the transformation of v. 21b by the translator. It seems more likely that the translator is struggling to make sense of the narrative logic of v. 21, without the preceding narrative in v. 17. Rather than being an example of, "the narrator said it there so he must have said it here," it is an example of the translator making good sense of the narrative he is translating.

[95] 1 Samuel 18:21b contains the statement that "Saul said to David a second time become my son-in-law today." This is clearly part of the large MT plus, because it is dependent upon the content of the large MT plus in 18:17-19.

[96] While the verb ἐντέλλω ("to command") does occasionally occur in the active form in Classical Greek, it occurs most often in the middle form and is treated as a deponent (*LSJ*). It occurs exclusively in the middle form in the LXX and is the standard equivalent of צוה (cf. *LEH*). With very few exceptions (e.g., Gen. 45:19) it takes the dative as its object. For the particular use of ἐντέλλω in the Greek Pentateuch see A. Pelletier, "L'autorité divine d'après le Pentateque grec," *VT* 32/2 (1982): 236-42.

[97] On this typical Hebrew phrasing introducing direct speech see C.L. Miller, "Introducing Direct Discourse in Biblical Hebrew Narrative," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. R.D. Bergen; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 199-241. Though this use of the participle in Greek appears to depend heavily on the frequency of this kind of phrase in the Septuagint, similar occurrences do occur in Classical Greek, for example, Herodotus (e.g., *Hdt.* 1.11.4; 1.88.2; 2.172.5; cf. *BDF* §420).

represented within Saul's direct speech) is introduced with לאמר, thought the introduction to

Saul's direct speech needed the same introduction and so introduced λέγων at this point.

Saul tells his servants what he wants them to do: "You speak secretly to David."[98] The

presence of the second person pronoun ὑμεῖς is not necessary following the imperative verb

and has no equivalent in the Hebrew. If we assume an average line count as suggested by

4QSamᵃ and that either the translator's *Vorlage* contained or the translator read his *Vorlage* as

ואתה ("and you") in place of the MT's ועתה ("and now") in v. 22b, then it is likely that ועתה

or ואתה would have been the immediately following word in the next line down, and could

easily have crept into its current location, especially since the previous word ended with a

waw (דברו).[99]

Saul tells his servants to speak to David secretly (λάθρᾳ).[100] Robert Alter suggests that

this does not mean that Saul's servants are to speak to David "in secret" but that they are to

speak to him in such a way that they hide their master's true intentions.[101] While possible, it

seems unlikely that the narrative means to imply that the servants know Saul's intentions. It

seems more likely that the servants are to speak to David without David learning that the

servants are acting on Saul's behalf.[102]

What the servants are to speak is given in direct speech, signaled by λέγοντες:[103]

---

[98] The different word order between the MT: דברו אל־דוד בלט and the OG: Λαλήσατε ὑμεῖς λάθρᾳ τῷ Δαυειδ is puzzling. Perhaps the translator, in rendering the Hebrew prepositional phrase (בלט) with an adverb (λάθρᾳ), thought the adverb should occur closer to the verb. However, this is not the only example of seemingly arbitrary alteration in word order in this passage.

[99] On the line counts in 4QSamᵃ see *DJD* 17, 16-17.

[100] The adverb λάθρᾳ ("secretly") is used twice in 1 Reigns. Each time it translates the Hebrew prepositional phrase בלט ("in secret," 1 Rgns. 18:22; 26:5) Cf. 1 Rgns. 24:5 which translates בלט with λαθραίως. This is different than the rest of the LXX which uses λάθρᾳ to translate סתר ("secret"). The Hebrew word לט is used only two other places in the Hebrew Bible to mean "secretly" (Judg. 4:21; Ruth 3:7) and in each of those cases LXXᴮ uses κρυφῇ ("secretly") to translate it.

[101] Alter, *David Story*, 116.

[102] So Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 259.

[103] Unlike the previous occurrence of a participial form of λέγω, there is an underlying לאמר in the MT.

"Behold the king desires you" (Ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς θέλει ἐν σοί).[104] The Hebrew phrase ב- חפץ

("delights in") is common enough, but quite variously translated.[105] There are only two certain

instances in the OG portions of 1-4 Reigns where this Hebrew phrase is translated. In both of

these the translator uses a form of θέλω + ἐν (1 Rgns. 18:22; 3Rgns. 10:9).[106] The decision to

render חפץ as θέλω and to include the standard equivalent for the preposition ב (ἐν) has led to

an odd Greek formulation θέλει ἐν σοί ("desires in you"). We may have expected a more

natural Greek expression such as ἥδομαι + dative (e.g., Rom. 7:22; *Xen.Eq.* 10.4), but this

seems not to have been the preference of the OG translators of 1-4 Reigns, perhaps because

the Hebrew word חפץ does overlap with θέλω in its sense of "desire" but also to "to will" or

"feel inclined to" (*HALOT*).[107]

   In this message to David, Saul's desire for David is given in parallel with the love of

Saul's servants for David: "and all his servants love you" (καὶ πάντες οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ

ἀγαπῶσίν σε).[108] It is difficult to know whether this statement is part of the intended

subterfuge or if David really did enjoy some level of popularity among Saul's court. If these

servants are high-ranking officials of Saul or perhaps his "inner-circle" then this could be part

---

[104] Note that the translator has rendered the Hebrew *qatal* form with a present indicative. It is often pointed out that in direct speech the *qatal* form is the standard form for past tense action in Biblical Hebrew. See e.g., Alviero Niccacci, "Analysis of Biblical Narrative," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (ed. Robert D. Bergen, SIL: 1994), 176-77. In his analysis of the translators handling of Hebrew verb forms in Chronicles, Roger Blythe Good, "The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles" (Ph.D. diss.; University of California Los Angeles, 2003), 243-48, notes that the aorist is by far the most common tense to translate a Hebrew *qatal* in discourse and that the few instances where a present tense is used are mostly translated the specific construction כה־אמר. Here, however, the translator has contextually rendered this Hebrew construction with a present tense verb, which makes good sense.

[105] E.g., Gen. 34:19, ἐνέκειτο γὰρ τῇ θυγατρί ("for he was involved with the daughter"); Deut. 21:14, ἐὰν μὴ θέλῃς αὐτήν ("if you do not want her"); Jer. 6:10, οὐ μὴ βουληθῶσιν αὐτό ("they will not want it").

[106] The phrase also occurs in MT 1 Sam. 19:1, but this text is part of a minus in LXX[B], LXX[L] translates the occurrence in 19:1 as ἡρεῖτο τὸν Δαυιδ ("he chose David"). *NETS* suggests a translation of "he was taken with David." *Rahlfs-Hanhart* considered LXX[L] to have the original reading and included it in their text.

[107] *LEH* does list "take delight in" as a meaning for θέλω citing the present text as an example, but this is likely a case of reading a Hebrew meaning into the Greek word; though cf. the nuance of *GELS*, "to be favourably disposed towards." Cf. Alvaro López Pego, "Evolucíon del significado de θέλημα, 'voluntad', del Antiquo Testamento al Nuevo Testamento," *EstBib* (2000): 325-26.

[108] Note again that the Hebrew *qatal* form is translated with a Greek present tense.

of the subterfuge to give David the impression he has more friends at court than he really

does.[109] However, in light of the rest of the narrative it seems most likely that David really

does enjoy a large amount of popularity, even in Saul's court.

That Saul's servants love David allows for yet another instance of someone "loving"

David. This has become something of a *Leitmotiv* in David's life.[110] Whether true or not,

David's popularity is such that it is at least conceivable that even Saul's servants love him.

In the context of Saul's speech to David through his servants, David's extreme

popularity is meant to suggest that the next logical step would be to marry Saul's daughter:

"and as for you, become son-in-law to the king" (καὶ σὺ ἐπιγάμβρευσον τῷ βασιλεῖ).[111] The

MT reads "and now become son-in-law to the king" (ועתה התחתן במלך). As noted above, it

appears that the translator of Reigns has read ועתה ("and now"), either by a different *Vorlage*

or accident, as ואתה ("and you").[112] The phonetic similarity between these two readings,

together with the fact that the phrase ועתה seems more natural in the flow of the argument

makes this likely an accidental transformation by a scribe or translator.[113]

The use of the Hebrew prepositional phrase במלך after חתן, though seemingly odd,

appears to be a standard way of referring to someone being son-in-law to someone else,

perhaps because of its meaning of "make a marriage contract with" (see Deut. 7:3; Josh.

---

[109] So McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 317. Firth, *Samuel*, 211, points out that the servants dutiful compliance with Saul's subterfuge, suggests that "they at least did not love David."

[110] Cf. Brueggemann, "Narrative and Coherence," 239.

[111] The Greek verb ἐπιγαμβρεύω ("become son-in-law to") appears to be a septuagintal neologism of ἐπί plus a verbalization of γαμβρός ("son-in-law" or "connection by marriage"). See *LEH*. It is used almost exclusively to translate the Hebrew verb חתן.

[112] Cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316. *BdA*, 315, notes that the reverse happens in 28:2.

[113] On this kind of variant in the LXX see Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 137.

23:12; 1 Sam. 18:21-23, 26-27).[114] The Greek use of the dative case captures the sense of the Hebrew prepositional phrase without the use of a preposition.[115]

Verse 23 continues the pattern of indirect discourse in this narrative and states only that "the servants of Saul spoke these words into the ears of David." This will be the practice for the remainder of this narrative. Saul and David will engage in an indirect dialogue through intermediaries and rather than giving voice to the intermediaries' actual discussions with Saul or David, the narrative will simply say that they spoke "these words" (τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, vv. 23, 24, 26). The effect of this narrative strategy is that only the voices of Saul and David are heard by the reader, but only the voices of the servants are heard by David and Saul. Saul and David never speak directly to each other, but they are the only ones that speak directly. Thus, the two main players of this narrative are simultaneously linked and distanced at the same time.[116]

David's response is reported to us in direct speech. He says, "Is it light in your eyes to become son-in-law to the king?" (Κοῦφον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ὑμῶν ἐπιγαμβρεῦσαι βασιλεῖ;).[117] Though it doesn't appear to fit his categories exactly, this statement, with the statement that follows appears to be a fairly typical use of what Coats calls "self-abasement" formulas found throughout the Old Testament,[118] though the use of this formula may be a way of expressing humble thanks.[119]

---

[114] Smith, *Samuel*, 174, suggests that the prepositional phrase shows the real force of this statement to be "ally yourself by marriage with the king."

[115] See Robert Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta: Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax* Κοινή (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928), 251-52.

[116] See further the analysis of Green, *How Are the Mighty Fallen*, 304-11.

[117] B^ab z boc₂e₂ Ol and Chrys read εἰ κοῦφον ἐν ὀφλαλμοις, and *Rahlfs-Hanhart* prints this in their main text.

[118] George W. Coats, "Self-Abasement and Insult Formulas," *JBL* 89/1 (1970): 14-26, esp. 18. Though Coats does not deal with our passage he does deal with the parallel of this passage in 18:18. See also Stansell, "Honor and Shame," 57-59; and Green, *How Are the Mighty Fallen,* 306-07.

[119] Edward J. Bridge, "Self-Abasement as an Expression of Thanks in the Hebrew Bible," *Bib* 92/2 (2011): 255-73.

The verb קלל was used in the piel in 17:43 to describe Goliath's cursing of David. There the translator of Reigns rendered it with a good cursing word, καταράομαι ("to bring down curses"). In 18:23, however, the verb קלל is used in the nifal form which carries with it the sense of "to be insignificant or trivial" (see *HALOT*). The translator of Reigns, apparently understood the nuances of this verb, or at least understood its use in context and translated it with κοῦφος, meaning "light, nimble, swift," which in this case is clearly overlapping with קלל in the sense of "light" or "lightly esteemed."[120]

With the use of the phrase "in your eyes," David is essentially asking for the servants' perspective on this issue. On the one hand, this leads the reader to wonder about the perspective of Saul's servants. They function as go-betweens in this narrative, but we do not know where they stand. On the other hand, this reference, in the self-abasement formula that it occurs in, implies that to become son-in-law to the king is not something lightly esteemed in David's eyes. Thus, in an indirect way the reader is given some insight into David's perspective on the issue.[121]

David continues his self-deprecating speech with the belittling phrase: "And I, a humble man and not honored." David describes himself as a "humble man" (ἀνὴρ ταπεινός), by which he means a lowly person. This is a slightly different meaning from רוש, which signifies economic poverty (see *HALOT*). The LXX generally translates this Hebrew word with πενής or πτωχός, both of which signify economic poverty (see *LEH, GELS*, s.v., "πτωχός").[122] In the MT, the main issue is David's economic status, which means he cannot afford to marry Saul's daughter because he cannot come up with a worthy bride-price. In the

---

[120] *GELS* offers the translation "of little consequence" for this usage. Cf. *LEH*.

[121] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 199-200, suggests that David may be posturing before Saul's servants, but in the narrative thus far (at least in the Greek version) we have no reason to suspect such motives from David.

[122] Cf. *BdA*, 315. There is no other certain place where ταπεινός or ταπεινόω are used to translate רוש, though note the textually uncertain renderings in Prov. 10:4; 13:7; and Isa. 58:4.

OG, the main issue is David's social status which means he cannot marry Saul's daughter because he is not of the proper social standing. We may perhaps surmise that a scribe was uncomfortable with the idea that David is economically poor, and translated with a term that on the one hand can mean lowly, but on the other hand can also mean humble as a positive quality in contrast with the proud or arrogant (see Prov. 3:34; 11:2; 16:2).[123] Thus, this may be an intentional shift by the translator to mitigate a possible negative view of David and portray him in a more positive light.[124]

David also describes himself as someone who is "not honored" (οὐχὶ ἔνδοξος). With this description we have a clear case where the translator has transformed his text in order to refrain from saying something unseemly about David. In the MT David refers to himself as "dishonored" (ונקלה). Though this term (קלה) can simply mean the opposite of "honored" (כבד, cf. Isa. 3:5), and appears to have this meaning here,[125] it is a by-form of the word קלל which frequently has the much stronger meaning "to curse" (see *HALOT*). The translator of Reigns appears to have been bothered by the possibility that a reader would see David as "cursed" and so opted to translate קלה in this instance as "not honored," (οὐχὶ ἔνδοξος). While this strategy mitigates the problem of referring to David as קלל, it does miss out on the wordplay that is present in the Hebrew. In the Hebrew David rhetorically asks the servants, "Is it light (נקלה) in your eyes to become son-in-law to the king?" and then goes on to describe himself as "of no repute" (נקלה). Thus, his argument is that it is no insignificant

---

[123] Cf. Ragnar Leivestad, "Ταπεινος - Ταπεινοφρων," *NovT* 8/1 (1966): 42-43. Though Leivestad notes that it is likely that the Hebrew meaning is coming to the fore in these texts from Proverbs rather than the inherent Greek meaning. However, in the context of these parallels, one need not know the underlying Hebrew to know that to be "lowly" in contrast to "proud" or "arrogant" is a positive quality.

[124] Cf. *BdA*, 315.

[125] So Driver, *Samuel*, 154; and Smith, *Samuel*, 174.

thing to become the king's son-in-law and he cannot do it because he is an insignificant person. In the Greek, though the basic meaning is retained, the wordplay is lost.[126]

In verse 24 the servants of Saul report back to him about David's response to Saul's proposal. The conversation between Saul and David continues to be indirect dialogue through the medium of the servants. Again, the narrative presents the servants' words indirectly rather than allowing the reader to hear their actual repetition of David's speech. The Hebrew gives the servants direct speech but portrays their repetition of David's speech indirectly, thus, "the servants of Saul declared to him, saying, 'according to these words David spoke.'" The OG, on the other hand, gives the servants only indirect speech, thus, "the servants of Saul declared to him according to these words which David spoke."[127] The Hebrew direct speech marker לאמר is not represented in the OG. Fokkelman notes that it is interesting that the narrator gives the servants direct speech,[128] and it appears the translator of Reigns found this odd as well and opted to portray the speech of the servants indirectly. This is actually in keeping with the way the narrative has portrayed the speech of the servants throughout this narrative.

Saul's response to this new development is given in verse 25 with another direct speech of Saul directed at David through his servants: "And Saul said, thus you shall say to David." The indirect dialogue between David and Saul continues.

The content of what the servants are to say to David is given in two parallel phrases. First, Saul says, "the king does not desire in a gift."[129] The previous reference to Saul's desire

___

[126] If *GELS* is correct in offering a translation for κοῦφος as "of little consequence," then that would have been an excellent choice in the present phrase to maintain the wordplay and still retain the sense of the passage.

[127] Note that the Greek has also added the relative pronoun ἅ ("*which* David spoke"). This seems motivated by the shift in the Greek to indirect speech.

[128] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 239.

[129] In the MT the king is the indirect object of "desire": אין־חפץ למלך ("there is no desire *to the king*"). In the Greek, the king is the subject: Οὐ βούλεται ὁ βασιλεὺς ("the king does not desire"). This is likely owing to the fact that there is no perfect Greek equivalent for the Hebrew negative particle אין. The translator of 1 Reigns most frequently uses οὐ followed by a form of εἰμί to render this Hebrew particle (e.g., 1 Rgns. 1:2; 2:2; 3:1; 9:2, 4, 7; 10:14, and frequently). Here, however, it has led the translator to make "the king" the subject of the verb, which makes good sense in the context.

(Heb. חפץ) was in his indirect speech to David, and was translated by θέλω. Here, however, the word βούλομαι is used. Perhaps the different verbs reflects a desire to differentiate between the untrue desire (for David) and the true desire (for David to attempt to claim one hundred foreskins), but such suggestions must be made with due caution.[130]

What Saul does not desire is a gift (δόμα). This generic term for gift is used to translate the rare Hebrew word מהר, often understood as meaning something like "bride-money" (*HALOT*).[131] This is a rare word in the Hebrew Bible,[132] and the exact social function of this "bride-price" is not precisely understood. For our purposes it will suffice that it functioned as some sort of expected dowry that a would-be husband paid to the father of his prospective bride.[133] The translator may not have known the precise meaning of מהר, and thus used a more generic and less precise word for gift that would likely be easily understood by the reader in this context.[134]

The phrase expressing what Saul does not desire is followed by a contrastive phrase expressing what he does desire. This phrase begins with the contrastive ἀλλ' ἤ, which generally has the sense of "but rather" or often "except" when it is preceded by a negative.[135] It is most frequently used in the LXX to translate כי אם. Indeed, many commentators suggest this as the translator's *Vorlage* and the likely original reading.[136] However, it is sometimes

---

[130] J.A.L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983), 144, notes that the word βούλομαι is the standard word for desire in the Pentateuch but slowly gives way to θέλω so that by the time of the NT it is the usual word.

[131] Auld, *Samuel*, 222, notes that the Antiochene tradition uses the appropriate technical term for bride-price, ἔδνον.

[132] It is used nominally with this meaning in Gen. 34:12; Exod. 22:16; 1 Sam. 18:25, and verbally in Exod. 22:15 and perhaps Ps. 16:4 (see *HALOT*).

[133] See further Driver, *Samuel*, 154; Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions* (Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1997), 26-29; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 317; Christopher J.H. Wright, *God's People in God's Land: Family, Land and Property in the Old Testament* (Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1990), 191-94; Tsumura, *Samuel,* 486.

[134] Cf. *BdA*, 315.

[135] Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, §108. Cf. *BDF* §448(8).

[136] E.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 185. Numerous Hebrew MSS have this reading.

used to translate a simple כי (e.g., Gen. 45:8; Exod. 16:8; Deut. 4:26; and frequently in 1 Sam. 8:7; 10:19; 12:12; 17:45; 18:25; etc.). In Aejmelaeus' classification of the uses of כי, the category of "introducing a positive alternative after a negative statement ('but rather')" would be well captured by the Greek ἀλλ' ἤ.[137]

The content of this contrastive statement is in parallel with what it is contrasting. It is an elliptical phrase and requires the main verb of the previous clause to complete the thought. Thus Saul does not desire a gift, but rather he desires "in one hundred foreskins of Foreigners." Though modern readers may not see the humor in this grotesque request, readers familiar with the Old Testament are used to this sort of cross humor at the expense of enemy nations. One thinks of Ehud's humiliating assassination of Eglon (Judg. 3:12-30), or of the disastrous effect the ark of the covenant has upon the conquering Philistines (1 Rgns. 5:1-6:18). While the main point of this desire is to collect war trophies, akin to collecting scalps,[138] the element of humor should not be lost. Saul in one sense is asking David to bring one hundred Foreigners into the covenant community, though of course this action is predicated on the deaths of these one hundred Foreigners, but therein lies the dark humor.[139]

Another element of the negative rhetoric against the Foreigners is the very word used to translate "foreskins" (ערלות). The word the translators use is ἀκροβυστία. This appears to be a septuagintal neologism, consisting of a play on the normal Greek word for foreskin, ἀκροποσθία (see *LSJ*) and the Hebrew word for "shame," בשת (thus ἀκρο + בשת = ἀκροβυστία).[140]

---

[137] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Function and Interpretation of כי in Biblical Hebrew," *JBL* 105/2 (1986): 200-01.

[138] E.g., Alter, *David Story*, 116-17. Cyrus H. Gordon and Gary A. Rendsburg, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1997), 187, n. 6, note the parallel that "the circumcised Egyptians counted their slain foes by heads or hands, except in the case of the uncircumcised Libyans, whose phalli were often amputated for counting."

[139] Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 260, notes that this incident shows the contempt of the Israelites for the Philistines.

[140] See *LEH* and Marguerite Harl, *La Genèse* (BdA 1; Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994), 170. This strategy is consistent throughout the whole of the LXX. This kind of phenomenon where one must know the word play

The reason that Saul desires one hundred foreskins is "in order to avenge on the enemies of the king" (ἐκδικῆσαι εἰς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ βασιλέως). The infinitive ἐκδικῆσαι appears to have a causal sense here.[141] The use of the preposition εἰς in this instance seems to be odd. The expected rendering of the Hebrew phrase להנקם ב־ would be ἐκδικῆσαι ἐπί–.[142] The preposition εἰς can be used to express "the object or destination of a thing" and so the idea that vengeance "unto" his enemies may be meant.[143] Furthermore, using εἰς in this clause makes the phrase "unto his enemies" grammatically parallel to "into the hands of the Foreigners."

In the Hebrew version of this story the reason for Saul's desire for vengeance upon the Foreigners/Philistines must be read from the regular antagonism between Saul and the Foreigners/Philistines (e.g., chs. 13-14; 17). In the Greek version there has been a specific narrative aside drawing attention to the fact that the hand of the Foreigners was against Saul (v. 21). The reader has had extra preparation for this request from Saul in the Greek.

That Saul desires one hundred foreskins of the Foreigners "in order to avenge on the enemies of the king" can be ironically interpreted. On the one hand, the basic meaning of this statement is that Saul desires vengeance upon his enemies, the Foreigners, because their hand is continually against him (v. 21). On the other hand, the reader knows that the "enemy of the king" is really David. This reading is clarified by the next statement.

---

between the Greek word (ἀκροποσθία) and the Hebrew word (בשת), is an example of evidence that the Septuagint likely always had readers who were aware of both the Greek and Hebrew. For an explanation based solely on Greek wordplay see Angelo Tosato, "Sulle origini del termine ἀκροβυστία (prepuzio, incirconcisione)," *BeO* 24 (1982): 43-49.

[141] It is not atypical for the translator of Reigns to render a Hebrew ל + Infinitive Construct with a simple infinitive.

[142] See Helbing, *Die Kasussyntax der Verba*, 37-38. The verb ἐκδικέω most frequently takes a prepositional phrase with ἐπί as its object or a simple accusative. Though Sir. 39:30 includes similar wording to the present usage: καὶ ῥομφαία ἐκδικοῦσα εἰς ὄλεθρον ἀσεβεῖς ("and a sword taking vengeance on ungodly ones for destruction").

[143] Cf. Conybeare and Stock, *Septuagint Greek*, §90f. This is the case in both classical usage and the Septuagint, though its prevalence in the Septuagint is owing to the use of εἰς to translate ל.

In the final part of v. 25 the narrator gives us insight into Saul's thoughts and motivations: "and Saul thought to cast him into the hands of the Foreigners."[144] Once again, Saul's thoughts and intentions are made clear.[145] By suggesting that David pay his "bride-price" by military victories Saul is attempting to get David killed without having to do it himself. Readers familiar with the whole narrative of the David story will see in this act an interesting foreshadowing of the David and Uriah episode, as David will employ the same strategy to rid himself of a problematic member of his court. David, however, will have more success with his plot than does Saul, though with tragic results.[146]

In v. 26, having received this message from Saul, his servants turn and speak these words to David. Again, the actual dialogue of the servants is reported indirectly so that the only speakers continue to be Saul and David: "and the servants of Saul spoke these words to David."[147] The previous two verbs depicting the servants' speeches to Saul and David have been in the aorist tense (vv. 23, 24). Now, the Hebrew *wayyiqtol* (ויגדו) is translated with the present tense verb, ἀπαγγέλουσιν. In the present narrative it is probable that this should be understood as an historic present. There is no obvious reason from the source text why the translator would have chosen to use a present tense here. In all of the exchanges between Saul and David via the servants the speaking words have been aorist verbs (v. 22: ἐνετείλατο; v. 23: ἐλάλησαν, εἶπεν; v. 24: ἀπήγγειλαν; v. 25: εἶπεν). Now, the final instance of indirect speaking is given with an historic present. It seems likely that this switch in verb forms is meant to signal the end of this indirect dialogue.[148]

---

[144] The MT explicitly names David and puts his name after the infinitive, where the Greek uses the pronoun αὐτός and places it between the indicative verb and the infinitive (ἐλογίσατο αὐτὸν ἐμβαλεῖν).

[145] Alter, *David Story*, 117. Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 148, suggests that this transparency "might even be intended to imply a transparency in Saul's efforts as a Machiavellian schemer: he is a simple character, inclined to clumsy lunges rather than deft thrusts, and perhaps for that reason not *political* enough to retain the throne."

[146] Cf. Firth, *Samuel*, 207.

[147] The MT simply uses a pronoun to refer to Saul, where the OG names Saul explicitly.

[148] This is commensurate with the use of the historic present in Classical and Koine Greek as well as other septuagintal usage. See Sicking and Stork, "So-Called Historical Present," 131-68; Anssi Voitila, *Present et*

The narrator tells us David's response to this news: "and the word was right in David's eyes to become son-in-law to the king." This is the second time that something has been said to be "right in [someone's] eyes." In 18:20, Michal's love for David was right in Saul's eyes. Now, Saul's proposal for David to fulfill the bride-price with the foreskins of the king's enemies is said to be right in David's eyes.[149] This is the first narratorial insight into David's thoughts and motivations. David is often seen as an opportunistic character here because, 1) the link between Saul's perception of Michal's love for David is linked with David's perception of Saul's proposal, creating a negative association and 2) the phrase that follows notes that David approved of the plan to "become son-in-law to the king" not of the plan "to marry Michal," emphasizing what David saw as the important aspect of this transaction.[150]

This reference to David's estimation of Saul's plan does allow for the interpreter to infer at least some level of political aspiration in David's thoughts, though the narrative would insist that these aspirations are divinely inspired (16:13). However, the problem in the narrative was never whether or not it was a good thing to marry Michal. The problem was whether or not David was worthy to marry someone of Michal's social standing. The solution Saul offered was a way for David to become worthy of marrying someone of Michal's social standing by setting a bride-price that was achievable by the young and successful warrior. Thus, what is "right in David's eyes" is the becoming son-in-law to the king is now achievable.[151] So, while the text may allow us to see in David some sort of political aspirations, too much should not be read into this, for David's reaction is merely following the logic of the narrative. That David's perception of the situation is important can be seen by

---

imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuch grec: Une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001), 91-106; S.M.B. Wilmshurst, "The Historic Present in Matthew's Gospel: A Survey and Analysis Focused on Matthew 13.44," *JSNT* 25/3 (2003): 269-87; and Mavis M. Leung, "The Narrative Function and Verbal Aspect of the Historic Present in the Fourth Gospel," *JETS* 51/4 (2008): 703-20.

[149] Cf. Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 235.

[150] See Edelman, *King Saul,* 142; Bodner, *Samuel*, 200.

[151] Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 487.

the fact that this is the third reference in this episode to someone's viewpoint by use of the phrase "in the eyes of x" (ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς x; 18:20, 23, 26).

In the OG, the narrative then goes on to tell of David arising and acquiring his bloody bride-pice. In the MT, however, there is a short plus that gives an extra piece of narrative detail: ולא מלאו הימים ("and the days were not filled").[152] This will be discussed further below.

The reader now knows that Saul's proposal is acceptable to David. Verse 27 then details David's actions in light of this proposal. David is portrayed as a man of action, who, after approving the proposal, is now the subject of five successive verbs: καὶ ἀνέστη . . . καὶ ἐπορεύθη . . . καὶ ἐπάταξεν . . . καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν . . . καὶ ἐπιγαμβρεύεται. In Hebrew this is a chain of *wayyiqtol* verbs. In Greek it is a series of aorist indicative verbs ended by an historic present. This is likely another instance of the translator's narrative sensitivity. The motivation for the use of the historic present here could be as a structural device to highlight that becoming the king's son-in-law is the most important and culminating aspect of this series of actions and the last act of which David is the subject.

This series of actions begins with David arising and going out, "he and his men" (αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ). The parenthetical comment that it was David and his men that went out is a subtle narrative reminder that David is now a leader of a thousand men, a position that Saul put him in (v. 13). It is Saul's action, then, that has put David in a place to carry out the king's request.

---

[152] *CATSS* marks this as a short minus in LXX, and thus not part of the larger LXX minus in this chapter. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 233, however, has argued that ולא מלאו הימים ("and the days were not fulfilled") should be read as ולא מלא היום ("and the day was not fulfilled"). The rationale for this is that there is no expectation of a time period for this request in the text except for the possibility of reading the MT plus in v. 21 as a time frame set for the request: "and Saul said to David a second time 'you shall become my son-in-law *today* (היום)." Thus, with Ehrlich's proposed emendation in v. 26 to ולא מלא היום there is a consistent expectation that these events happen on the same day. If Ehrlich is correct, then the short MT plus in v. 26 is actually related to the larger MT plus in ch. 18. Though Ehrlich's reading is logically consistent, it seems more likely that the MT plus in v. 26 is related to the MT plus in v. 27 rather than the MT plus in v. 21, as we will argue below.

Thus, David and his men went out "and struck among the Foreigners one hundred men." In the MT David and his men go out and strike two hundred men, doubling the request of Saul. If the reading "two hundred" (מאתים) was original, it is possible that a scribe or translator accidentally read "one hundred" (מאה), because that is what was expected from v. 25. If the variation is intentional it is difficult to say which version did the altering because each version has a logic to its numbers.

In the Greek there is a consistent reference of the number of foreskins expected and attained. There is a clear request–fulfillment structure. Saul requests one hundred foreskins (18:25) and receives one hundred foreskins (18:27). When this fact is referred to later in the narrative the number is again one hundred (2 Rgns. 3:14). This tradition is consistent. In the MT David delivers twice the number of foreskins requested. Saul requests one hundred foreskins (18:25) but receives two hundred foreskins (18:27)! This reading makes David an overachiever going above and beyond the requested bride price and fits with the MT plus in v. 26 which includes the comment that David fulfilled the request in less than the required time (ולא מלאו הימים).

It is possible that a scribe increased the number from one hundred to two hundred in order to exaggerate David's feat.[153] However, it is also possible that the OG has harmonized this text so that it remains consistent.[154] The text-critical decision here is difficult, but the narrative effect of each reading, as noted above, suggests that each can be meaningfully read in their context.

---

[153] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111; Driver, *Samuel*, 154; Smith, *Samuel*, 174; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316; and Klein, *1 Samuel*, 190. Wellhausen further notes that the reading of 100 better fits the following phrase וימלאום למלך (which he reads with LXX[AL], Aq and Vulg as וימלאם).

[154] So Tsumura, *Samuel*, 487; Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 235-36; and Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 161-62. On the discrepancy between the number two hundred here and one hundred in 2 Sam. 3:14, Tsumura remarks that the "point there [2 Sam. 3:14], though, may be that he had fulfilled Saul's conditions, and so Michal was legally married to him, and the fact that he had paid more was beside the point."

Having gone out and slain one hundred Foreigners, David then brings the foreskins to Saul. The narration of this part of the action exists in some textual complexity as can be seen in the following table (adjustments marked by underlining).

Table 11: 18:27

ויבא	דוד	את־ערלתיהם	וימלאום	למלך	<u>להתחתן</u>	במלך
καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν	--	τὰς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτῶν	--	τῷ βασιλεῖ	<u>καὶ ἐπιγαμβρεύεται</u>	τῷ βασιλεῖ

The use of the proper name, David, is not necessary because he is the understood subject of all of the verbs in this sequence of action. It is likely that the name was introduced here in order to signal that it was David who brought the foreskins to Saul, not David *and his men*.

The next major difference between the MT and OG is the concept of fulfillment, which is present in the MT (וימלאום) but absent in the OG.[155] The relationship between these two witnesses is textually complex. The OG is a fairly straightforward and simple sentence, "and he brought their foreskins to the king, and he became son-in-law to the king." The MT is much more complicated, "and David brought their foreskins, and they fulfilled to the king to become son-in-law to the king." The MT includes the plural verb וימלאום ("and they fulfilled"), which either must be emended to וימלאם ("and he fulfilled"),[156] or have David *and his men* as the understood subject.[157] However, as Wellhausen noted, it would be quite odd for David *and his men* to the subject of the fulfilling while only David is the subject of the infinitive, "becoming the son-in-law" (להתחתן).[158]

---

[155] This MT plus is attested by the Antiochene tradition (boc₂[sub ※]e₂) and multiple manuscripts of the hexaplaric family (Acx lpqtz Arm).

[156] So Driver, *Samuel*, 154; Smith, *Samuel*, 174.

[157] So Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 159; Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 346; Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 260.

This is the second MT plus involving the word מלא in as many verses. Though numerous scholars treat these two variants separately, viewing the MT plus in v. 26 as an interpolation and the MT plus in v. 27 as original,[159] for several reasons it seems more likely that these two variants are related. First, both of these variants involve the verb מלא in plural form. Second, both of the plus readings fit somewhat awkwardly in their context. The plus in v. 26 has no antecedent and thus no reason for it to be in the text.[160] The plus in v. 27 is grammatically odd in its plural form, is not necessary in its context (the sentence reads smoothly without it), and as McCarter noted, there is no real parallel for the use of מלא in such a phrase as this.[161] Third, the most logical way to read these two uses of מלא is as a wordplay on each other. Thus, the point of these two verses would be, "though the days were *not fulfilled*. . . . David *fulfilled* to the king."

It seems most plausible that these two variant readings may have originated as a marginal note.[162] A scribe then has worked the note into the text in both v. 26 and v. 27 in such a way that they play off of each other. While they work very well together, they both fit awkwardly in their immediate contexts, suggesting they were not original.

If our view of the origin of the two MT pluses in vv. 26-27 is correct then it is likely that the OG's use of ἐπιγαμβρεύεται reflects a *Vorlage* that read ויתחתן (cf. 1 Kgs. 3:1).[163] As we noted above, the use of the present tense here suggests that this is the most important element in the story and finishes the series of actions of David.

---

[158] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111. Though this would be grammatically odd, the context would surely make it understandable.

[159] So Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111; Driver, *Samuel*, 154; Smith, *Samuel*, 174; Stoebe, *Samuelis,* 346. Though Tsumura, *Samuel,* 487, argues for the originality of both MT pluses.

[160] Cf. Gordon, *Samuel*, 347.

[161] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316.

[162] Cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316. *BdA*, 315-16, attributes the plus in the MT and LXX[AL] to an allusion to the Jacob and Laban story.

[163] So McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316.

The result of this series of action is given in the final clause of v. 27, "And he gave Michal his daughter to him, [to be] for him unto a wife." The MT explicitly lists Saul as the subject of the verb, which is not absolutely necessary given the reference to "his daughter Michal," but aids the reading of this sentence.[164] The translator's use of a present tense verb to render the Hebrew *wayyiqtol* form (ויתן) is likely to connect this verbal action to the final action in the previous clause: "and he became son-in-law . . . and he gave Michal to him." The additional preposition (αὐτῷ), not represented in the MT, is likely due to the fact that the translator understood there to be an implied verb in the last clause, thus something like [εἶναι] αὐτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα.[165]

With Saul giving Michal to David the transaction is now complete. Saul's plot has been foiled by David's success. This episode has been about the tension and indirect dialogue between Saul and David, but the instigation for this episode was Michal's love for David, which now reaches its conclusion with their marriage.

From the beginning of this chapter the story has been about perspective, specifically about various characters' perspectives about David. The story ends with Saul's perspective. Verse 28 begins the conclusion of this narrative with Saul's view: "And Saul saw that the Lord was with David." The MT describes this perception with two verbs: וירא . . וידע ("and he saw . . . and he knew"). The OG describes this perception with one verb: καὶ εἶδεν ("and he saw"). The connection between "seeing" and "knowing" is one that is brought out in many places in the Hebrew Bible (cf. Isa. 6:9; 41:20; 44:9). In this instance, the use of both

---

[164] Cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 316-17.

[165] The Hebrew preposition ל is used here not in a locative sense but in a purpose sense Saul is giving David his daughter "for a wife" (cf. *WHS*, §277). The Greek would have been more natural if the translator had simply put γύνη in the dative case, but since it had added αὐτῷ it presumably needed to distinguish the function of the pronoun in the sentence. The preposition εἰς can carry something similar to the connotation of the usage of ל in this context, i.e., Saul is giving his daughter 'for' or 'with reference to' a wife (cf. *BDAG*).

concepts in the MT allows the narrative to emphasize that Saul has not just "observed" that the Lord is with David, he has "perceived" and "understood" that the Lord is with David.

The Greek text has only a verb of seeing and not a verb of knowing, though in this context knowing is certainly implied. Many scholars prefer the OG reading and see the MT's two verbs as superfluous.[166] Syntactically, it may be said that the OG reading is smoother, with only one verb and one object clause (introduced by ὅτι). However, this actually seems to suggest that the reading of the MT is likely original and the reading of Reigns is a later syntactical simplification. It seems likely that the translator may have been syntactically offended by using ὁράω without an object and so simplified the sentence for syntactical purposes. While the meaning is retained the Greek text has lost a little bit of the emphasis of the Hebrew's use of both "seeing" and "knowing."[167]

The significance of this first part of v. 28 is in Saul's acknowledgment, to himself at least, that the Lord is with David. The reader has seen this in the spirit of the Lord rushing upon him (16:13); in David's claim to Goliath that he comes in the name of the Lord (17:45); and in that the very phrase, "the Lord was with him," is used by the suspiciously knowledgeable servant of Saul (16:18), and by the narrator himself (18:14).[168] Now in 18:28, the reader sees that Saul knows this to be true. This is the tragic irony of Saul. All of his subsequent acts against David can now be read in light of his full realization that the Lord is with David.[169]

The fact that the Lord is with David is not all that Saul sees. He sees that "all Israel loved him."[170] This statement is different from the MT which reads "and Michal the daughter

---

[166] Smith, *Samuel*, 175; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 320; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 159.

[167] Cf. Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 346.

[168] In the MT there is also the additional use of this phrase in 18:12.

[169] Cf. Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 237.

[170] It is possible to read this as a separate clause and not connected to what Saul saw. However, the fact that this clause begins with the subject πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ and is connected to the previous clause with καὶ it is most likely

of Saul loved him." It is possible that the MT's ומיכל בת־שאול reflects a corruption of וכי
כל־ישראל.[171] However, the fact that each reading seems a very logical and intentional
conclusion, albeit with different emphases, to the narrative suggests that this may be the
result of intentional scribal adjustment.[172]

On the one hand, the MT's note that Michal loves David makes an inclusio for the
final episode of this chapter vv. 20-29. Saul now realizes that David has people who love him
within his own family.[173] On the other hand, the reading of the OG that "all Israel loved
David" connects this episode with the previous half of ch. 18 and makes v. 28 the conclusion
of the whole chapter.[174] Thus, both readings illuminate the narrative in a different way, and it
is extremely difficult to offer any argument for the priority of one reading over the other.[175]
So we will refrain from speaking of originality in this instance and instead note that the
Greek text ties together the whole of this chapter under a theme of the love of David and
gives license to the title of the present chapter of this study.

The final concluding comment in this narrative is Saul's reaction to his realization that
the Lord is with David and that all Israel loves him. The narrator notes, "And he continued to
be suspicious from David still[176]" (καὶ προσέθετο εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ Δαυεὶδ ἔτι).[177] We have

_____

that it is to be understood as the second part of the ὅτι clause and is part of what Saul saw.

[171] Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111; Driver, *Samuel*, 155; Smith, *Samuel*, 175. Auld, *Samuel*, 222, notes the
similarity between these two readings.

[172] Barthélemy, *Critique*, 193, argues that each reading is intentional and each independent literary tradition
should be respected in this instance.

[173] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 201. Gordon, *Samuel*, 162; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates,* 243; and Firth, *Samuel*, 206,
also appear to prefer this reading.

[174] Cf. *BdA*, 316.

[175] Cf. Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 234.

[176] The Greek ἔτι is used almost exclusively to translate the Hebrew עוד. In many circumstances this is an
excellent match. However, in the current context, where the Hebrew עוד is meant to convey something like
"even more," the Greek word ἔτι does not carry that nuance, hence our translation of "still." Here is a case where
lexical consistency in the translation is making for a slightly odd formulation in Greek.

[177] The use of an indicative form of προστίθημι plus an infinitive is a standard way for the LXX translators
to render the Hebrew idiom denoting repetition with יסף (e.g., Gen. 4:12; 18:29; 1 Rgns. 3:8; 9:8; and
frequently). See H.S. Gehmen, "Hebraisms of the Old Greek Version of Genesis," *VT* 3/1 (1953): 144-45; Harl,
Genèse, 78.

previously encountered the word εὐλαβέομαι in v. 15. There it was used to translate the

Hebrew גור ("be afraid"). We suggested that the translator may not have known the term but

understood from context that Saul was becoming suspicious of David and perhaps beginning

to plot against him. Here the word εὐλαβέομαι is used to translate the more common word for

fear, ירא, which was translated with φοβέομαι in v. 12.[178] Thus, there appears to be a

consistent intuition on the part of the translator that where the Hebrew narrative sees Saul's

fear of David, the Greek narrative sees his "watching out" for or "being suspicious" of

David.[179] This is consistent with the narrative that follows, for as much as Saul is depicted as

fearing David, he will much more be depicted as being suspicious of David and plotting

against him (cf. 19:1, 11).

The use of εὐλαβέομαι in this instance also helps bring the whole of the narrative of

ch. 18 together. We have noted that there are three separate episodes in this chapter: 1) David

as viewed by the dancing women (vv. 6-9); 2) David as viewed by all Israel and Judah (vv.

12-16); and 3) David as viewed by Michal (vv. 20-29). However, we noted that v. 12

functions as both the conclusion to the section in vv. 6-9 as well as the introduction to the

section of vv. 12-16, thus tying the two episodes closely together. There is a sense then, in

which vv. 15-16 could be seen as concluding the whole of the first half of ch. 18.[180] With the

use of εὐλαβέομαι in v. 29 the translator has further tied together the conclusion in vv. 15-16

with the conclusion in vv. 28-29 chiastically:[181]

---

[178] It is possible that the odd infinitive form לרא confused the translator (perhaps seeing it as a form of ראה?). The only occurrences of εὐλαβέομαι in 1 Reigns are in 18:16 and 18:29. Thus, whether the translator was confused at the form of לרא or not, he has understood the context of the story he is telling and made a good contextual rendering. On the odd form of לרא see Driver, *Samuel*, 155; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 321; and *GKC* §69n.

[179] Heinrich, *David und Klio*, 233-34, sees the progression from v. 12 (καὶ ἐφοβήθη) to v. 15 (καὶ εὐλαβεῖτο) to v. 29 (καὶ προσέθετο εὐλαβεῖσθαι) as the impetus for this translation decision.

[180] Cf. Wellhausen, *Samuelis*, 111-12.

[181] In the Hebrew this structure is not quite as clear since it uses גור in v. 15 and ירא in v. 29. If the use of εὐλαβέομαι in v. 29 is an intentional translational decision with this structure in mind then it is seems likely that

A. v. 15 καὶ εὐλαβεῖτο ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
   B. v. 16 καὶ πᾶς Ισραηλ καὶ Ιουδας ἠγάπα τὸν Δαυιδ
   B'. v. 28 καὶ πᾶς Ισραηλ ἠγάπα αὐτόν
A'. v. 29 καὶ προσέθετο εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ Δαυιδ ἔτι

The two conclusions are thus tied together by Saul's suspicions of David and all Israel's love for him.[182]

5. Conclusion

We have now come to the end of the text under investigation. With the conclusion in ch. 18, the story is now set for the rest of the antagonism between Saul and David and David's inevitable rise to the throne in the rest of 1 Reigns. For our purposes, all that remains is to survey the key themes of ch. 18 and the special emphases of the Greek version before turning to read the shorter Greek version against the longer Hebrew version in the next chapter.

5.1. Themes of 1 Reigns 18

Walter Brueggemann suggests that the narrative of 1 Samuel 18 offers three judgments about David: 1) David is loved, 2) David is successful, and 3) the Lord is with David.[183] Each of these themes work their way through the three episodes of this chapter and are a good starting point for our discussion of the key themes of ch. 18.

David is loved. That David is loved can be seen in the popularity that is displayed by the song of the dancing women in v. 7. In the rest of the chapter he is loved by all Israel and

_____

the translator may also be responsible for changing the reading in v. 28 from "Michal loved him" to "all Israel loved him."

[182] The MT includes a final statement that "Saul was an enemy of David all his days" and a further note about David's success (vv. 29b-30). This is frequently understood to be a long minus (e.g. *CATSS*). However, this is not the only place we have encountered a plus in the MT that makes explicit what was implicit in the OG version of the narrative. We will address this minus in the next chapter.

[183] Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 240.

Judah as a result of his leading them in battle (v. 16) and by Saul's daughter Michal (v. 20), and the chapter concludes with the reminder that all Israel loved David (v. 28).

David is successful. The first episode contains the praise of David for his success in battle (18:6-9). The second episode details Saul's demotion of David to a military leader which only leads to him having more success in battle leading Israel's armies (18:12-16). In the final episode Saul tries to get David killed by enticing him to attempt to hunt down one hundred Foreigners (18:20-29). David, however, is successful yet again and fulfills the bloody request.

The Lord is with David. This theme carries over from the previous chapters. In the present narrative David's success (or success resulting from wisdom - see below) is linked to the fact that the Lord is with him (v. 14). Whether his success is a result of the Lord's presence with him or not, the two factors are narrated together and we are likely meant to consider them together. The final conclusion of the narrative portrays Saul coming to the conclusion that the Lord is with David (v. 28). This realization strikes an ominous note for Saul.

There is another theme related to David that comes out in this narrative—David is unknown. Numerous scholars have noted that the narrative in ch. 18 is unusually open about character's internal perspectives, especially in regards to Saul and Michal.[184] By contrast, David's character is revealed solely through his words and actions, with the single exception of the comment that Saul's plan for David to marry Michal was "right in his eyes" (v. 26). This revelation aside, David's character remains largely veiled.[185]

We have mentioned the theme of the love of David, but there is the corollary of that theme, which is Saul's perspective on David. Saul's perspective is characterized by paranoia,

[184] E.g., Alter, *Biblical Narrative*, 147; Polzin, *Samuel*, 176.
[185] Polzin, *Samuel*, 178, 181.

plotting and fear. The chapter opens with the song of the women, which Saul interprets negatively when a positive interpretation was open to him. We then see Saul "eyeing David suspiciously" (v. 9) and this perspective on David will continue throughout the narrative as Saul "fears" David (v. 12) and "watches him suspiciously" (v. 16), only to continue to "watch him suspiciously still" (v. 29). Saul's perspective on David is one of suspicion, but also plotting. In v. 13 Saul demotes David, likely in order to curb his potential influence at court, but possibly also to put him in harm's way. The narrative is silent on Saul's motives at this point, but is explicit as to his motives in his next scheme. He sets a bride-price of one hundred Foreigners' foreskins in order to cast him into the hands of the Foreigners (v. 25). But Saul's plotting turns to naught, as each new plot leads not to David's demise but to his rise.

A final thematic element of this chapter is the way in which the narrative is told. This is by way of narratorial insight into characters' thoughts and indirect discourse between the characters. In this short chapter the reader is given nine different insights into Saul's thought (vv. 8, 9, 12, 15, 20, 21, 25, 28, and 29), one insight into Michal's thought (v. 20) and one insight into David's thought (v. 26). The reader is thus given unprecedented insight into the thoughts and motivations of the characters, especially Saul. By contrast, none of the main characters in this chapter speak to each other and they are thus kept in the dark about each other's thoughts and motivations. While the reader is given insight into the various characters' perspectives, each character is kept at arms length from understanding the other characters by way of indirect dialogue. This technique allows the narrative to powerfully portray a scene of plots and intrigue which will characterize the rest of the David–Saul story.

214

5.2. Special Emphases of the Greek Text

There are numerous differences between the MT and OG, most of them small adjustments, that are likely unrelated to the major versional difference between the MT and OG that still give the OG version a different nuance.

The first subtle but significant variation in the Greek text is the reference to the foreskins (ערלת) David is to collect as ἀκροβυστίαι, a word that is a play on the normal Greek word for foreskin (ἀκροποσθία) and the Hebrew word for shame, בשת. Like the reference to the Philistines as the Foreigners (ἀλλοφύλοι), depicting them as the quintessential others, the use of the word ἀκροβυστία shows the same kind of denigration of the Philistines, but now attaches the negative connotation of shame to a part of their identity (i.e., their uncircumcised status).

The Greek text appears to emphasize David's wisdom. In 16:18, we noted that the translators rendered the title איש חיל ("man of might") with ἀνὴρ συνετός ("man of wisdom"). In the present chapter we noted that David's "success" (שׂכל) is translated as "prudence" or "wisdom" (συνίημι). On the one hand, this is attributable to the use of συνίημι to translate שׂכל because of its semantic overlap as a term for "wisdom." On the other hand, this use of שׂכל meaning "success" is not conveyed with συνίημι and so the use of this word matches the reference to David as an ἀνὴρ συνετός, and emphasizes his wisdom.

Another slight shift in the portrayal of David is his self-deferential comments in v. 23. In the MT David says that he is "a poor man and dishonored" (איש־רש ונקלה). In the OG, instead of being economically poor, David is "humble" (ταπεινός), which can refer to low social standing or to humility as a positive quality in contrast to pride. Instead of being

215

dishonored, with a word that can even mean cursed, he is "not honored" (οὐχὶ ἔνδοξος). The Greek has thus softened David's self-deprecating comments.

Just as there is a slight shift in the portrayal of David in this chapter, so there is a slight shift in the portrayal of Saul. In the MT Saul "eyes" David (עוין: v. 9), perhaps suspiciously and he "fears" him (ירא: v. 12; גור: v. 15) and continues to "fear" him (ירא: v. 29). In the OG Saul "looks suspiciously" at David (ὑποβλέπω: v. 9), he "fears" him (φοβέομαι: v. 12) and he "watches out" for him (εὐλαβέομαι: v. 15), and continues to "watch out" for him (εὐλαβέομαι: v. 29). The first two references to Saul's view of David are fairly similar in the MT and Greek (עוין // ὑποβλέπω; ירא // φοβέομαι), but the second two are different. The idea of Saul's fear of David is translated to Saul's watching out for David. Both concepts are present in both texts, but the translator's use of εὐλαβέομαι gives further emphasis to the attitude of Saul toward David that will characterize the rest of their relationship, one of suspicion and plotting.

There are also a number of differences between the OG and MT which can be loosely labelled "subtle narrative minuses." By this I mean that there are a number of instances where the MT contains an additional reading that either makes explicit something that was already implicit in the narrative or adds an extra bit of information that slightly nuances the narrative. It is very difficult to discern whether these are related to the large MT plus or whether they are independent. First, in v. 8, after lamenting about the song of the women and its exaltation of David, Saul laments "what more is there to him except the kingdom?" This idea is implied by the narrative, but the additional comment in MT makes it explicit. Second, there is the comment in v. 12 that "the Lord was with him, but had turned aside from with Saul." This comment merely reinforces what the reader already knows. Third, there are the two

216

comments regarding David "not filling" the days and "filling" the requirement to Saul (vv. 26, 27). These additions add extra information, one of which further nuances the story, the other is simply making explicit what the reader knows—that David's handing over the foreskins to Saul fulfills his requirement to become his son-in-law. Fourth, the final comment in v. 29 is that "Saul was an enemy to David all his days." This comment acts as a conclusion to this narrative and also summarizes what the reader will learn in the rest of the David-Saul story. All of these MT pluses nuance the story and make some of its themes a little more explicit. Without them, the OG version is a slightly more subtle story forcing the reader to work out some of these implications on their own.

A final area of emphasis in the Greek text is related to its narrative sensitivity. For example, we frequently noted that the translator varied his use of verbal tense not because of the forms of the verbs from his source text, but because of his own narrative sensitivity to the story he was telling. In v. 7 the translator used two imperfect verbs to describe the women beginning to sing their song of praise. The use of the imperfect to translate the Hebrew *wayyiqtol* verbs likely implied the continuous nature of these actions. In v. 13 the translator used two imperfect verbs to depict David "coming in" and "going out" before the people, again conveying continuous or habitual action, even though the verbs in Hebrew were simple *wayyiqtol* forms. In v. 26 the translator used an historic present to render a Hebrew *wayyiqtol* in his translation of the indirect dialogue between Saul and David after previously using aorist verbs to translate Hebrew *wayyiqtol* forms. This variation signaled the end of the dialogue. Finally, in v. 27 David is the subject of a series of actions depicted with aorist verbs only to end with an historic present verb depicting him becoming son-in-law to Saul, signaling the end or result of a series of actions as well as drawing emphasis to it.[186] It

[186] The next verbal action was Saul giving his daughter to David, which the translator depicted with an historic present, likely in order to connect this action with the previous action depicted by an historic present,

appears that the variation of verbal tense was a tool that the translator readily used in order to tell his story.

In a number of places we noted the translator varying his text for reasons of narrative structuring. First, in vv. 7-8 we saw that in Saul's repetition of the women's song, the translator reversed the word order in the first clause so that the pattern of parallelism in Saul's version of the song, matched the pattern of parallelism in the women's version: ABC::A'B'C'.[187]

Second, in v. 16 when it is stated that all Israel and Judah loved David because he went in and went out before them, the word order is reversed from the Hebrew. In reversing this word order the Greek text created an inclusio which framed the story of David's appointment over the thousand men and highlighted his success in that role.

> V. 14   A) ἐξεπορεύετο
>   B) εἰσεπορεύετο
> V. 16   B') εἰσεπορεύετο
>   A') ἐξεπορεύετο.

Finally, in vv. 28-29 where the MT speaks of *Michal* loving David and Saul *fearing* him, the Greek text speaks of *all Israel* loving David and Saul *watching out* for him. These two transformations make the conclusion of the second half of the chapter chiastically parallel with the conclusion to the first half of the chapter.

> A. v. 15 καὶ εὐλαβεῖτο ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
>   B. v. 16 καὶ πᾶς Ισραηλ καὶ Ιουδας ἠγάπα τὸν Δαυιδ
>   B'. v. 28 καὶ πᾶς Ισραηλ ἠγάπα αὐτόν
> A'. v. 29 καὶ προσέθετο εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ Δαυιδ ἔτι

Thus the translator appears to have been willing to adjust his text in order to create these meaningful narrative structures.

_____
David's "becoming in son-in-law" to Saul.

    [187] The Greek also added an article to μυριάδας so that the parallelism was more complete.

These small adjustments between the MT and OG of this chapter and all the previous chapters subtly nuance the story in various and often significant ways. However, the major difference between the MT and the OG lies in the major MT pluses that are scattered throughout chs. 16-18. Now that we have offered a close reading of the shorter Greek version of this story we will now turn and examine how the story we have read differs from the story that exists in the MT by examining the short version of the text against the longer MT version.

CHAPTER 5

DAVID AND GOLIATH IN GREEK AND HEBREW:
READING MULTIPLE VERSIONS OF A BIBLICAL STORY

1. Introduction

The present study has thus far offered a close reading of the David and Goliath story in its

Greek version, and has followed an approach that would be fitting for any text of the

Septuagint.[1] However, the story of David and Goliath is one of the instances of a biblical text

existing in two variant literary editions in the MT and LXX. Therefore, in the present chapter

we will turn and examine the literary relationship between the shorter Greek version of the

David and Goliath story, which has been the subject of this study, and the longer Hebrew

version of the story in the MT.

The approach of the present chapter will be to present a summary-style review of the

narrative in 1 Samuel 16-18 combined with close readings of each of the large MT pluses

(and in the two cases where it has a small minus). The reason for this approach is that it

allows us to read the version of the story in the Greek text against the version of the story in

the MT rather than the supposed Version 2 of the David and Goliath story that is contained

solely in the large MT pluses. Much of the scholarly literature on the two versions of the

---

[1] Although portions of the Septuagint that were either composed in Greek (e.g., 2 Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon) or do not have an extant *Vorlage* (e.g., 1 Maccabees), or at least an approximation of a *Vorlage*, would require a slightly different approach.

David and Goliath story does not deal with the two extant versions of the story but with the two presumed sources behind the MT text: the version contained in the LXX version and the version contained in the MT pluses.[2] Though this kind of analysis can be fruitful and worthwhile it unfortunately neglects the actual texts we possess in order to study conjectural texts that are not certain ever to have existed on their own.

The story of David and Goliath in LXX[B] and MT are two variant literary traditions, each of which existed as definitive editions of the story in their own right and should be treated as such.[3] Furthermore these two variant literary editions of the story likely existed concurrently as competing versions of the story from a very early stage.[4] Therefore, the present chapter will explore the "final form" of the Greek version of the story (LXX[B]) and the "final form"[5] of the Hebrew version (MT), in order to ascertain the literary relationship between the two versions.[6]

2. 1 Reigns 16 / 1 Samuel 16

The narrative material in 1 Samuel/Reigns 16 does not exist in variant literary editions. It is clear that the *Vorlage* of 1 Reigns 16 was very close to the MT of 1 Samuel 16. Even though in our study of this section we noted different nuances between the two, they are substantially the same version of the story. However, briefly reviewing the narrative of 1 Samuel 16 is

---

[2] See for example, McCarter, *1 Samuel*, esp. 306-09; Tov, "Composition," 350-56; and more recently Hutton, *Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 263-65. One recent attempt to treat both of the extant versions of the story can be found in Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 272-87.

[3] Lust, "Hebrew and Greek Texts," 126; and idem, "Epilogue," in *BGLT*, 156.

[4] This can be seen by the fact that 4QSam[a] likely contained the long version of the story. See Johnson, "Reconsidering 4QSam[a]."

[5] The label "final form" is put in scare quotes in light of the fact that to speak of a "final form" of a story that exists in two different versions is something of a misnomer.

[6] Thus we will see whether Halpern was right to say that the differences between the MT and LXX[B] versions do not "materially affect the shape of the story" (*David's Secret Demons*, 7).

necessary at this point because the story in 1 Samuel 16 is integral to the two different versions of the David and Goliath story in chapters 17-18.

The first part of the chapter (vv. 1-13), tells of Samuel's response to God's rejection of Saul's kingship and his command to Samuel to go anoint another king amongst the sons of Jesse (vv. 1-2). Samuel goes to Jesse in Bethlehem and after viewing all of his sons is eventually introduced to David whom he anoints (vv. 3-13a). Following David's anointing the spirit of the Lord rushes upon him (v. 13b). One of the key themes of this section is the theme of seeing. Samuel sees the impressive stature of Eliab and assumes he is God's chosen one. The Lord, however, has seen something in David that leads him to choose him (cf. 1 Sam. 13:14; 16:1).

The second part of the chapter (vv. 14-23), tells of David's arrival into Saul's court. The section begins on the heels of the previous one telling of the movement of spirits, for just as the spirt of the Lord came upon David it left Saul and an evil spirit from the Lord took its place (v. 14). Recognizing Saul's spiritual problem, his servants suggest that he employ a musician to soothe him and an overly qualified son of Jesse is nominated (vv. 15-18). Saul sends for David and he arrives at Saul's court (vv. 19-21a). Saul immediately loves David and makes him his armor bearer (v. 21b). David remains at Saul's court as his armor bearer and musician and brings peace to Saul whenever the evil spirit ails him (vv. 22-23). This section of the narrative continues the theme of seeing but in a slightly different way. Instead of the repeated use of a word for "seeing," vv. 14-23 describe David and Saul's reaction to him.

3. 1 Reigns 17 / 1 Samuel 17

In chapter 17, the story of David and Goliath proper, we are firmly within two variant literary editions. In the following analysis we will summarize the whole plot of 1 Samuel 17, while offering close readings of each of the MT pluses.

The Common Story . . .

This portion of the narrative begins by a geo-political setting of the scene, highlighting the significance of the coming conflict (vv. 1-3). The story then introduces the main protagonist—the Philistine giant, Goliath. It includes a detailed description of this Philistine giant (vv. 4-7), and his challenge to the ranks of Israel (vv. 8-10). The challenge is met only by the dismay (חתת) and fear (ירא) on the part of Saul and all Israel (vv. 11). In the Greek version of the story, the challenge of Goliath and the fear of Saul and Israel is juxtaposed immediately by David's response "let not the heart of my lord fall" (v. 32). In the version in MT, the giant's challenge is followed by a long narrative about a shepherd boy (vv. 12-31).

3.1. A Shepherd Boy's Challenge (17:12-31)

The narrative in 17:12-31 is the longest additional material in the MT's account of the David and Goliath story. As such, it substantially changes the story in a number of ways. The difference that this additional material makes to the story can be grouped into four categories: 1) narrative pace, 2) narrative genre, 3) narrative foreshadowing, and 4) characterization.

227

3.1.1. Narrative Pace

The structure of the Greek version of the story at this point has its own rhetorical power. Goliath is introduced as the opponent and he offers his challenge. The reaction of Saul and the Israelites is one of fear and dismay (v. 11). Immediately juxtaposed with the fear of the people and Saul, is the exhortation of David, who is still present at the king's side, not to fear, specifically, that Saul not fear (v. 32). The rhetorical effect of this is clear: David is willing to do what Saul and all Israel are not. The version of the story in the MT is very different at this point. Following the fearful reaction of Saul and all of Israel, the reader does not get David's reaction, but instead a scene change and an introduction to a seemingly new narrative.

Verse 12 appears to be an introduction to a new narrative: ודוד בן־איש אפרתי הזה מבית לחם יהודה ושמו ישי ("Now David was the son of this Ephrathite from Bethlehem of Judah, and his name was Jesse"). Scholars have frequently noted the similarity between this introductory sentence and a standard introduction to new narratives in biblical narrative such as Judg. 13:2; 1 Rgns. 1:1; and 1 Sam. 9:1.[7] In fact, one need only change ודוד בן־ to ויהי and remove הזה and the sentence would be virtually identical to the set form found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible.[8] The reconstructed introduction would read: ויהי איש אפרתי מבית לחם יהודה ושמו ישי ("And there was an Ephrathite man from Bethlehem of Judah and his name was Jesse"). Many scholars make this connection and conclude that this is evidence that this MT plus is an independent narrative being inserted into the text at this point.[9] Other scholars have argued that the material in vv. 12-31 is dependent upon its surrounding literary context,[10]

[7] See Johan Lust, "Second Thoughts on David and Goliath," in *BGLT*, 90-91; Driver, *Samuel*, 108; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 301; Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 25; van der Kooij, "David and Goliath," 127; Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 170, 178; and Hutton, *Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 250-51. Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 446.
[8] On this introductory form see Mark Leuchter, "'Now There Was a [Certain] Man': Compositional Chronology in Judges-1 Samuel," *CBQ* 69 (2007): 429-39.
[9] This is the opinion of all of the scholars listed above in n. 7, except Tsumura and van der Kooij.
[10] Barthélemy, "Trois Niveaux d'Analyse," 49-51.

which has led scholars interested in the text as it now stands to suggest that this introductory formula is part of a literary strategy to create suspense.[11]

Tracing the diachronic history of this text is not our primary interest here. However, recognizing the introductory formula or an appropriation of the introductory formula in 17:12, does help understand the literary function of the following scene in its current form.

First, though from a source-critical perspective v. 12 may appear to mark the beginning of a new narrative, the use of the formulaic introduction "there was a man . . . ." may suggest otherwise. Each of the uses of this formulaic phrase, where the father of a main protagonist is introduced,[12] starts a narrative section that is seemingly unrelated to what preceded, but in reality begins the story of the person who will respond to the problem or "initiating event"[13] that was introduced in the preceding pericope. The use of this introductory phrase in Judg. 13:2 introduces the character of Samson who will respond to the initiating event of Israel's continuing apostasy in 13:1. The use of the phrase in 1 Sam. 9:1, introduces Saul, who will be the response to the initiating event in 1 Samuel 8 of Israel's request for a king.[14] The use of this formulaic phrase in 1 Sam. 1:1 does not have an obvious immediately preceding initiating event. However, the book of Judges as a whole, especially the final chapters's repeated use of the phrase "in those days there was no king in Israel and everyone did what was right in their own eyes," can be read as the initiating event for the whole of the narrative of 1 Samuel.[15] Thus, even though the formulaic expression "there was a [certain]

---

[11] Gooding, "Literary and Textual Problems," 64-65; Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art*, 120-21; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 446; and Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 179-80.

[12] Leuchter, "'Now There was a [Certain] Man,'" 436-38, persuasively argues that the uses of the formulaic phrase, "there was a man," in Judg. 17:1 and 19:1 are used differently from the uses of the same phrase in Judg. 13:2; 1 Sam. 1:1; and 9:1, and should thus be understood differently.

[13] William F. Brewer, "The Nature of Narrative Suspense and the Problem of Rereading," in *Suspense: Conceptualisations, Theoretical Analyses, and Empirical Explorations* (ed. Peter Vorderer, Hans J. Wulff, and Mike Friedrichsen; Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996), 113, defines the "initiating event," as "an event that has the potential to lead to a significant outcome (good or bad) for one of the main characters in the narrative."

[14] Cf. Rachelle Gilmour, "Suspense and Anticipation in 1 Samuel 9:1-14," *JHebS* 9/10 (2009): 5-8.

[15] Marvin A. Sweeney, "Davidic Polemics in the Book of Judges," *VT* 47/4 (1997): 528.

man" begins the book of 1 Samuel, it still introduces a narrative that responds to the "initiating event" which preceded it.

Similarly, the use of the formulaic expression in 1 Sam. 17:12, though seemingly independent from what preceded, follows this pattern and introduces the character who will respond to the "initiating event" of 17:1-11. The first eleven verses of ch. 17 set up the problem that needs to be overcome: Goliath's challenge. The material found in vv. 12-31, and initiated by a form of the formulaic expression "there was a [certain] man" begins the response to the problem and uses the dramatic technique of creating suspense by introducing the solution to the problem through a seemingly unrelated narrative.

Second, although the use of this formulaic expression in 17:12 is grammatically similar to the use of this expression elsewhere, and the narrative follows a similar pattern, introducing a man, where he is from, giving his name, etc., the fact remains that this particular instantiation of the formula is adapted to fit its current context. The sentence begins with ודוד instead of ויהי, and references Jesse as "this (הזה) Ephrathite" rather than simply "an Ephrathite."[16] These features, however awkward they may seem, help fit this formulaic introductory statement into a context where it is not functioning as an introduction because both David and Jesse are already known to the reader.

Rhetorically, by beginning the sentence with "Now David" (ודוד), this section stands in dramatic juxtaposition to the previous statement about the fear and dismay of Israel and Saul.[17] Thus, the sentence as it now stands in MT allows for the creation of suspense by introducing David into the narrative through the indirect means of telling about his father and his father's mission for him, while simultaneously signaling the reader from the first word,

[16] See McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 301; Lust, "Second Thoughts," 90-91; and Hutton, *Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 250-51.
[17] Cf. Aurelius, "David," 52.

that this story is about David in juxtaposition to Saul and Israel. The inclusion of vv. 12-31, and the introductory sentence in particular, juxtaposes the reactions of Saul and Israel against David, but also creates heightened narrative suspense by means of the long narrative of David as bringer of gifts before a solution to the Goliath problem can be found. Thus, the major shift in terms of narrative pace between the two versions of this story (in this section at least) is that in response to Goliath's challenge, instead of David speaking up immediately, the reader must wait twenty verses for a solution to the initiating event. The pace is slowed, the suspense is heightened, the drama is increased.

3.1.2. Narrative Genre

Scholars who accept that the story in MT is an amalgamation of two versions of the David and Goliath story often note that there appears to be a difference in genre between the two versions. De Vries identified the form of the story roughly equivalent to the MT pluses as a "hero-saga," while he classified the other story, roughly equivalent to the material in LXX[B], as a "legend."[18] Jason analyzed this story using the rubric of folklore and concluded that the MT version was a "historic epic," while the version in LXX[B] did not fit this generic model.[19] Rofé has noted that the MT version, especially the material in the MT pluses, shows signs of being a folkloristic fairytale and the short version in LXX[B] reflects an abridged text that has removed these themes.[20]

However one generically labels the two versions, the fact is that a story about a king's armor bearer volunteering to face Israel's foe when no one else would is generically different from a story about a young shepherd boy bringing food to his brothers at his father's behest

---

[18] De Vries, "David's Victory," 23-36.
[19] Jason, "David and Goliath," 36-70.
[20] Rofé, "Battle," 117-51.

who, being at the right place at the right time and showing great courage and faith, ends up slaying a giant.

The generic difference between the short septuagintal version and the longer MT version allows for a different emphasis in theme between the two accounts. In the Septuagint version David is a young warrior who shows greater bravery and faith than Saul and all of Israel. In the MT version, David's "chance" arrival on the battlefield just as Goliath is offering his challenge is actually evidence of divine direction.[21] Thus, the theme of God's role in the conflict and in David's path to the throne is emphasized in the MT.

Another theme that has a different emphasis between the two versions of the story is brought out with the repeated emphasis on David as the young one. In the version of the story in LXX[B], the reader is informed that David is "the small one" ($\dot{o}$ $\mu\iota\varkappa\rho\dot{o}\varsigma$) of Jesse's sons (16:11). In the MT, however, the issue of David's "youth" or "smallness" is brought out again. In the narrative depicting David's arrival to the battlefield, David is introduced alongside his three brothers. By introducing David in this way, the narrative emphasizes David's status as the "small one." Verse 13 notes that "the three eldest (or "greatest," הגדלים) sons of Jesse went out after Saul for war." Verse 14 then states, "Now David was the youngest (or "smallest," הקטן), and the three eldest (or "greatest," הגדלים) had gone out after Saul." The juxtaposition of the description of the three brothers as the eldest or greatest, with David as the youngest or smallest, allows an emphasis on the theme of David as the younger brother, one who is poorly equipped, by conventional standards, to be the hero of Israel.[22] Though being the youngest brother may make David an unlikely hero according to some standards, in biblical literature the youngest brother is the likeliest to be chosen by God to receive his special

---

[21] On the role of chance and coincidence in the narratives of 1 Samuel as evidence of divine direction see Deist, "Coincidence as a Motif," 7-18; and Jacobs, "Secondary Characters," 495-509.
[22] Cf. Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 252.

blessing, and thus, the youngest brother theme allows for another element that emphasizes God's role in the election and success of David. Thus, in bringing the reader's attention to David's status as the youngest or smallest (הקטן) son, the theme of God's role in Israel's victory and David's rise is emphasized.

One final generic difference between the two versions must be noted. The story of David and Goliath in the popular imagination is one where a young shepherd boy faces and defeats a giant. This is not the picture painted in the Septuagint version. While David never fully escapes his shepherd image (see 1 Rgns. 17:40, 43) and Goliath is still an ominous figure measuring over six and a half feet tall, the story in the Septuagint is more like a story of a young warrior slaying the formidable champion of the enemy.[23] The story in the MT, however, is the story that has captured popular imagination throughout the centuries. It is the story of a young shepherd boy, who, armed with his faith and a sling, slays a giant of near-mythical proportions.

3.1.3. Narrative Foreshadowing

The additional material in vv. 12-31 of the MT also allow for at least one element of literary foreshadowing. The issue of royal marriage, especially the bride-price of a royal marriage, will be a significant theme in chapter 18. The material in vv. 12-31 of the MT offers the first sounding of that theme in the words of "the men of Israel" to David: "And it will be that the king will greatly enrich the man who kills him and he will give him his daughter and his father's house will be free in Israel" (17:25).[24] This piece of information is an important

---

[23] Esler, "Ancient Mediterranean *Monomachia*, 19-28, compares the Greek version of the story with other ancient Mediterranean instances of single combat, especially the combat between the account of Titus Manlius and a Gaul (*Livy* 7.9.6-10.14).

[24] What it means for his father's house to be free (חפש) in Israel is not our concern here. Our primary concern is with the offer or perceived offer of a royal marriage. On the issue of the meaning of חפש see Stoebe, "Die Goliathperikope," 403-04; McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 304; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 454.

narrative element for the story as it unfolds in chapter 18, especially the form of the story found in the MT.

As we will see below, in chapter 18 David will be appointed as a military leader and have great success (18:13-15) and the people will love him because of this (18:16). Immediately following verse 16 in the MT version Saul offers his eldest daughter Merab to David as a wife (18:17). The movement from the people's love of David in v. 16 and Saul's offer of Merab in v. 17 is abrupt.[25] However, the logic of the relationship between 18:16 and 18:17 is provided by the material in the MT plus of 17:12-31, specifically, 17:25.[26] Whether or not Saul actually spoke these words or they are rather a sort of war-time hyperbole is beside the point.[27] The logic of a royal marriage following military victory is present, whether it is an actual offer or something that is perceived by the people as something the king should do.[28] Thus, in the MT material in 17:12-31, not only is a major theme of the next chapter foreshadowed, but the narrative logic for subsequent events is provided.

3.1.4. Characterization

This extra material in the MT also adjusts David's characterization. First, as we have already addressed, his youth and his identity as a shepherd are emphasized. Second, his conversation with Eliab and the other men in the camp causes the reader to question the characterization of David in a way different from the version of the story in LXX[B].

We already noted how the portrayal of David as a youth and a shepherd adjusts the genre of the narrative. It also adjusts the characterization of David. By emphasizing David as

---

[25] Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 233, notes that the "strain between vv 16 and 17 is enormous."

[26] The connection between 17:25 and 18:17-19 is frequently noted. See e.g., Gordon, *Samuel*, 156; Alter, *David Story*, 115; and Cartledge, *Samuel*, 232.

[27] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 181.

[28] This is different from the LXX[B] account which only has only the offer of Michal, the impetus of which appears to be Michal's affection for David and thus does not need the logic of a royal bride as the reward for military victory, though that does come into the story under the guise of a bride-price.

the young or small one (הקטן), the narrative emphasizes the disproportion between the small

David and the giant Goliath. By repeating this small/large motif, the narrative places more

emphasis on David's faith that God can deliver him from such a mismatched confrontation.[29]

The most striking piece of characterization is given in the dialogues between David

and Eliab and David and the other men at the camp. After arriving at the camp, David hears

Goliath's challenge (v. 23), and the fearful response of the men at the camp (v. 24). The men

of Israel then tell of the rewards that will be given to the one who kills the Philistine

champion (v. 25). David then speaks his first words in the biblical narrative. In biblical

narrative, a character's first words are often "a defining moment of characterization."[30] Thus,

David's words require attention and bear quoting in full:

מה־יעשה לאיש אשר יכה את־הפלשתי הלז והסיר חרפה מעל ישראל כי מי הפלשתי הערל הזה כי חרף
חמערכות אלהים חיים

What will be done for the man that kills this Philistine and turns aside the reproach from upon
Israel? For who is this uncircumcised Philistine who reproaches the ranks of the living God?

David's speech consists of two questions. The first question is an actual question and is in

direct and chiastic response to the speech of the men of Israel from v. 25:

Men of Israel (v. 25)	A) הראיתם האיש העלה הזה כי <u>לחרף את־ישראל</u>	
	B) והיה <u>האיש אשר־יכנו</u>...	
David (v. 26)	B') מה־יעשה <u>לאיש אשר יכה</u> את־הפלשתי הלז	
	A') והסיר <u>חרפה מעל ישראל</u>	

What is the relationship between these two elements? Was David aware of what the men of

Israel were saying and asking for this statement to be confirmed? Or was he unaware of what

---

[29] Cf. Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 252.
[30] Alter, *The David Story*, 105. Cf. Bodner, "Eliab and the Deuteronomist," 17.

the men of Israel were saying? How does answering these questions help us to understand David's first words?

It is clear that the initial statement is not addressed to David. The Hebrew literally reads: "And a man of Israel said, 'Have you (pl.) seen. . . .'" (. . .הראיתם ישראל איש ויאמר). Placing the dialogue in the mouth of an unidentified "man of Israel" appears to be a way of communicating something like "the men of Israel were saying."[31] Furthermore, the initial verb, הראיתם, in the second person plural clearly indicates that the speech was not primarily directed at David, but rather communicates that this was something that the men of Israel were saying to each other.[32]

David's first speech seems to be in response to the talk of the camp. Rather than an initial query, it appears more like a clarifying question, "*What* did you say will be done for the man who kills this Philistine?"[33] This may suggest that this opening speech by David is not quite as self-serving as scholars sometimes note.[34] But the important element of David's repeated speech may not be in the similarities between his speech and the speech of the men of Israel but in their differences.

First, the men of Israel speak of "the man" (האיש), whereas David refers to him as "this Philistine" (הלז את־הפלשתי). Referring to Goliath as "the man" is a simple and neutral way to refer to him. David's label for him, however, may be rhetorically loaded. Scholars frequently note the pejorative disdain that David shows for Goliath in the second rhetorical

---

[31] Cf. NRSV; JPS.

[32] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 453.

[33] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 160. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 453, suggests that "David was not informed of what was said in v. 25," but the close relationship between the verses seems to suggest otherwise.

[34] Cf. Polzin, *David and the Deuteronomist*, 91; Bodner, "Eliab and the Deuteronomist," 17-18.

question by labeling him "this uncircumcised Philistine" (הפלשתי הערל הזה),[35] but Noegel has argued that David's use of the demonstrative pronoun הלז also conveys an insult.[36]

Second, the men of Israel note that Goliath has "reproached" (חרף), but David speaks of the reproach as something that needs to be "removed" (הסיר).[37] This theme of "removing" will be picked up later in the narrative when David will "remove" Saul's armor (17:39) and then later "remove" Goliath's head (17:46).[38] David's response thus suggests that he sees something needs to be done.

David's initial question then is in direct response to what the men of the camp were saying and is characterized by David's attitude toward the situation: his disdain for Goliath, and his instinct that something must be done about the giant's reproach of Israel.[39] On this reading, it does not seem that David's ambition is the primary focus of his initial speech, though it may be there secondarily. Perhaps the most significant aspect of David's initial speech is 1) that he is responding to the words of the men of Israel, and 2) he appears to see the need for action. This can be contrasted with the implied silence of Saul, who is included with the men as reacting to the giant only in fear.[40]

The second part of David's opening speech is a rhetorical question that elaborates on the first part of his speech. In this rhetorical question David shows that he recognizes the theological aspect of Goliath's challenge.[41] In the first part of this rhetorical question, he further shows his disdain for the Philistine, referring to him as "this uncircumcised Philistine"

---

[35] E.g., Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 160; George, "Constructing Identity," 402.

[36] Scott B. Noegel, "The 'Other' Demonstrative Pronouns: Pejorative Colloquialisms in Biblical Hebrew," *JBQ* 33/1 (2005): 23-30.

[37] Cf. Firth, *Samuel*, 198.

[38] Cf. LXX-1 Sam. 17:36, and above ch. 3.

[39] See Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 161, for a similar view of the differences between the parallel speeches of the men of Israel (v. 25) and David (v. 26).

[40] Green, *How Are the Mighty Fallen*, 288.

[41] Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 151; George, "Constructing Identity," 402; Bar-Efrat, *Samuel*, 243-44; Firth, *Samuel*, 198.

(הפלשתי הערל הזה). In the second part, he connects the Philistine's "reproach" against Israel to a "reproach" against the living God: "that he reproaches the ranks of the living God" (כי חרף מערכות אלהים חיים). David includes God's identity in the honor-shame scenario of Goliath's challenge.[42] Furthermore, in referring to God as "the living God" (אלהים חיים), David has emphasized God's identity over against the lifeless identity of the foreign gods of the Philistines.[43]

It is perhaps telling that the response to David's question, "what will be done (עשׂה)?" is a firestorm of "words" (דברים), many of which are given only indirectly. In the short section that follows the root דבר will be used seven times, most often to signify repeated speech and responses to repeated speech.[44] Polzin has argued that this section shows significant stylized narration in its use of repeated speech and highlights a key aspect of the narrative.[45]

> And the people said to him according to this word (דבר), saying "thus will he do to the man who strikes him." And Eliab his eldest brother heard his word (דבר) to the men and Eliab's anger burned against David and he said, "Why have you come down, and with whom have you forsaken those few sheep in the wilderness, I myself know your pride and the evil of your heart, for you have come down in order to see the battle." And David said, "What have I done now? Was this not a word (דבר)?" And he turned from beside him to others. And he spoke according to this word (דבר) and the people returned a word (דבר) according to the first word (דבר). And they heard the words (דברים) which David spoke (דבר), and they declared them before Saul. And he took him. (1 Sam. 17:27-31)

The repetition of the word דבר and the constant reference to previously spoken words suggests that this is a key theme in this section. In light of the prevalence in this section for

---

[42] George, "Constructing Identity," 402; Wénin, "David roi," 84.
[43] Cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 293; Gordon, *Samuel*, 156; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 454, on the use of the phrase "living God" (אלהים חיים).
[44] See Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 164-65.
[45] Polzin, *Samuel*, 167-69.

referencing a character's speech without recording the actual words, we must pay special attention to the actual words that are spoken.

When David's eldest brother Eliab hears David's word (דבר) spoken to the men of the camp, he berates David for this. Though it may be that Eliab's rebuke is the response of a jealous older brother,[46] several factors suggest that Eliab's speech should not be written off, but is instead important to the narrative. First, as Bodner notes, Eliab's speech is a response to David's first words in the narrative. If David's first words are important as a matter of characterization, then the response to those words is likely important as well.[47] Second, Eliab's speech stands out since it is in a section with a significant amount of repeated speech, but little actual dialogue. Third, as Miscall has noted, Eliab's speech brings out the two key themes of knowledge (ידע) and heart (לבב).[48] The theme of knowledge is introduced here, but it becomes very important in the theological climax of the narrative in David's speech in 17:46-47, where he states that all the land (v. 46) and all the congregation (v. 47) will know (ידע) that there is a God in Israel because of David's victory over Goliath. The theme of the heart of the agents of Yhwh is an important theme throughout the narrative of 1 Samuel.[49] It is especially important for David's characterization as it is the key element that has been brought up involving God's estimation of David (13:14, 16:7). Here, in this first scene that David appears as a character in his own right, his elder brother is confronting him with issues of motivation, using the key terms "heart" and "knowledge." The reader is immediately confronted with the question of whether or not they know the motivations of David's heart.

---

[46] See Klein, *1 Samuel*, 178; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 161-64; Gordon, *Samuel*, 156; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 455.

[47] Bodner, "Eliab and the Deuteronomist," 19.

[48] Miscall, *Workings of Old Testament Narrative*, 65.

[49] See Johnson, "The Heart," 460-67.

However, the reader is also in a position to offer some judgment on David's motivation and heart. In 16:1 the Lord tells Samuel that he has seen (ראה) a son of Jesse that he approves of for king. In 16:3 he tells Samuel that he will make known (ידע) to him who he is to anoint. Then, after telling Samuel that the Lord looks (ראה) to the heart (לבב) in 16:7, David arrives on the scene and the Lord tells Samuel, "this is the one" (זה הוא) in 16:13. Thus, the reader has been given an initial insight into David's character. Eliab has called this insight into question and the reader is asked to assess David again. In the present narrative, David's speeches and actions confirm the Lord's assessment to be true, and Eliab's assessment to be misguided.[50]

David's response to Eliab's criticism is not to say, "I came because father sent me (17:17-18) and I left the flock with a keeper (17:20)," as the reader might expect.[51] Instead, David's response comes in the form of two rhetorical questions that bring us back to the key theme of this section: "What have I done (עשׂה) now?[52] Was this not a word (דבר)?" (17:29). The phrase "Was this not a word?" (הלוא דבר הוא) is difficult to understand. It is gnomic in nature and quite ambiguous, and the difficulty in interpreting it is compounded by the diverse meanings of the word דבר from "word" to "thing" or "matter."[53] Some understand this phrase to be something of a rhetorical question, something like "isn't this just a word" or, perhaps, with the NIV, "Can't I even speak?"[54] Others suggest that the phrase means to communicate

---

[50] We have noted that in ch. 16 the *character zones* of Eliab and Saul overlap in many ways. One could further explore the way Eliab's misjudgment of David here, matches up with Saul's misjudgment of David in later chapters.

[51] Cf. Miscall, *Workings of Old Testament Narrative*, 63.

[52] Auld, *Samuel*, 209, notes that this is a question David asks with some regularity (1 Sam. 17:29; 20:1; 26:18; 29:8).

[53] Alter, *David Story*, 106.

[54] See *HALOT*; Gordon, *Samuel*, 156; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 455.

that David is defending himself, stating that he is addressing the essential issue, thus translating the phrase something like "isn't this the essential matter?"[55]

We noted that David initiated this scene by asking the question "what will be done (עשׂה)?" He now asks, "What have I done (עשׂה) now? Was this not a word (דבר)?" These questions bring together the two key themes of this section. Fokkelman is right that "David's reply is a centre of gravity in this scene-part with its *dbr*-network,"[56] but his suggestion of understanding דבר here as "matter" misses the key wordplay. The two key themes of "doing" (עשׂה) and "word" (דבר), come together in this question and its answers. David says, "What have I done (עשׂה) now?" The answer is nothing. David, along with Saul and all of Israel have as yet done nothing about the Philistine threat. His next question is, "Is this not a word (דבר)?" The answer is yes, this is just a word and that is the problem. Eliab is upset at David's words, but David appears to be concerned for what is to be done. The essential matter then is this: there have been entirely too many words exchanged, but nothing has been done. But David's words are brought to Saul and they initiate action. The answer to David's question, "What have I done now?" is nothing . . . yet.

Thus, while some have suggested that this section provides a slightly negative assessment of David's character as one defined by ambition and calculation,[57] the reading offered here suggests that David is being characterized as a man of action amongst men of words.[58]

The Common Story Continues . . .

[55] See Stoebe, *Samuelis*, 322-24; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 164-65; Bergen, *1, 2, Samuel*, 193; Firth, *Samuel*, 191, 193.
[56] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 164.
[57] See Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 282.
[58] Green, *How the Mighty Are Fallen*, 288, suggests that this section exhibits a "clearly drawn contrast of Yhwh's two anointeds."

The story continues as David's words are brought before Saul. The king is clearly skeptical of the ability of this newcomer to face the giant. Saul points out David's inexperience saying, "you are a youth, but he has been a man of war from his youth" (17:32). These words have a different nuance in the MT version from the LXX version. In the LXX version, David is a member of Saul's court, an armor bearer, and thus his relative inexperience in warfare is of a different kind from his inexperience in the MT version where he is a shepherd boy newly arrived onto the camp. In response to Saul's objection David tells of his experience protecting his sheep by fighting of lions and bears. The rhetoric of David's boast is successful, but the version in the MT is lacking one additional element.

3.2. What David Will Do (17:36)

In the MT David follows up his story about killing lions and bears by saying, "Moreover your servant has struck lions and also bears, and this uncircumcised Philistine will be like one of them, for he reproached the ranks of the living God" (17:36). The LXX version includes some additional material (in italics): "And your servant has struck bears and lions, and the uncircumcised Foreigner will be like one of them, *will I not go and strike him and remove the reproach from Israel today? For *who is* this uncircumcised one who reproaches the ranks of the living God?" (17:36 LXX). What difference does this additional material, or lack of it, make to the narrative? First, in the LXX version the plus material adds another level of connectedness between David's boast and what actually occurs. The themes of "striking" and "removing" are sounded once again, and David's faith in what will happen, matches what does happen quite closely.[59] Second, in the LXX version David refers to the giant in a rhetorical question, "for who is. . . ?" This adds an element of disdain for the giant but

---

[59] See above pp. 109-10.

implicitly adds an element of critique against Saul and all Israel, who would not face the giant. In the MT, this reference to the giant is in a simple statement in a causal relationship to what preceded. Thus the fact that Goliath reproached the ranks of the living God is the *reason* that he will be dispatched just as David dispatched many a lion and bear.

The Common Story Continues . . .

Saul apparently accepts David's reasoning and proceeds to offer David his own armor, which David refuses in preference for his sling (17:38-40). Now armed, the hero goes to face the giant. The approach to this scene happens slightly differently between the two accounts.

3.3. Approaching the Confrontation (17:41, 48b)

The two MT pluses in 17:41 and 48b are two instances where scholars frequently see a doublet.[60] It is easy to see why. Verse 41 is repeated by v. 48a, and v. 48b is a repeat of v. 40b. However, the question remains why these repetitions exist. It is possible that these repetitions are a sign that there are two different versions that have been combined here.[61] However, the structure of the text as it currently stands suggests that these repetitions can be read as a framing device, which frames the dialogue between David and Goliath.[62] The references to the motion of David and Goliath chiastically frame the dialogue:

---

[60] See Johan Lust, "David and Goliath," 18; De Vries, "David's Victory," 31; Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 177-78; and Aurelius, "David," 58.

[61] See Tov, "Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18," 351-52; De Vries, "David's Victory," 31. Cf. Campbell, *1 Samuel* 175-76, who notes the doublet but suggests that they do not necessarily denote multiple traditions in this instance.

[62] For examples of this kind of framing device see Burke O. Long, "Framing Repetitions in Biblical Historiography," *JBL* 106/3 (1987): 385-99.

A) And David approached the Philistine (v. 40b)

    B) And the Philistine came (הלך) and drew near (קרב) to David (v. 41)

       X) David and Goliath: A Battle of Words (vv. 42-47)

    B') And the Philistine came (הלך) and drew near (קרב) to greet (לקראת) David (v. 48a)

A') And David hurried and ran . . . to greet (לקראת) the Philistine (v. 48b)

As the above outline shows, in the MT the repetition of movement between David and Goliath artfully frames their dialogue.[63] The LXX[B] version of the story depicts a simple linear progression: David approaches Goliath (v. 40b), Goliath sees him and they exchange their verbal blows (vv. 42-47), then Goliath approaches David (v. 48a), and the battle of arms commences. This is a linear progression of movement with a coherent logic.[64] The MT version, however, with its chiastic framing device, draws extra attention to the dialogue in vv. 42-47.[65] As we noted in our analysis of ch. 17, the dialogue in vv. 42-47 and David's speech in vv. 46-47 mark the theological high points of the narrative. It is therefore significant that the MT contains a literary device that further emphasizes this section.

One other minor difference that is made with the inclusion of v. 41 in the MT is the additional reference to Goliath's shield bearer going before him (והאיש נשא הצנה לפניו). This reference has been interpreted as 1) a further example of Goliath's abundant armor and tech-

---

[63] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 179, though he only speaks of the repetition of Goliath's movement in v. 41 and v. 48.

[64] Klein, *1 Samuel*, 172, 174, suggests that both v. 41 and v. 48b have been lost in LXX[B] due to haplography. Verse 41 was lost in the Hebrew (הפלשתי – הפלשתי) and v. 48b was lost in the Greek (καὶ ἐτάχυνεν - καὶ ἐξέτεινεν). The similarity between ἐτάχυνεν and ἐξέτεινεν does not seem close enough to make haplography likely. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 288, sees the possibility of haplography in v. 41, but thinks it more likely that it is only responsible for the loss of ויבט הפלשתי in v. 42a, rather than the whole of v. 41. The logic of the Greek reading makes it unlikely that these two LXX minuses were lost separately and accidentally. It is more likely that the Greek reading is intentional, whether original or redactional.

[65] Aurelius, "David," 58, suggests that this framing repetition is used to frame the insertion of vv. 41-48 and that this structure emphasizes v. 49 as the crucial part of the story. It is true that v. 49 is a climactic moment in the story, but the framing device separates out the dialogue in vv. 42-47 and draws more attention to this scene, which as we have noted contains the theological climax of the story.

nological advantage over David,[66] 2) evidence that Goliath is "encumbered by heavy armor with little range in combat and vulnerable to an attack launched from a distance,"[67] or 3) evidence that Goliath had a visual problem.[68] In light of the whole presentation of Goliath it seems much more likely that the reference to his shield bearer carrying his shield should be interpreted as a reference to Goliath's superior equipment rather than a narrative hint that he is encumbered by too much armor. It is difficult to imagine too much armor being a major inconvenience in ancient warfare. Furthermore, it seems quite possible that the imagery of the Philistine champion going forth with his shield bearer (נשׂא הצנה) in front of him may also call to mind the fact that the Israelite champion, Saul, is also letting his armor bearer (נשׂא כלים) go in front of him (16:21). There is thus an ironic contrast between the armor bearer of Goliath who has very little role in the battle, and the armor bearer of Saul who fights the battle himself.

3.4. David's Taunt (17:43b)

We have discussed the MT pluses in 17:41 and 48b that frame the dialogue between David and Goliath in vv. 42-47, but we must briefly mention the LXX plus in v. 43b. We have addressed this LXX plus above.[69] In our analysis we noted that by affording David an extra response to Goliath's taunt, the LXX version of the story further characterizes David as one who is σοφὸς λόγῳ ("wise in words," 16:18) and very confident. He returns Goliath's disdain for him in equal measure.

---

[66] E.g., Auld and Ho, "The Making of David and Goliath," 30; Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 279-80.
[67] Miscall, *Workings of Old Testament Narrative*, 60.
[68] See Diether Kellermann, "Die Geschichte von David und Goliath im Lichte der Endokrinologie," *ZAW* 102/3 (1990): 344-57; and Vladimir M. Berginer and Chaim Cohen, "The Nature of Goliath's Visual Disorder and the Actual Role of His Personal Bodyguard: נֹשֵׂא הַצִּנָּה (I Sam 17,7,41)," *ANES* 43 (2006): 27-44.
[69] See above pp. 126-27.

The Common Story Continues . . .

Upon finishing the dialogue between David and Goliath (vv. 42-47) and narrating the movement of the combatants toward each other (v. 48), the actual confrontation commences. Verse 49 narrates the battle: David slings a stone, strikes the Philistine in the forehead, and he falls to the ground on his face. In the MT what follows this basic narration of the fight is an additional comment not found in the LXX account.

3.5. Goliath's Death, Take One (17:50)

The LXX account of the actual battle between David and Goliath proceeds very logically. David strikes Goliath in the forehead with his sling, Goliath falls face forward onto the ground (v. 49), and David runs to him and kills him with his own sword, cutting off his head (v. 51). In the MT, the action is interrupted by the inclusion of v. 50, which appears to narrate David's killing Goliath (וימיתהו) before he kills (וימתתהו) him again in v. 51. Whatever the history behind this reading,[70] in its current context it clearly interrupts the story.[71]

The main point of the verse appears to be to make emphatically clear to the reader that David's statement in 17:47, that the Lord does not save by sword and spear, is fulfilled by David slaying Goliath with a sling *and not a sword*.[72] Whether this point is an emphatic aside,[73] or a theological clarification preempting a potential misreading of the story,[74] it clearly emphasizes the connection between Goliath's death and David's theological claim in v. 47.

---

[70] Many scholars see two sources here, e.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 305; Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 178; Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 173. For a recent and plausible attempt to explain v. 50 as an interpolation to anticipate a misreading of the narrative see R.W.L. Moberly, "By Stone and Sling: 1 Samuel 17:50 and the Problem of Misreading David's Victory Over Goliath," in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies* (ed. James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011), 329-342.

[71] Cf. Klein, *1 Samuel*, 178; Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 186-88; Gordon, *Samuel*, 158; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 465.

[72] Moberly, "By Stone and Sling," 335-39; Nitsche, *David Gegen Goliath*, 98.

[73] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 186-88; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 465; Gordon, *Samuel*, 158. Cf. Gooding, "Textual and Literary Problems," 69-70.

[74] Moberly, "By Stone and Sling," 335-39.

Three other features are significant in this inclusion of v. 50 in the MT. First, the inclusion of this verse allows for significant repetition of some key themes and ideas. The use of repetition as a literary device in Hebrew narrative has been well documented.[75] In this instance, every verb in v. 50 is a verb that was also present in v. 35 and used in the same order: חזק, נכה, and מות.[76] This further connects Goliath's death with the deaths of the lions and bears that David boasted of in 17:35-37.[77] Furthermore, the use of the verb נכה ("strike") in v. 50 adds one more use of this verb in this narrative. The theme of "striking" (נכה) is one that has been sounded repeatedly throughout this story (17:9[2x], 25, 26, 27, 36-37[3x], 46). One of the driving factors of the story is clearly the question, "who will 'strike' the Philistine giant?" By repeating David's "striking" of Goliath, the plus in v. 50 adds to that theme.

Second, the inclusion of v. 50 means that the narrative recounts David "striking" (נכה) Goliath twice (vv. 49 and 50), and "killing" (מות) Goliath twice (vv. 50 and 51). Briggs has suggested that the feature of repetition in the Old Testament can be compared to the law of double testimony reflected in Deut. 19:15.[78] Thus, the use of repetition may be a literary technique to foreground "the claim that such testimony is to be taken with due seriousness as reliable testimony."[79] In other words, by repeating David's victory over Goliath, both the striking and the killing, the text may mean to imply that this event is reliable testimony.

---

[75] See Alter, *Biblical Narrative,* 111-41; and Sternberg, *Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 365-440. It is especially prominent in the Books of Samuel. See David G. Firth, "'Parallelismus Membrorum' in Prose Narrative: The Function of Repetition in 1 Samuel 5-6," *OTE* 15/3 (2002): 647-656; idem, "'Play it Again, Sam': The Poetics of Narrative Repetition in 1 Samuel 1-7," *TynBul* 56/1 (2005): 1-17; idem, "The Accession Narrative (1 Samuel 27 - 2 Samuel 1)," *TynBul* 58/1 (2007): 73-74.

[76] Though the verb חזק is used in slightly different contexts and slightly different meanings in each verse, its presence in both verses in the same order suggests intentional allusion.

[77] Cf. Wénin, "David roi," 86.

[78] Richard S. Briggs, "The Theological Function of Repetition in the Old Testament Canon," *HBT* 28/2 (2006): 95-112, esp. pp. 110-12. Though Briggs' suggestion is in regard to larger patterns of repetition the same logic can be applied here.

[79] Briggs, "Theological Function of Repetition," 110.

Finally, the inclusion of v. 50 in this story also sounds one significant intertextual note. The significant explanatory note in v. 50 that "there was no sword in David's hand" (וחרב אין ביד־דוד) recalls the note in 13:22 that "and neither sword nor spear was found in the hand of all the people" (ולא נמצא חרב וחנית ביד כל־העם).[80] Just as in 13:22 no sword or spear was found in the hand of any of the people of Israel, but Saul and his son Jonathan had them, in ch. 17, there was no sword in David's hand, but Saul had one (17:39). This intertextual allusion suggests that though the primary reason for the mention of David's lack of a sword is to show that the Lord does not save by sword or spear (17:47), a secondary reason for the reference may be to further contrast David and Saul. Though Saul may be more materially equipped to face the giant, David is more spiritually equipped.

The Common Story Continues . . .

The story continues with the victory of David and the geographical aftermath of that victory as the Israelites pursue the Philistines all the way back to Gath and Ekron (17:52).[81] David then takes the head of Goliath to Jerusalem and his armor to his tent (17:54). In the LXX version of the story the next scene is the women coming out of all the towns of Israel to sing their victory song to David (18:6). In the MT version there are still two significant scenes yet to be narrated before the women can begin their musical celebration.

3.6. Whose Son is This? (17:55-58)

After the notice that David brought Goliath's head to Jerusalem the narrative breaks the linear chronology and flashes back to the moment that David heads off to battle with Goliath.[82] This

---

[80] Edelman, *King Saul*, 133.
[81] We noted above the geographical differences between the two accounts. See above ch. 3.
[82] On the break in the linear progression in vv. 54-58 see Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 258.

scene is one of the clearest examples of tension between an individual pericope and its surrounding narrative context. The scene details Saul's query about the identity of David, which according to the preceding narrative would have been information Saul would have previously acquired (see 16:21-22; 17:34-39). How then can it be that Saul must ask Abner about David's identity?

One obvious explanation for the tension between the pericope in 17:55-58 and the surrounding narrative context is that 17:55-58 is derived from a source different from the surrounding narrative context and has been inserted into the narrative despite the obvious tensions.[83] However, the question remains why a redactor would have let this tension stand.[84] Is it possible to understand 17:55-58 within its current context? Or is it in such tension with the rest of the narrative that it must be interpreted separately?[85] Several factors suggest that it can and should be read in its current context.

The narrative begins "As Saul saw David go out to meet the Philistine." As noted above, this marks a break in the chronology. Verses 55-56 occur as Saul is watching David go out to face Goliath. Verses 57-58, however, occur when David returns from killing Goliath. The significance of this is that it would have been very easy for an author or redactor to maintain the straight chronology of the story and place vv. 55-56 prior to David's fight with Goliath, perhaps just before or just after v. 40. Thus the question, "whose son is he?" would have nicely framed the battle and been an effective narrative strategy. Whoever is responsible

---

[83] E.g., Willis, "Redactional Joints,"314-314; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 174; Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 178; and Campbell, *1 Samuel*, 173.

[84] Cf. Alter, *The David Story*, 110. Cartledge, *Samuel*, 222, agrees separate traditions likely led to the tensions but suggests that "this interlude functions to shine a literary spotlight on David."

[85] Johannes Klein, "Unbeabsichtigte Bedeutungen in Den Davidererzählungen: Am Beispiel von ISam 17,55-58," in *David und Saul im Widerstreit — Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit: Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches* (ed. Walter Dietrich; OBO 206; Fribourg: Academic Press / Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 129-37, suggests this is an instance where the text originally meant one thing but in placing it in its current context has led it to mean something else.

for vv. 55-58 has decided that it was more important to keep these verses together than to fit them into the chronology of the chapter.

The fact that vv. 55-56 and vv. 57-58, which chronologically occur on either side of the battle, are here placed in immediate juxtaposition, highlights other aspects of their parallel nature. The beginning of v. 55 is grammatically parallel to the beginning of v. 57, with Saul as the subject in the former verse and David in the latter. Each begins with a *waw* plus a temporal כ plus an infinitive construct: וכשוב דוד // וכראות שאול ("And as Saul saw" // "And as David returned"). This juxtaposition highlights that Saul is *watching* the battle while David is *fighting* the battle.

The most difficult aspect of this pericope is Saul's question to Abner, "Whose son is this youth?" Many scholars point out the fact that Saul is not asking David's name or who David is, but is instead asking whose son he is.[86] So the reader must ask, what does this question mean and why does Saul ask it? It may be that this question is the equivalent of asking "what is his background?"[87] Many scholars note that this question may be in reference to Saul's supposed offer of freedom for the family of the one who slays the Philistine champion in 17:25, 27, and 30.[88] This line of reasoning makes sense when the question is asked in v. 58, after David has defeated Goliath and there is a reason to inquire about his family. However, it seems premature for Saul to inquire about his family for this reason in v. 55. In the chronology of the narrative this question takes place as David is marching to face the giant. We may therefore suggest that the question here may imply something like the modern parlance, "Who *is* this guy?"[89]

[86] See e.g., Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 189; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 470.
[87] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 470; Bergen, *Samuel*, 198-99.
[88] Gooding, "Literary and Textual Problems," 60; Gordon, *Samuel*, 158; Edelman, *King Saul*, 134-35; Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 183-84; and Firth, *Samuel*, 202. Cf. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 470.
[89] Polzin, *Samuel*, 172-73, suggests something similar but thinks that the use of the demonstrative pronoun זה suggests that this is a derisive comment. While this may certainly be true, I think it is likely that the fact that Saul let David go suggests that there is also a significant element of amazement on Saul's part.

There is also the possibility that this question affords a further characterization of Saul. Jobling has suggested that perhaps there is a motif of Saul's ignorance in such texts as ch. 14, 17:55-58 and his statement in 22:8, "no one tells me anything."[90] It is possible that the narrative is painting a picture of Saul who is repeatedly ignorant and needs others to do what needs to be done. Jonathan defeats the Philistine garrison (ch. 14), Samuel is the one who slays Agag (ch. 15), Saul's servants are the ones who figure out how to solve his spiritual problem (ch. 16), and David kills Goliath (ch. 17).

Another possible intertextual echo that is sounded here is that of Saul's enigmatic episode among the prophets, which leads an onlooker to query, "who is their father?" (ומי אביהם), or perhaps, "who is *his* father?" (ומי אביו).[91] Why this connection would be made is difficult to say, because both texts are fraught with difficulty. However, it is interesting that shortly after Saul's anointing (10:1) there is a question about his parentage (10:12), just as shortly after David's anointing (16:12) there is a question about his parentage (17:55-58).[92]

We have not yet fully unlocked the potential of meaning behind this question, but we have noted that there is perhaps more going on in this question than appears at first glance. Abner's response to this question further suggests that there is more going on here. In response to the question about David's identity Abner replies to Saul, "As your soul lives O King, I do not know" (חי־נפשך המלך אם־ידעתי).[93] The phrase "as your soul lives" (חי־נפשך) is a set phrase and part of a standard oath formula that is most often attached to the phrase "as

---

[90] David Jobling, *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament (1 Samuel 13-31, Numbers 11-12, 1 Kings 17-18)* (JSOT Supp. 7; Sheffield, England: JSOT, 1978), 20-21, 25.

[91] MT and 4QSamª read אביהם, whereas the LXX, OL and Syr reflect אביו ("who is *his* father"). See McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 172. Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 30-31, prefer the LXX reading here.

[92] Cf. Edelman, *King Saul*, 134; Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 30-31; Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 189; and Gilmour, *Representing the Past*, 255. Edelman, suggests that in each case the implied identity of the father in question is Yhwh.

[93] The problems with translating נפש into English are legion. I have retained the translation of "soul," problematic as it is, for the sake of the smoothness of the English phrase "as your soul lives." Accordingly, the translation of נפש as "soul" in this instance implies all the requisite caveats and addenda. Let the reader understand.

Yhwh lives" (חי יהוה, e.g., 1 Sam. 20:3; 25:26; 2 Kgs. 2:2, 4, 6, 2 Kgs. 4:30). The use of the phrase "as your soul lives" within the context of the set oath formula may suggest simple "conscious deference" on the part of an inferior when addressing a superior.[94] However, it is decidedly odd in this context, and it may signify something else is going on here.

The phrase "as your soul lives" is used on its own four times in biblical narrative (1 Sam. 1:26; 17:55; 2 Sam. 11:11; 14:19). In his study of oath formulas in biblical narrative, Ziegler suggests that each of these instances of the phrase "as your soul lives" occur in contexts that do not require oaths and occur in contexts where "the recipient of the oath is directly threatened."[95] Thus, in these instances the formula is used "to reasure the party addressed that the speaker continues to view them as a person of authority."[96] The subtext of the scene in 1 Sam. 17:55-58 is certainly that Saul is threatened by the arrival and victory of David. Abner's use of this formula suggests that he is aware that the question of David's identity is a loaded question, and he begins his answer by reaffirming his loyalty to Saul. This is yet another sign that there is more going on in this scene than meets the eye.

Saul's response to Abner's ignorance is to ask him to ask that very question himself: "*You* ask whose son this youth is" (שאל אתה בן־מי־זה העלם). Several factors suggest this statement is important. First, Saul tells Abner to "ask" or "inquire" about David's parentage. Saul's very name means "asked" and the theme of asking has been one that has been woven throughout his story.[97] Thus, Saul telling his right hand man to "ask" a question, may tie this

---

[94] See Yael Ziegler, "'As the Lord Lives and as Your Soul Lives': An Oath of Conscious Deference," *VT* 58 (2008): 117-30.

[95] Yael Ziegler, *Promises to Keep: The Oath in Biblical Narrative* (VT Supp. 120; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 109. Ziegler treats the oath in 2 Sam. 11:11 separately since it is part of an odd formulation: חיך וחי נפשך (see pp. 109-11). Nevertheless, his suggestions about 2 Sam. 11:11 are similar to, if nuanced from, his suggestions about the other instances of this phrase.

[96] Ibid.

[97] It is frequently understood that Hannah's expressed etymological reason for Samuel's name ("I asked [שאל] him from Yhwh," 1 Sam. 1:20) is meant to connect Samuel to Saul in some way (see Peter D. Miscall, *1 Samuel: A Literary Reading* [Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986], 14). Furthermore, Saul's appointment as king is brought about because the people "asked" (שאל) for a king. Four times the narrative

pericope into wider themes in the book. Second, Saul seems to emphatically refer to Abner here, saying "*You* ask." Muraoka lists this verse as an example of the emphatic use of a personal pronoun to show "implicit contrast."[98] Thus, Saul would be contrasting himself with Abner, suggesting something along the lines of "*I* have already asked, now *you* go ask." It seems likely in the context of the narrative that this emphatic use of the pronoun would also emphasize the importance of the question and perhaps also imply a high level of emotion attached to this question on the part of Saul.[99] There may be other possible literary reasons for this emphasis, but we will come back to this issue.

The narrative now shifts to the time just after David's victory over Goliath, when Abner brings David to Saul.[100] The narrative frames David's movement to Saul with two references to his victory over Goliath (17:57):

> A. And as David returned from striking (נכה) the Philistine
> B. And Abner took him
> B'. And brought him before Saul
> A'. And the head of the Philistine was in his hand.

This double reference to David's victory over Goliath suggests to the reader that David's relationship with Saul is now framed by his victory over Goliath.

When David arrives before Saul, the king asks his question again, this time directed at David, "Whose son are you, young man?" This is now the third time in four verses that Saul has posed this question. Polzin is certainly correct when he notes that the repetition of this question three times in four verses "should at least alert the reader that Saul's questioning is being emphasized here with a vengeance."[101] We noted above that chronologically vv. 55-56

refers to the people "asking" (שאל) for a king (1 Sam. 8:10; 12:13, 17, 19).

[98] Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures*, 55. Cf. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 231.

[99] See *IBHS*, §16.3.1e; *WHS*, §106; Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures*, 58.

[100] It is perhaps of note that Abner is not recorded as asking about David's parentage, but is instead reported to bring David to Saul so that the king may ask David himself.

[101] Polzin, *Samuel*, 172.

and vv. 57-58 occur on opposite sides of the material contained in vv. 40-53. By juxtaposing these verses in this tight unit the repetition of the question about David's identity reaches a critical mass of emphasis. This leads to the possibility that perhaps the question is being put to Abner and David only secondarily, and is primarily being put to the reader.[102] Borgman has suggested that reader is being led to answer Saul's question: Just who is David?[103] To use Bakhtin's literary categories, it is certainly possible that this question of Saul's is being posed in double-voice. On one level the question is posed to Abner and to David. On another level it is being posed to the reader. On one level Saul is asking about David's family background. On another level the narrative is leading the reader to ask about the person and identity of David.[104]

We have thus far noted that there is more going on here than may be seen at first glance. We have not yet made a case for how this scene works in the present narrative. Polzin has offered perhaps the most concerted attempt to read 17:55-58 as a coherent part of the larger narrative. He notes many features in this section which inform his interpretation. First, he notes Saul's repeated reference to David as "this youth" (זה הנער zo or זה העלם) or "the youth" (הנער), which Polzin suggests implies Saul's derisive opinion of David.[105] Second, he notes that there is a significant narrative shift between the question in vv. 55-56 and the question in v. 58. In v. 58 when Saul is facing David, we can no longer assume that Saul does not know who David is, as we may have in vv. 55-56. Thus, Polzin suggests that where the first two instances of the question marked Saul's derision of David, the final instance of the question marks Saul's attempted coercion of David, as he attempts to get David to declare loyalty

---

[102] Note that in the second two occurrences of this question the pronoun "you" (אתה) is used.

[103] Borgman, *David, Saul, & God*, 46-48.

[104] Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 193, suggests that the question about David's identity should be read "as to his essence, his future as a charismatic leader, etc."

[105] Polzin, *Samuel*, 172-73.

to himself by proclaiming himself a son of Saul.[106] This David refuses to do, by identifying himself as the son of Jesse.

Polzin has helpfully noted many of the important features of this narrative, but has perhaps read too much into the text by suggesting that Saul is attempting to force David to identify as his own son. There does not seem to be a clear suggestion in the text that this is the meaning of his question. I suggest that the repeated question about David's identity is used here to emphasize the importance of this issue and the key narrative piece of information is found in David's answer.

In response to this question David identifies himself as "the son of your servant Jesse, the Bethlehemite" (בן־עבדך ישי בית הלחמי). This is a piece of information that both Saul (16:18), and the reader (16:1, 18; 17:12) already know. However, this reference appears to be more important than is often recognized. We have suggested that Saul's question about David's father is really a question about David's identity. In this section both Saul and the reader are asking the question of David's identity. Polzin is likely correct that the question of David's identity after he has defeated Goliath (v. 58) is likely different than the questions before he has defeated Goliath (vv. 55-56). However, they are likely different in urgency, not in meaning. Before David defeats Goliath Saul is certainly interested in the identity of this young man, but after he has defeated Goliath he is likely doubly interested and perhaps a little suspicious as well. His suspicions are likely confirmed by David's answer.

The reference to Jesse as the Bethlehemite is very rare. There are only four instances in the whole Hebrew Bible where someone is identified as a Bethlehemite (בית הלחמי). Three of them refer to Jesse the Bethlehemite (ישי בית הלחמי).[107] Thus, the reference to David being

---

[106] Ibid., 174-75.

[107] 1 Sam. 16:1, 18; 17:58. The other is 2 Sam. 21:19, which refers to Elhanan son of Jaare-oregim the Bethlehemite (בית הלחמי), who slew Goliath the Gittite. Analysis of this, though interesting, is beyond the scope of this study.

the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite recalls two sections, each of which convey important information about the character of David. Upon hearing David identify himself as the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, we imagine that Saul would recall David's resumé in 16:18, where his servant says, "I have seen a son of Jesse the *Bethlehemite* who knows how to play, who is a mighty man of valor, a man of war, understanding in word, a man of form, and Yhwh is with him." David's impressive resumé, which originally got him the job of court musician, may now be causing Saul to have concerns about this young warrior—a trajectory which will carry on into the next chapter.

The reader of this passage recalls one additional and significant piece of information about David. In 16:1, the Lord tells Samuel "go I am sending you to Jesse the *Bethlehemite*, for I have seen among his sons a king for myself." By identifying himself as the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite, David causes the reader to recall his royal destiny.

There has been much in 1 Samuel 16-17 about the character of David. We are told that the Lord looks approvingly upon his heart (16:7-13). We have been asked to consider his character by Eliab's accusation (17:28). His speeches have suggested that he understands the theological import of the moment (esp. 17:45-47), and his actions have suggested that he is fulfilling what he is destined to do. It is significant that the final episode of chapter 17 causes the reader (and Saul) to consider the identity of David, and in so doing to recall the important aspects of his character as expressed in 16:18 and the all-important fact that he is Yhwh's chosen king (16:1). This final episode in the MT version of 1 Samuel 17 makes the narrative much more about David's divinely appointed role, and sets up Saul's suspicions about this young and successful warrior.

4. 1 Reigns 18 / 1 Samuel 18

4.1. David and Jonathan (18:1-5)

The additional material in the MT continues with 18:1-5. The scene begins in 18:1 with the

phrase "And it happened when he finished speaking to Saul. . ." (ויהי ככלתו לדבר אל־שאול).

This sentence links this scene to the previous scene which ended with Saul questioning

David.[108] It also subtly links this scene with the following narrative material by noting that

David *finished* speaking to Saul. In the material that follows, especially the main section in

vv. 20-29 one of the main themes will be the indirect discourse between David and Saul.[109] As

Bodner notes, in a certain sense "Saul and David will never speak 'openly' (that is, without

posturing dissimulation, hidden agendas, or *double entendre*)."[110] The narrative will begin to

draw a distance between Saul and David, and this subtle introduction hints that the narrative

is moving in that direction.

What happens "as David finished speaking to Saul," is that Jonathan is moved with

affection toward David. The narrative describes this in a twofold description: 1) "And the life

of Jonathan was bound with the life of David" (ונפש יהונתן נקשרה בנפש דוד), and 2) "and

Jonathan loved him as his own life" (ויאהבהו יהונתן כנפשו[111]). These statements of Jonathan's

affection for David in 18:1 and elsewhere have led many scholars to theorize that the rela-

tionship between David and Jonathan is a homosexual relationship.[112] Though it is not the

purpose of this study to weigh in on this debate, there are several reasons that suggest that

the narrative interest in the relationship between David and Jonathan has nothing to do with

---

[108] Alter, *David Story*, 112; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 471.
[109] Though in the MT plus in 18:17-19, Saul and David do speak directly.
[110] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 192.
[111] Reading with *Qere*. *Ketib* reads ויאהבו, on which see Tsumura, *Samuel*, 471.
[112] For a review of the literature see Martti Nissinen, "Die Liebe von David und Jonatan als Frage de modernen Exegese," *Bib* 80/2 (1999): 250-63; and James E. Harding, "David and Jonathan Between Athens and Jerusalem," *Relegere* 1/1 (2011): 37-92.

homosexuality.[113] First, the phrase "And the life of Jonathan was bound with the life of David," is very similar to the description of Jacob's relationship with his youngest son Benjamin described in Gen. 44:30: "and his [Jacob's] life is bound with his [Benjamin's] life" (ונפשו קשורה בנפשו).[114] In the context of Genesis 44, this phrase communicates "inseparable devotion."[115] Thus, the context is one of strong familial relationship. Second, the verb "love" (אהב) is a key word in these early chapters of David's story and suggests certain political overtones.[116] Third, the theme of the love of David is one that is carried throughout 1 Samuel 18 as every character that David comes in contact with will love him.[117] Thus, the narrative seems to be interested in the David-Jonathan relationship as one which fits the theme of everyone's affection for David as well as showing the political loyalty Jonathan shows to David, which will be crucial to later episodes of the story.[118] This relationship is probably best explicated as a *ḥesed* relationship which includes both affection and loyalty.[119]

Verses 2-4 depict the actions of Saul and Jonathan toward David, presumably in response to his victory over Goliath. In 18:2, Saul takes David and does not allow him to return to his father's house. Thus, after David's victory over Goliath a new phase in his career has

---

[113] One entrance into this debate would be the article arguing that the David-Jonathan relationship reflects a homosexual relationship by Silvia Schroer and Thomas Staubli, "Saul, David and Jonathan—the Story of a Triangle? A Contribution to the Issue of Homosexuality in the First Testament" in *A Feminist Companion to Samuel and Kings* (ed. Athalya Brenner; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 22-36, and the two responses to this article by Markus Zehnder, "Exegetische Beobachtungen zu den David-Jonathan-Geschichten," *Bib* 79 (1998): 153-79; and idem, "Observations on the Relationship Between David and Jonathan and the Debate on Homosexuality," *WTJ* 69 (2007): 127-74.

[114] Cf. McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 305.

[115] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 471.

[116] See Thompson, "The Signficance of the Verb Love," 335-36; and Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Verb Love—ʾāhēb in the David-Jonathan Narratives—A Footnote," *VT* 25/2 (1975): 213-14. Cf. also Vermeylen, *Loi du plus fort*, 102.

[117] See above ch. 5. Cf. Gordon, *Samuel*, 159; Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 193.

[118] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 305. Otto Kaiser, "David und Jonathan: Tradition, Redaktion und Geschichte in 1 Sam 16-20, Ein Versuch," *ETL* 66/4 (1990): 281, compares the relationship between David and Jonathan with the relationships of "pairs of friends" (Freundespaaren) in classical literature such as Achilles and Patroclus, which are relationships of both political loyalty and affection. Cf. also Gooding, "Literary and Textual Problems," 78-79.

[119] See Kim, *Identity and Loyalty*, esp. 30-103.

begun. There will be no more going back and forth between his father's house and Saul's house (17:15). The only shepherding David will do from here on out will be shepherding the people of Israel (2 Sam. 5:2).

Verse 3 details Jonathan's action toward David and his reason for it: "And Jonathan cut a covenant with David because he loved him as his own life" (ויכרת יהונתן ודוד ברית באהבתו אתו כנפשו).[120] The theme of the covenant between Jonathan and David will recur throughout the following narrative.[121] The content of the present covenant is unclear, but later instances of covenantal type oaths between Jonathan and David contain promises of loyalty and protection of each other and each other's families (e.g., 1 Sam. 20:14-15; and 23:17). The reason for this covenant is Jonathan's love for David.

Following the making of the covenant, Jonathan clothes David in his own armament. The first and most important piece of clothing that passes from Jonathan to David is Jonathan's "robe" (מעיל). A "robe" has previously appeared in the narrative of 1 Samuel in a significant way. Samuel is given a "robe" (מעיל) by his mother (1 Sam. 2:19) and that robe is subsequently torn in an episode where it signifies that the kingdom has been torn away from Saul (1 Sam. 15:27-28). Thus a "robe" has been used in symbolically significant ways in the narrative to symbolize the kingdom. Here, where issues of kingship are hovering just below the surface, it seem likely that this transaction is meant to symbolize, to the reader at least, some sort of transfer of kingship from Jonathan, the heir apparent, to David, the anointed one.[122]

---

[120] The word order of יהונתן ודוד preceded by the singular verb ויכרת shows that the initial subject, Jonathan, is the more important individual here and likely the primary actor of the verb. See Caquot and de Robert, *Samuel*, 220; Alter, *David Story*, 112; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 472. On this grammatical rule see E.J. Revell, "Concord with Compound Subjects and Related Uses of Pronouns," *VT* 43 (1993): 72-73.

[121] Shimon Bakon, "Jonathan," *JBQ* 23/3 (1995): 148-49, speaks of three separate covenants between Jonathan and David at 18:3; 20:14-15; and 23:17. See also 2 Sam. 1:26; 2 Sam. 9:1; and 21:7.

[122] See Julian Morgenstern, "David and Jonathan," *JBL* 78/4 (1959): 322-25; Mettinger, *King and Messiah*, 39; Gunn, *Fate of King Saul*, 80; Prouser, "Suited to the Throne," 31-32; Birch, "Books of Samuel," 1120; and Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 193. See Firth, *Samuel*, 208 for other significant uses of a "robe."

The symbolic transfer of clothing and weaponry continues as Jonathan gives David his garment (מד), sword (חרב), bow (קשת), and belt (חגור). Jonathan's action of arming David, with the previous action of giving him his "robe" and his covenant with him seems to further suggest that he is abdicating his right to the throne in favor of David.[123] Two of these items, a "garment" (מד) and "sword" (חרב), were offered by Saul (17:38-39). Before the battle with Goliath David would not accept the royal armaments, perhaps symbolically to distance his victory from Saul. Now, after his victory, David is able to accept the royal armament, perhaps suggesting that now he has earned it. David's acceptance of the sword is doubly significant, because of the importance that "swords" have played in this narrative. David, who rejected Saul's sword (17:39) and won the victory over Goliath without a sword (17:47, 50), cut off the head of the Philistine champion with his own sword (17:51), has now accepted the sword of Saul's heir (18:4). For someone who has won his greatest victory without a sword, he now has two very significant swords.[124]

In our analysis of 17:38-39, we noted that there is a common motif of arming the hero in epic literature. Here, however, we have a scene of arming the hero after the combat. Thus, the arming likely has a different significance. This is one further indication that Jonathan's arming of David is functioning on a symbolic level.

Verse 5 then tells of the first of David's continuing military success as David goes and has success in all the missions that Saul sends him so that Saul appoints him to a position of leadership in the military. This verse may be anticipating Saul's appointment of David over his military men in 18:13,[125] or it could be a first step in David's high rising career. The latter possibility seems more likely since in this instance it is David's success that appears to be the

---

[123] Jobling, *Sense of Biblical Narrative*, 12.

[124] The episode in 1 Sam. 20:18-23 may suggest that Jonathan is particularly known as an archer and thus the gift of his bow (קשת) in 18:4 would also be particularly significant.

[125] See Willis, "Redactional Joints," 306-08.

reason for David's promotion,[126] whereas in 18:13, it is Saul's fear of David that leads to his promotion. Thus, in the present form of the narrative, David's promotion in 18:5 appears to be a first step in his military career.

The final note in this section tells of David's appeal to all the people, even the servants of Saul. This final notice, along with Jonathan's love of David and his continued military success introduces some of the key themes in ch. 18. This portion of the text thus functions as a significant introduction to the narrative that follows.[127] The LXX version of ch. 18 has its own logic in introducing this chapter. However, the MT plus sets up several of the themes that will recur in ch. 18, and sets up the David-Jonathan relationship which will play a significant role in the rest of 1 Samuel.[128]

The Common Story Continues . . .

The story continues by detailing David's return from battle and the response of the women of all the cities of Israel (18:6). They all come out and sing their song "Saul has slain (נכה) his thousands, and David his ten thousands" (18:7). The result is that Saul views this as evil and he "eyes David suspiciously" from that day onward (18:8-9).

4.2. David and Saul, Spirit and Spear (18:10-11)

In the MT the narrative continues in 18:10, "And it happened the next day" (ויהי ממחרת). This temporal reference ties the episode in vv. 10-11 with the previous episode which took place on the day David slew Goliath (vv. 6-9).

---

[126] 1 Samuel 18:5 is textually difficult. On this reading which sees David's promotion as a result of his military success see Johnson, "Reconsidering 4QSamᵃ."

[127] Cf. Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 232.

[128] Cf. Jobling, *Sense*, 12; Green, *Bakhtin*, 79-82; and Hutton, *Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 253.

This scene, which tells of Saul being seized by an evil spirit of God[129] and trying to impale David with his spear, has such significant similarities with 19:9-10 that many scholars speak of the passage in 18:10-11 as being modeled on or a duplicate of that later passage.[130] However, explaining 18:10-11 in this way does not do justice to how interconnected this passage is with many episodes and themes in 1 Samuel.

The first note in this episode is that "an evil spirit of God seized Saul" (ותצלח רוח אלהים רעה על־שאול). The similarity between this passage and several others can be easily noted:

1 Sam. 10:10[131] ותצלח עליו רוח אלהים
1 Sam. 11:6 ותצלח רוח־אלהים על־שאול
1 Sam. 16:13 ותצלח רוח־יהוה אל־דוד
1 Sam. 18:10 ותצלח רוח אלהים רעה אל־שאול

In 10:10 the spirit of God (אלהים) rushes upon Saul in fulfillment of the signs that Samuel had given Saul after his anointing. Thus, the language in 18:10 recalls the rush of the spirit upon Saul at his anointing.[132] In 11:6, the spirit of God (אלהים) rushes upon Saul in response to the story of the woes of the people of Jabesh at the hand of Nahash the Ammonite. The spirit rushes upon Saul and stirs him to action. The victory against Nahash is one of the high points of Saul's early career. In 16:13-14, the spirit of Yhwh (יהוה) rushes upon David, while the spirit of Yhwh (יהוה) turns aside from Saul and an evil spirit from Yhwh torments Saul.[133]

---

[129] Though 16:14 identifies this injurious spirit as "an evil spirit *from* Yhwh" (רוח־רעה מאת יהוה), later references speak of it in a grammatically ambiguous manner, an "evil spirit *of* God" (רוח אלהים רעה). Thus, I prefer the grammatically ambiguous translation "an evil spirit of God."

[130] E.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 305; Klein, *1 Samuel*, 188.

[131] Cf. the prediction of this event in 10:6.

[132] Cf. Nelson, "1 Samuel 16-18 and 19:8-10," 131-32; Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 36-37.

[133] See Nelson, "1 Samuel 16-19 and 19:8-10," 132-33; and Howard, "The Transfer of Power," 473-83. Cf. also Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 36-37.

Thus, the reference to the spirit rushing upon Saul also recalls the movement of spirits from Saul to David and many of the key elements in the early chapters of 1 Samuel.

The mention of an evil spirit of God (רוח אלהים רעה) recalls a different but overlapping series of intertexts.[134] This passage most clearly recalls chapter 16, where an "evil spirit" is referenced in vv. 14, 15, 16, and 23. In 16:14-16 the problem and planned solution to Saul's spiritual problem is discussed and v. 23 narrates solution to it in summary fashion, "And it happened *when* the spirit of God was upon Saul. . ." (והיה בהיות רוח־אלהים אל־שאול). The narrative episode in 18:10-11 appears to be a particular instance of the kind of thing that would happen repeatedly according to 16:23.[135] Thus, the short episode in 18:10-11 rather than appearing "out of place at this point,"[136] logically ties in the beginning of the antagonism between Saul and David with the important theme of the "evil spirit from God" which will continue to play a role in the next chapter (19:9-10).

The story then continues to narrate what happens as a result of the evil spirit rushing upon Saul: "and he raved/prophesied in the midst of the house" (ויתנבא בתוך־הבית). The meaning of the hithpael form of נבא appears to convey something like "act as a prophet,"[137] although numerous uses of this formulation, as here in 18:10, suggests that it may convey frenzied or ecstatic behavior and is frequently translated here as "rave" (e.g., NRSV,

---

[134] For a wider set of references to the "evil spirit" motif see Routledge, "An Evil Spirit from the Lord," 3-22; and Hamori, "The Spirit of Falsehood," 15-30.

[135] See further Nelson, "1 Samuel 16-18 and 19:8-10," 132-33; and Hamori, "The Spirit of Falsehood," 19-20.

[136] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 305.

[137] See *HALOT*. On this category of the hitphael see *GKC* §54e; *IBHS* §26.1.2c; and 26.2f; and Keith N. Grüneberg, *Abraham, Blessing and the Nations: A Philological and Exegetical Study of Genesis 12:3 in its Narrative Context* (BZAW 332; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003), 205-06.

NASB).[138] The importance for our purposes is not the precise action that is in view here, but the narrative connections and themes that this activity suggests in the present passage.

Like the reference to the spirit seizing Saul, this reference to Saul prophesying (hithpael of נבא) recalls Saul's initial spiritual experience in chapter 10, when he joins a group of prophets in their prophetic activity (10:10-13) in fulfillment of the sign that Samuel had given him (10:5-6). In this instance, Saul's prophesying is a positive experience that is part of signifying that the spirit of the Lord is upon him.[139] It is of interest that this event leads to the proverbial phrase in 10:11, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" and that it includes Saul prophesying in the midst a band of prophets.

Saul's next bout of prophecy does not happen in the midst of a band of prophets but in the midst of his own house. Though Saul is seized by the spirit in chapter 11, after his initial prophetic activity at his anointing in chapter 10, Saul does not prophesy again until the present text in 18:10. In chapter 10 Saul prophesies because he is seized by the "spirit of God" (רוח אלהים). In 18:10 Saul prophesies because he is seized by an "evil spirit of God" (רוח אלהים רעה). It appears that prophetic activity can be instigated by the "evil spirit" as well as the "spirit of God."[140] It is significant that Saul's prophetic activity, which began as a positive activity, now has such negative associations. In fact, in light of the previous reference that the "evil spirit from Yhwh tormented (בעת) Saul," (16:14), it seems that Saul's "prophesying" in 18:10 may be more akin to a manic state than to ecstatic utterance.

---

[138] David G. Firth, "Is Saul Also Among the Prophets? Saul's Prophecy in 1 Samuel 19:23," in *Presence, Power, and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament* (ed. David G. Firth and Paul D. Wegner; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011), 302, notes that "at no point in the books of Samuel does the verb mean 'to proclaim Yahweh's word'." However, on some of the difficulties in automatically assuming the hithpael of נבא suggests frenzied or ecstatic behavior see John R. Levison, "Prophecy in Ancient Israel: The Case of Ecstatic Elders," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 503-21.

[139] See Firth, "Is Saul Among the Prophets," 296-97.

[140] Firth, "Is Saul Among the Prophets," 300; Levison, "Prophecy in Ancient Israel," 509.

Saul's negative prophetic experiences will continue in chapter 19. After David escapes Saul's initial attempts at his life, Saul sends men out to capture David. However, they cannot reach him because each time they try the "spirit of God" comes upon them and they "prophesy" (19:20-21). Apparently fed up with his men's failures Saul himself goes to capture David only to suffer the same fate: "And the spirit of God also came upon him, and he continued to go along, and he prophesied" (19:23). The text goes on to detail more about Saul's prophetic activities, which this time includes stripping off his clothes and laying naked all day and night (19:24). In this case, Saul's prophetic activity is a stalling tactic that keeps him from getting to David and allows David to escape.[141]

We can thus understand Saul's prophetic experience in 18:10 as part of a narrative arch. Saul's initial prophetic experience, initiated by the spirit of God, is a positive sign of the Lord's presence with Saul (10:10-13). His final prophetic experience is one in which the spirit of God inhibits him from capturing the Lord's anointed, David (19:23-24). In between these two references, Saul's prophetic experience in 18:10 is one in which the *evil* spirit of God causes him to prophecy. In the context this appears to be a negative experience, one from which he needs relief, but it is not yet an experience which shows that the spirit of God is overtly working against him as in 19:23-24. Saul's prophetic experiences, like his spiritual relationships, mark his steady decline from positive, to worrying, to negative.[142]

Before we learn of Saul's next act after his prophesying, the story provides a little narrative blocking: "Now David was playing what was in his hand, as he did day by day, but a spear was in Saul's hand." The juxtaposition of these two clauses paints the picture of each of the two important men and what they have in their hands: Saul, his spear, and David, his

---

[141] Cf. Firth, "Is Saul Among the Prophets," 302.
[142] Cf. Ibid., 304-05; and Firth, *Samuel*, 209-10.

lyre.[143] Both of these actions carry interesting resonances. With David's lyre, we recall his role as court musician (16:23). With Saul's spear, we recall his failure to act in chs. 13-14, when only he and Jonathan had swords and spears (13:22). However, we also recall Goliath's famous spear (17:7) and that David made a point of saying that the Lord does not save with sword *and spear* (17:45, 47). Again, the equipment of David is differentiated from the equipment of Saul and we continue to see that their characterization is different as well.[144]

With the scene thus set, each man holding what is in his respective hands, Saul hurls the spear (18:11). With the spear hanging in mid air, the reader is told, not who the spear is directed at, though we can guess, but Saul's internal thoughts: "And Saul said 'I will strike David into the wall!'" (אכה בדוד ובקיר).[145] Three things are significant about this phrase. First, the placement of this phrase, while the spear is in mid-air, creates narrative suspense, as the reader must hear of the intent behind the thrown spear before hearing of its success. Second, the declaration of Saul's thoughts is another instance in this chapter of a series of insights into Saul's internal monologues (18:8, 11, 17, 21) and assessments (18:8, 9, 12, 15, 20, 29, 30). As we noted above, in ch. 18 the reader is given unprecedented access into Saul's mind,[146] and what we see there is largely antagonistic toward David. Third, Saul says he will "strike" (נכה) David. In ch. 17, the question of who will strike (נכה) whom was one of the key questions. However, in ch. 17 the only subjects of the verb "strike" (נכה) are Goliath in his challenge (17:9) and David repeatedly (17:9, 25, 26, 27, 36, 46, 49, 50).[147] Now for the first time, other

---

[143] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 479.

[144] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 223.

[145] On the idiom וב . . . ב. as meaning "strike them together" or, in this instance, "I will pin David to the wall," see Driver, *Samuel*, 152. Cf. Deut. 15:17. Tsumura, *Samuel*, 478, thinks the *waw* has an emphatic function here.

[146] Cf. Green, *How the Mighty Are Fallen*, 297.

[147] Admittedly, vv. 9, 25, 26, and 27 do not mention David specifically, but each speak of the one who is able to strike, which turns out to be David.

than in the women's song,[148] Saul is the subject of the verb "strike" (נכה). This reference to Saul attempting to "strike" (נכה) David in such close proximity to David's "striking" (נכה) in ch. 17 draws a sharp contrast between the two characters.[149]

Saul's attempt to "strike" David is unsuccessful, and the narrative informs us that "David eluded him, twice." The narrator informs us retrospectively, what we will learn later (19:9-10), that Saul's attempt to spear David is not a one-time thing.[150]

In sum, the short episode in 18:10-11, though bearing similarities to 19:9-10, is a meaningful episode in its own right and in its own context which weaves an intricate web of intertextual connections with other sections of 1 Samuel to produce an important segment in the characterization of Saul, and by inference, David. This is a key moment in Saul's spiritual journey and the first open antagonism between David and Saul.

In the larger narrative, however, this scene does change the progression of the antagonism between Saul and David. We noted that in the LXX version of the story, the first explicit antagonism between Saul and David was given in 18:21, where Saul plots to use Michal as a foil for David. Thus in the Greek text the progression of Saul's plotting against David is a slow and linear progression. In the MT, it begins with the outright aggression of a thrown spear (18:10-11), then two attempts at a subtle assassination (18:17; 21), before it turns back to open attempts on David's life (19:1; 9-10; 11-17). Thus, inasmuch as the episode in 18:10-11 makes for a logical progression in Saul's spiritual journey, it complicates the progression of the Saul-David relationship.

---

[148] Note, however, that in the women's song Saul's striking of thousands is compared with David's striking of ten thousands.

[149] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 196, also notes that the effectiveness of the two characters' attempts at "striking" draws further contrast between them.

[150] Cf. Fokkelman, *Crossing Fates*, 224. Whether this is a reference to Saul's attempt in 19:9-10 or simply a reference that Saul tried this repeatedly, the point is the same.

The Common Story Continues . . .

The narrative continues with Saul's continued fear of David (18:12). In the LXX version of the story, Saul's fear of David is simply an extension of his "eyeing" him in 18:9. In the MT, however, Saul's fear of David in 18:12, is instigated by Saul's continued infliction by the evil spirit, and David's ability to elude him in 18:10-11. Each version has its own narrative logic, but each is substantially different in the larger narrative arch of chapter 18. In each case, the result of David's appointment, is success and adoration from all Israel and Judah (18:16). However, from this point the MT includes the narrative of Saul's initial offer to David of his daughter Merab.

4.3. David and Merab (18:17-19)

The episode of David and Merab[151] is another instance where scholars tend to see parallel accounts. Here David's potential marriage of Saul's daughter Merab (18:17-9), is seen as a parallel account of his actual marriage of Saul's daughter Michal (18:20-26).[152] In its current form, however, this episode adds to the existing narrative in a number of interesting ways.

Unlike the episode of David and Michal (18:20-26), which begins with Michal's love of David (18:20), the present episode begins with Saul offering his eldest daughter Merab to David for a wife (18:17). Saul is the instigator of this event. While scholars often note that this offer appears to be dependent upon the promise referenced in 17:25,[153] the text itself does not explicitly connect this offer to the promise in 17:25. Instead, this offer follows immediately on a scene which ended with Saul being greatly afraid of David and all Israel and Judah

---

[151] I retain the MT's spelling of Merab (מֵרַב), despite the attestation of Merob by 4QSamᵃ (מרוב) and LXX^AL (Μεροβ), simply because I am using MT here as my base text. On this see McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 254.

[152] See H.J. Stoebe, "David und Mikal: Uberlegungen zur Jugendegeschichte Davids," in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran: Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen und altorientalischen Forschung* (BZAW 77; ed. Johannes Hempel and Leonhard Rost; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958), 224; Hertzberg, *Samuel*, 160: and Hutton, *Transjordanian Palimpsest*, 262-63.

[153] E.g., McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 306; Gordon, *Samuel*, 161; Alter, *David Story*, 115; Tsumura, *Samuel*, 482.

loving him (18:15-16) and is rationalized by Saul as a strategy to get rid of David at Philistine hands.[154] So while 17:25 may offer some narrative logic for his offer, in the text of 18:17-19 Saul is portrayed as the instigator of this action and the only rationale suggested by the text is his fear of David's growing success and popularity (18:15-16).

Saul puts a stipulation on his offer. He tells David "only be for me a son of valor and fight the battles of Yhwh."[155] It is not without a little narrative irony that Saul requests that David do exactly what he has been doing, i.e., having military success. The very thing which has been distressing Saul is the very thing that he requests from David. It is further ironic that the narrative has led us to expect Saul to offer his daughter to David because he has killed a Philistine but instead Saul offers his daughter so that David will be killed by Philistines.[156]

The narrative then affords another example of Saul's internal monologue. He says, "that my hand not be against him, let the hand of the Philistines be against him." The last time we heard an interior monologue of Saul, he was also plotting David's death (18:11). However, since the last internal monologue was recorded as he was in the act of hurling a spear at David, the reader gets the impression that Saul did not give this act much forethought. In the present instance, Saul's plan is a little more subtle. Saul's plot to have David killed in battle foreshadows David's use of the same strategy to remove Uriah, though David will have more murderous success than Saul.[157]

David's response is a set of rhetorical questions that communicate self-abasement:[158] "Who am I and who are the people of my father's family in Israel that I should become son-

---

[154] Cf. Polzin, *Samuel*, 177.

[155] Note that Saul's pious language of "battles of Yhwh" (מלחמות יהוה) is somewhat reminiscent of David's language in 17:46-47. Cf., Green, *How Are the Mighty Fallen*, 302.

[156] Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 198; Miscall, *Workings of Old Testament Narrative*, 64.

[157] Firth, *Samuel*, 207. Alter, *David Story*, 115, suggests that Saul's transparency in the narrative may reflect "his incapacity in the harsh realm of politics."

[158] See Coats, "Self-Abasement," 18.

in-law to the king?"[159] We recall that David has a penchant for asking rhetorical questions (e.g., 17:26, 29; 18:18, 23). Though it has been suggested that David's reply is a refusal of the offer,[160] it is possible that this is a way of giving thanks,[161] and thus may suggest acceptance of the offer. David's reply does, however, repeat the theme of identity by asking yet again about David's paternity.[162] David's reply also recalls Saul's own questions about his humble origins in 9:21.[163] Here is another element which causes the reader to compare Saul and David. In this case, their origins are quite similar and humble, leading the reader to ask about the subsequent differences between the two characters.

Saul has made an offer that David can certainly fulfill and David's response is ambiguous enough to suggest that he will accept the offer. Thus, the reader expects that David will be married to Merab. However, "when the time came to give Merab, the daughter of Saul, to David, he gave her to Adriel the Meholathite for a wife" (18:19). In addition to the abrupt and surprising introduction of Adriel the Meholathite,[164] this turn of events leads to a number of questions. Why did Saul withdraw the offer of Merab? Did David refuse it? Is Saul suspicious of David's royal aspirations? The narrative leaves these questions unanswered and gives no obvious reason for why Merab was not given to David.

Though the reader may not know Saul's reasons for reneging on his offer of Merab to David, the deceptive act of going back on a promise of a marriage proposal has certain resonances with another biblical story about a young hero, an older man, and his two daughters: the story of Jacob's dealings with Laban for the marriage of Leah and Rachel. There are multiple resonances between these two stories: the deceptive dealings of the father regarding the

---

[159] On the difficulty of חיי, translated here as "people," see Tsumura, *Samuel*, 483.
[160] So Edelman, *King Saul*, 140-41.
[161] See Bridge, "Self-Abasement," 255-59.
[162] See above on 17:55-58.
[163] Edelman, *King Saul*, 140.
[164] Adriel the Meholathite will only appear again in 2 Sam. 21:8, which is itself a textually difficult and problematic verse. On this see J.J. Glück, "Merab or Michal," *ZAW* 77 (1965): 72-81.

marriage of his two daughters, the love of the younger daughter not the elder, a changing

bride-price for the marriage offers, and an odd case of hidden teraphim in each story (1 Sam.

19:13; Gen. 31:33-35).[165] The question is: how does recognizing these resonances nuance our

reading of this episode in 1 Samuel 18?

In the narrative of Jacob and Laban and his daughters, deception plays a key theme.[166]

Each character appears to be trying to get the upper hand on the other. This functions as an

instructive comparison to the narrative of Saul and David. For while Saul is consistently deal-

ing deceptively with David, David in turn does not appear to be dealing deceptively with

Saul. In fact, David foils Saul's plots, not by resorting to his own deceptions, but by sheer

success. Saul fears David's divine approval and so places him in the military (18:12-13), but

this only leads to more success for David (18:14-16). Saul attempts to get David killed by set-

ting an outrageous bride-price of one hundred Philistine foreskins (18:21, 25), but David suc-

ceeds beyond Saul's wildest dreams, or rather fears (18:27). David does not resort to decep-

tion in his relationship with Saul. He has no need. He overwhelms Saul because Yhwh is with

him. We may not know why Saul offered Merab to David and then changed his mind, but the

very act helps us to recall the Jacob narrative and offer a heuristically useful comparison be-

tween Jacob the deceitful one and David the successful one.

The Common Story Continues. . .

---

[165] See Stoebe, "David und Mikal," 237-40; Miscall, *Workings of Old Testament Narrative*, 87-88; and Robert B. Lawton, "1 Samuel 18: David, Merob, Michal," *CBQ* 51 (1989): 423-25. Other links between the David story and the patriarchal narratives have been proposed, e.g., see Craig Y.S. Ho, "The Stories of the Family Troubles of Judah and David: A Study of their Literary Links," *VT* 49/4 (1999): 514-31. Brueggemann, "Narrative Coherence," 233, n. 22, thinks that this "typological" approach is misguided. However, there appears to be enough similarity between the two stories to suggest that they can be fruitfully read against each other.

[166] For a recent exploration of this theme see John E. Anderson, *Jacob and the Divine Trickster: A Theology of Deception and Yhwh's Fidelity to the Ancestral Promise in the Jacob Cycle* (Siphrut 5; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011), 87-129.

The final episode of the story tells of Michal's love for David, Saul's subsequent offer and bride-price, and David's success and marriage to Michal. The story continues to tell of Saul's deception toward David, and David's continuing success. In the LXX, this episode concludes chapter 18 with the note that "Saul continued to fear from David still." The MT adds a few more concluding statements.

4.4. Summary and Prospect (18:29b-30)

The MT of chapter 18 includes the following final notices: "And Saul was an enemy to David all his days. And the chiefs of the Philistines marched out, and it was as often as they marched out, David had more success than all the servants of Saul. And his name became very great." This final note explicitly brings out two themes that were present in all of chapter 18. First, David is now officially "the enemy," or rather, Saul is officially an "enemy" to David.[167] The label "enemy" (איב) has so far in 1 Samuel been used predominantly of the Philistines (1 Sam. 4:3, 14:24, 30, 47; 18:25). Now, in the conclusion of ch. 18, Saul is officially the "enemy" of Yhwh's anointed. Second, v. 30 sounds the theme of David's success against the Philistines. The phrase "and it was as often as they marched out," specifically notes David's *repeated* success, even success above all the rest of Saul's servants. David is now officially the highest rising servant in Saul's court. This notice of Saul's antagonism and David's success simply repeats what the reader has been encountering throughout chapter 18, but the summary and conclusion here in 18:29b-30, re-emphasize that theme and sets the stage for everything that will follow.

---

[167] Cf. Bodner, *1 Samuel*, 201.

5. Conclusion

We have now read through the version of the story contained in MT, summarizing the sections common to both MT and LXX and offering a closer analysis of the MT pluses. In light of the preceding analysis it seems evident that the pluses contained in MT make that version of the story substantially different from the version contained in the LXX. The outlines of the two versions are represented below.[168]

Table 12: Outline of the Two Versions of the David and Goliath Story

LXXᴮ	MT
1 Reigns 16	**1 Samuel 16**
The Lord Sees David (16:1-13)	The Lord Sees David (16:1-13)
Saul Sees David (16:14-23)	Saul Sees David (16:14-23)
1 Reigns 17	**1 Samuel 17**
Setting the Scene (17:1-40)	Setting the Scene (17:1-40)
Geography (17:1-3)	Geography (17:1-3)
Enter the Giant (17:4-10)	Enter the Giant (17:4-10)
Reaction (17:11, 32)	Reaction (17:11, 32)
--	*Shepherd Boy's Challenge (17:12-31)*
Debating David's Daring (17:33-37)	Debating David's Daring (17:33-37)
What David Will Do (17:36)	--
Arming and Disarming (17:38-40)	Arming and Disarming (17:38-40)
Single Combat (17:42-51a)	Single Combat (17:42-51a)
--	*Drawing Near to David (17:41)*
Battle of Words (17:42-47	Battle of Words (17:42-47
David's Taunt (17:43b)	--
Battle of Arms (17:51a)	Battle of Arms (17:50-51a)
--	*David Runs to Goliath (17:48b)*
--	*Goliath's Death, Take One (v. 50)*
Aftermath (17:51b-54)	Aftermath (17:51b-58)

[168] Minuses depicted with --, pluses depicted in *italics*.

273

Geography of a Victory (17:51b-54)	Geography of a Victory (17:51b-54)
--	*Whose Son is This? (17:55-58)*
1 Reigns 18	**1 Samuel 18**
--	*David and Jonathan (18:1-6a)*
The Love of Women (18:6b-9)	The Love of Women (18:6b-9)
--	*David, Saul, Spirit, Spear (18:10-11)*
The Love of All Israel (18:12-16)	The Love of All Israel (18:12-16)
--	*David and Merab (18:17-19)*
The Love of Michal (18:20-29a)	The Love of Michal (18:20-29a)
--	*Summary and Prospect (18:29b-30)*

Having closely examined all the large MT pluses and their effect on the narrative of 1 Samuel 16-18, we have seen that they impact the story in many ways.

The major MT plus in 17:12-31 impacts the story in terms of 1) pace, 2) genre, 3) foreshadowing, and 4) characterization. 1) The pace of the narrative is drastically changed. Instead of an immediate response to Goliath's challenge by David (v. 32), the narrative builds suspense and anticipation by telling a seemingly unrelated story about a boy bringing provisions to his brothers at war. 2) The genre of the story is shifted toward the folktale, since it is now a story about a young shepherd boy who happens to be at the battlefield at the right time and slays a giant of mythic proportions. 3) The story also foreshadows the issue of royal marriage which will play a key role in the coming chapters. 4) The characterization of David is shifted. He is depicted more as the young (קטן) shepherd boy. The narrative also allowed more dialogue where his character is challenged on issues of knowledge and heart, and he shows himself to be a young man of deeds (עשה) amongst men of words (דבר).

The pluses in vv. 41, 48b, and 50, all fruitfully utilize the narrative technique of repetition. The pluses in vv. 41 and 48b use framing repetition to emphasize the key theological

dialogue in vv. 42-47. Verse 50 repeats the key actions of David's victory over Goliath and draws extra emphasis to it and its theological character.

The plus in 17:55-58 offers a further chance for characterization of David. The reader is barraged with the question of "whose son is David?" This highlights what Saul knows about David, but more importantly what the reader knows about David—he is Yhwh's anointed one (16:1).

All of the pluses in chapter 18 include significant intertextual links to other portions of the narratives of 1 Samuel. The David and Jonathan episode in 18:1-5, in addition to sounding some of the royal themes with Jonathan's gift of his armor, set up the David-Jonathan relationship that will continue throughout the narrative. The issue of David and Saul and the spirit and spear, sounds many themes, especially the steady downward spiral of Saul's spiritual movement from the positive moments in chs. 10-11 towards negative moments in chs. 18-19. The episode of David and Merab adds an intertextual echo of the Jacob and Laban story, which highlights the fact that David does not appear to repay Saul's deceitfulness in kind. The final plus in 18:29b-30, summarizes many of the main themes of ch. 18 in such a way that the reader is set up to see how the plot will continue in the rest of the chapters detailing the tension between David and Saul.

It seems safe to say that claiming that MT pluses (or LXX minuses) "do not materially affect the shape of the story"[169] is misguided. They certainly do materially affect the shape of the story in numerous and interesting ways. The major MT plus in 17:12-31, for example, changes the whole register of the narrative of ch. 17.

It is sometimes argued that it looks like an editor has removed portions of 1 Samuel 17-18 in order for that text to fit better into the context of the surrounding narrative.[170] How-

---

[169] Halpern, *David's Secret Demons*, 7.
[170] E.g., Pisano, *Additions or Omissions*, 84-86.

ever, one thing that seems clear from the preceding analysis is that the texts that make up the MT pluses, difficult though they may sometimes be, are significantly interconnected with the surrounding material. However one accounts for this historically, it seems clear that the material in the MT pluses are not part of an unrelated narrative that has been worked into the text superficially.[171] However we arrived at having these two versions of the story historically, they are clearly two different versions, with two differently nuanced takes on this story. They should each be treated as texts in their own right, but not necessarily without reference to each other. For as we have seen, reading each version of the story against the other has proved to be an insightful exercise.

---

[171] Thus, the theory of Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 24-38, is attractive.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

1. Summary

In this study we have offered a close literary reading of the narrative of David and Goliath in 1 Reigns 16-18. In so doing we have explored a method of reading the Septuagint as a document in its own right that also recognized its status as a translated text allowing both of these features to inform the reading. The exercise of a close literary analysis of the Greek version of the story allowed us to examine the tendencies of the translator and some of the differently nuanced emphases of the Greek story. Finally, in offering this reading of the short septuagintal version of the David and Goliath narrative we have highlighted the literary difference between the two final versions of the story that exist in LXX^B and MT.

1.1. Telling the Story in Greek

In our analysis of the Greek version of the story we spoke of two different, though interrelated, aspects of the Greek version: 1) the tendencies of the translator and 2) the different emphases of the Greek text.

1.1.1. Characteristics of the Translator: The Translator as Storyteller

The first notable characteristic of 1 Reigns is that the translator is consistently faithful to his *Vorlage*. The translator appears to prefer representing every Hebrew word, even when this

281

makes unidiomatic Greek, and follows the Hebrew word order. He also appears to provide good matches of Greek words for Hebrew words in terms of lexical meaning and grammatical form. In our analysis we have noted this fact on occasion but have not focused on it, because it is a well established characteristic of the translation.[1]

The second characteristic of 1 Reigns is that the translation shows signs of the translator's own literary sensitivity. This is an element of the translational tendency of 1 Reigns that we have noted frequently throughout this study. Examples of this are numerous. The translator used varied verb tenses (especially aorist, imperfect, and historical present) in order to structure the narrative (e.g., 17:1-4, 34-37, 52; 18:26, 27). The translator was also adept at using the Greek imperfect to convey repeated or continuous action in instances that were called for contextually but not grammatically from his source text (e.g., 18:7, 13). The translator occasionally appeared to remove difficulties such as avoiding Saul putting mail on David after he had already put on the helmet (17:38) and attempting to explain how Goliath could be hit in the forehead when he was wearing a helmet (17:49). The translator occasionally adjusted his source text in order to provide a different narrative structuring such as creating a better parallel in Saul's repetition of the women's song in v. 7 so that it more closely matched the song as sung by the women in v. 8, or the reversal of word order in 18:16 to create an inclusio that framed the story of David's military appointment (18:13-16). The translator occasionally showed his ethnic bias in the translation of the Hebrew פלשתי with ἀλλόφυλος, depicting the Philistines as the quintessential "others."[2] The translator also showed occasional signs of wanting to protect the character of David. For example, in the Hebrew David refers to himself as "a poor man and dishonored" (איש־רש ונקלה). The Greek has

---

[1] Cf. Driver, *Samuel*, lx; Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive*, 176-90; Sollamo, *Semiprepositions*, 280-89; Tov, "Composition," 346; and Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 124.

[2] Cf. also the translation of "foreskins" (ערלת) with ἀκροβυστίαι, a word that is a play on the normal Greek word for foreskin (ἀκροποσθία) and the Hebrew word for shame, בשת.

transformed this to a "humble" (ταπεινός) man, which can refer to low social standing or to humility as a positive quality in contrast to pride, and "not honored" (οὐχὶ ἔνδοξος), thus softening David's self-deprecating comment. Finally, the translator has shown that he understands the story of David and Goliath within the Greek tradition of μονομαχία (see 17:6, 10). In short, though the translator of 1 Reigns is faithful to his Hebrew *Vorlage*, he also shows signs of communicating his source text into the linguistic, cultural and literary register of his Greek-speaking Jewish readers.

1.1.2. Emphases of the Greek Text

In our approach to reading the Septuagint we have proposed to interpret the Greek text first and foremost as a Greek text in its own right. This means that we occasionally commented upon the effect an element had upon the narrative whether or not we could determine if the element was intentional on the part of the translator or not. Though there were many subtle emphases in the Greek text that were different from the Hebrew, a few of them are set out below.

We noted repeatedly that the theme of "seeing," especially in ch. 16, but also in chs. 17 and 18, was a crucial part of the narrative. In the septuagintal version of the story there were a few additional references which sounded the key theme of "seeing." First, in 16:4, Samuel's title was given as "Seer" (ὁ βλέπων). This connected the narrative to ch. 9, where Samuel's title was also used, and provided the ironic insight that the "Seer" needed correction to see rightly (16:7). Second, in the key section about seeing in 16:7, the Greek text was afforded an additional reference to seeing with the phrase "for not as humankind will see, *will God see* (ὄψεται ὁ θεός)." Third, in ch. 18 we are told three times in the MT that Saul "feared"

283

David, using the terms ירא (in 18:12 and 29) and גור (in 18:15). In the Septuagint, though the first instance of Saul's fear is described with the word φοβέω (18:12), the next two instances are described with the word εὐλαβέομαι (18:15, 29), which more naturally means "be cautious, beware, watch out for" (see *LSJ*). While this is not a direct reference to "seeing," coupled with the note in 18:9 that Saul watched David suspiciously (ὑποβλεπόμενος τὸν Δαυίδ), we are perhaps given another hint at the theme of seeing.

Related to the tendency of the translator to protect David's image, noted above, the Greek text appears to have an extra emphasis on David as the good one. In 16:12a where the MT speaks of David as "good of appearance" (טוב ראי), the LXX adjusts this theme by describing David as "good of appearance *to the Lord* (ἀγαθὸς ὁράσει Κυρίῳ). Then, in 16:12b, where in the MT the Lord tells Samuel, "this is he" (זה הוא), in the LXX he says to Samuel, "this one *is good*" (οὗτος ἀγαθὸς ἐστιν).

Related to the translator's practice of using ethnically charged translation equivalents (ἀλλόφυλος = פלשתי, ἀκροβυστία = ערלה), the Greek text also afforded two additional derogatory references to Goliath, by including two pluses in which David referred to Goliath as "this uncircumcised one" (v. 36b: ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος; v. 37: τοῦ ἀπεριτμήτου τούτου).

We also noted that in the Greek text there appeared to be a couple of additional critiques of Saul. Perhaps the most notable, and possibly the most textually uncertain, was David's speech in 17:32. In the MT he says, "let no man's heart fall" (אל־יפל לב־אדם), and in the LXX he says, "let not my lord's heart fall" (Μὴ δὴ συμπεσέτω ἡ καρδία τοῦ κυρίου μου).[3] Though David's remark may be deferential language, the key theme of the heart and the reference to Saul allow the reader to imply that Saul's heart is being judged here.

[3] It is also possible to read the unique reading of LXX[B] in 17: 8 (Ἑβραῖοι καὶ Σαούλ) in this way.

In the LXX David is afforded two extra short speeches that nuance his character. When David makes his case before Saul that he is equipped to face the giant he recounts how he has struck down lions and bears. He then says that the giant will be as one of them. The Septuagint, however, adds, "*will I not go and strike him and remove the reproach from Israel today?* For *who is this uncircumcised Foreigner who* reproached the battle lines of the living God." (17:36, LXX plus in *italics*). David's speech here further connects his confident assertion with what actually happens in 17:49-51. Later, when David and the giant are facing off in a battle of words, Goliath asks, "am I a dog that you come to me with sticks?"[4] In the MT Goliath continues his speech, but in the LXX David responds, "No, but worse than a dog." Each of these extra speech moments for David nuance his character. His confidence in the Lord is emphasized in 17:36 and his rhetorical skill is emphasized in 17:43.

One final emphasis in the Greek text is David's wisdom. In 16:18 we noted that Reigns has translated the Hebrew phrase איש חיל ("man of might") with ἀνὴρ συνετὸς ("man of wisdom"), adding a reference to David's wisdom. In ch. 18 David's success (שׂכל) is translated as David's "prudence" or "wisdom" (συνίημι, 18:14-15). While we noted that the reason for this is likely the translator's tendency to use συνίημι to translate שׂכל, the effect this translation has on the narrative is an extra reference to David's wisdom.

Each of these elements is an instance where the Greek contains a differently nuanced piece of the story outside of the major versional differences contained in the large MT pluses. The major MT pluses nuance the story in more far reaching ways.

[4] 17:43. LXX: "Am I *like* a dog, that you come to me with stick *and stones*."

1.2. David and Goliath in Greek and Hebrew

The Hebrew and Greek versions of the David and Goliath story are substantially different. Many of these differences can be categorized as different narrative strategies and include: narrative pace, genre, and intertextuality.

In terms of narrative pace, the Septuagint version is a more streamlined narrative. In response to Goliath's challenge the Greek version moves directly from the fearful response of Saul and the people (v. 11) to the courageous and faithful response of David (v. 32). The MT instead introduces a long and seemingly unrelated narrative about a shepherd boy bringing food to his brothers. Both have rhetorical effect, but both change the pacing of the story. Immediately after David's victory (17:49-54) the Septuagint version of the story moves to the celebratory song of the women (18:6b). The narrative moves from victory to celebration. In the MT there are two additional and significant episodes, the chronologically disjunctive scene with Saul and Abner trying to figure out David's identity (17:55-58), and the initial scene of David and Jonathan's relationship (18:1-5). Where the MT includes two scenes about David, the LXX moves from David's victory to the consequences of that victory and the initial suspicion of Saul towards David's high-rising career. The rest of ch. 18 is also more streamlined in the LXX. It moves from the celebratory response of the women (18:6-9) to David's "promotion" and subsequent success (18:12-16), and to his marriage to Michal (18:20-29). The story is more linear and does not include the first scene of Saul's attempt to spear David (18:10-11), nor the initial offer of Merab (18:17-19). In all, the narrative pace of the LXX story is more simple and follows a more linear progression.

In terms of narrative genre, the two versions appear different. The Septuagint version is a story about a young member of the king's court having the courage and faith to do what the rest of the kingdom (and especially the king) was unwilling to do. The MT version has

more resonances with a folktale or epic story which tells of a young shepherd boy who is sent on a quest to bring his brothers food and ends up saving the kingdom by slaying a giant. Though both versions essentially tell the same story, the large plus in MT 17:12-31, changes the narrative register of the story and gives each version a different generic feel.

Though the MT version of the story has a significantly less linear progression, the material in the pluses allows for more significant intertextual resonances with many other parts of the David-Saul story as well as many other parts of the Hebrew Bible. We saw that the introductory phrase in 17:12 ("Now David was the son of this Ephrathite man from Bethlehem of Judea and his name was Jesse"), connected it with many other examples of this formulaic expression, both in 1 Samuel (1:1; 9:1) and elsewhere (Judg. 13:2). Eliab's rebuke of David in 17: 28 about "knowing" (ידע) the "evil" (רע) of his "heart" (לבב), resonated with key themes throughout the David story. The scene where Saul and Abner are trying to discern David's identity uses the title of Jesse the Bethlehemite to recall the key information about David in 16:1 and 16:18. The scene of David and Jonathan's covenant (18:1-5) connects with the rest of the David-Jonathan relationship as it will unfold in the next several chapters. We noted that the scene of Saul's spirit-induced "prophesying" and his attempt to pin David to the wall connected that scene within a story arc that included Saul's anointing (10:10-13), Saul's initial military victory (11:5-15), Saul's attempt to spear David again (19:9-10) and the spirit's opposition of Saul (19:23-24). We also noted that the initial offer of Merab allowed for an interesting intertextual resonance with the Jacob cycle and highlighted the fact that David, unlike his ancestor, did not resort to trickery to respond to Saul's deceptive dealings but simply foiled Saul's plans by fulfilling the impossible task Saul set him.

287

In short, the versions of the David and Goliath story in the MT and LXX both appear to have different narrative strategies. Each version is an artistically powerful story in its own way, but each has its own distinct emphases and narrative techniques.

2. Prospect

2.1. Septuagintal Interpretation

The impetus for the current investigation was the existence of two variant literary traditions of the David and Goliath story. The existence of a distinct literary edition in the Septuagint gave justification for the method we employed in interpreting the version of the story in the Septuagint as a narrative in its own right.[5] However, the fact that the Septuagint was, from a very early stage, considered Sacred Scripture in its own right,[6] suggests that an approach such as the one promoted here is acceptable for any septuagintal text. The recognition that the Septuagint is an important document in its own right has led to recent interest in interpreting it as such.[7]

The analysis offered in chs. 3-5 above showed that interpreting septuagintal narratives as narratives in their own right was an insightful exercise. Indeed, it does not take substantial changes to a narrative to nuance the literary presentation of a story.[8] Future studies on the

---

[5] Cf. Lust, "Hebrew and Greek Texts," 126; and Debel, "Greek 'Variant Literary Editions,'" 189-90.

[6] Cf. Robert Hanhart, "Introduction: Problems in the History of the LXX Text from Its Beginnings to Origen," in *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*, by Martin Hengel (Grand Rapids, MI; BakerAcademics, 2002), 5, though Hanhart is clear to point out that it derives this authority from "the canonical authority of the Hebrew original." However, by the time of the early church (e.g., in the NT) it seems to have attained sacred status in its own right. See Hengel, *Septuagint*, 22, 108-09.

[7] E.g., Gauthier, "Toward an LXX Hermeneutic," 65-69; and van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre,* 15-19. Stanley E. Porter, "Septuagint/Greek Old Testament," in *Dictionary of New Testament Backgrounds* (ed. Craig A. Evans and Stanley E. Porter; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2000), 1103, cites the need for studies of the LXX as a document in its own right.

[8] For an interesting and similar suggestion about the literary contribution of the Qumran texts see Keith Bodner, "Excavating Ideas: The Qumran Scrolls of Samuel," in *The World of Jesus and the Early Church: Identity and Interpretation in Early Communities of Faith* (ed. Craig A. Evans; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2011), 141-51.

literary sensitivity of the translators or narrative interpretations of septuagintal texts would likely be fruitful endeavors.

Related to the theme of treating the Septuagint as a document in its own right, a further area of investigation that is worth pursuit is the importance of the Septuagint as Sacred Scripture in its own right. Studies such as Müller and Wagner suggest that the Septuagint could be further harnessed for modern theological discussions.[9] An approach such as the one promoted here would be of service to those seeking to appropriate the Septuagint in the continuing life of religious communities.

2.2. Reading Multiple Versions of a Biblical Story

The majority of this study has been offering a reading of the LXX version of the David and Goliath story. In chapter 6 we discussed the literary differences between the LXX and MT. The purpose was to explore how each was distinct, not to decide which was chronologically prior. We suggested that such an approach in instances where we possess multiple versions of a biblical story is helpful. Approaching examples of texts which exist in multiple literary editions as a textual problem to be solved is a difficult and conjectural exercise. Our approach was to see the existence of multiple versions of a biblical story not as a problem to be solved but as a literary richness to be explored. Textual pluriformity in the biblical witness is an opportunity to explore the various contributions that each version has to offer. This, we suggest, is an exegetically fruitful perspective on many of the biblical texts.

In sum, this study has offered a reading of the septuagintal version of the David and Goliath story. We have probed a way to interpret the Septuagint that takes seriously its nature as a translation and as a literary document in its own right. We have explored the literary

---

[9] Müller, *First Bible*, esp., 124-41; and Wagner, "Septuagint," esp., 27-28. Cf. Hengel, *Septuagint*, 125-26.

differences between the two versions of the David and Goliath story and shown that they each have their own literary strategy for telling this iconic story. How this story came to be transmitted in two distinct versions remains a puzzle to this author, but the result is two entrances into a story that has captivated readers for millennia.

APPENDIX I

NARRATIVE SENSITIVITY AND THE USE OF VERB TENSE IN

1 REIGNS 17:34-37

In this study we have repeatedly seen a phenomenon of the variation of verb tense for literary reasons. What follows is the full presentation in which I make the case that the variation of verb tense[1] was due to the translator's own literary sensitivity not to other factors. The particular example of this phenomenon we will examine is the instance in 1 Rgns. 17:34-37.

As James Barr noted, "The reader of the LXX gains the impression that, very generally speaking, the matter of verb tense was well handled."[2] In many, if not most cases, the translators did not struggle with what tense to use in translating Hebrew verbs and proceeded along what Barr calls the "normal" patterns, e.g., Hebrew *wayyiqtol* is normally translated with a Greek aorist indicative.[3] Barr argued that in most cases the translators were dependent upon context to determine tense.[4] Anssi Voitila, however, has cautioned against this conclusion.[5] For Voitila, though the context of a text may have some part to play in the translator's decisions, the tendency of the translators to translate only short segments at a time

---

[1] My purpose in this section is not to contribute to the discussion of tense versus aspect in the Greek verb, but rather to suggest that the LXX translator of 1 Reigns varied his verb tense in communicating his Hebrew source text into Greek. Thus, I use the word tense to refer simply to the morphological form of the word (i.e., present, imperfect, aorist, etc.).

[2] James Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (ed. Claude E. Cox; SBLSCS 23; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987) 381.

[3] Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense," 384.

[4] Barr, "Translators' Handling of Verb Tense," 386.

[5] Anssi Voitila, "What the Translation of Tenses Tells About the Septuagint Translators," *SJOT* 10/2 (1996) 183-96.

means that context was not the major deciding factor. Rather, something like a "stereotyping tendency" in the matter of verb tenses explains the translators' reasonably-competent handling of tenses.[6] While Voitila may be correct that the normal procedure of the translators was something like stereotyping in terms of verb tenses, it seems implausible that context played little into the translation decision,[7] for there are instances where no explanation can be found for variations from the "normal" procedure other than a sensitivity to the literary context. One such example, I suggest, is David's boast in 1 Rgns. 17:34-37.

1. David's Boast in Hebrew

Before understanding the translators' handling of David's boast we must understand the rhetorical use of verb patterns in the Hebrew. This passage has been well examined elsewhere,[8] so our discussion need only discuss the verbal patterns utilized in David's speech.

The speech begins with a periphrastic participial construction (היה + ptc) which sets the speech in something like perfective past time, "your servant was shepherding" (רעה היה).[9] Following this construction is a string of *weqatal* forms that should be read as iteratives:[10] "would come . . . would take . . . would go out . . . would strike . . . would deliver . . . etc."

---

[6] Voitila, "Translation of Tenses," 195-96.

[7] Indeed many of Voitila's examples fail to convince. See T.V. Evans, "Some Alleged Confusions in Translation From Hebrew to Greek," *Bib* 83/2 (2002) 238-48.

[8] E.g., Anthony R. Ceresko, "A Rhetorical Analysis of David's 'Boast' (1 Sam. 17:34-37): Some Reflections on Method," *CBQ* 47 (1985) 58-74.

[9] See *Joüon-Muraoka*, §121f; and *Waltke-O'Connor*, §37.7.1b. Cf. David Toshio Tsumura, *The First Book of Samuel* (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2007) 457-58. This is regularly an idiom depicting past continuous action (e.g. Deut. 9:7, 22, 24).

[10] See Jan Joosten, "Biblical Hebrew *weqatal* and Syriac *hwa qatel* Expressing Repetition in the Past," *ZAH* 5 (1992) 1-14; idem "The Disappearance of iterative weqatal in the biblical Hebrew Verbal System," in *Biblical Hebrew in its Northwest Semitic Setting* (ed. S.E. Fassberg and A. Hurvitz; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006) 135-47; and J.P. Fokkelman, "Iterative Forms of the Classical Hebrew Verb: Exploring the Triangle of Style, Syntax, and Text Grammar," in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer* (ed. K. Jongeling et al.; Leiden, 1991) 38-55. Joosten explicitly references our passage as an example of a cluster of iterative *weqatal* forms ("Disapperance of Iterative *weqatal*," 140). Cf. also P. Kyle McCarter, *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1980) 293.

Both the fact that these *weqatal* forms follow the periphrastic form previously mentioned and the multiple subjects ("a lion or a bear"[11]) for the initial verb suggest an iterative reading for these verbs.[12] Rhetorically, the point of this is that David is boasting that whenever a lion or a bear would come and steal one of his sheep, he would go and strike down the lion or bear and rescue the sheep. The iterative *weqatal* verb forms make this a repeated occurrence. Apparently he dispatched lions and bears on multiple occasions.

We can well understand the use and rhetorical force of the chain of *weqatal* forms in David's speech. What we have to wrestle with before we turn to analyze the Greek translation of this passage is the strange switch to a *wayyiqtol* form in 17:35b. The *wayyiqtol,* ויקם, certainly interrupts the chain of *weqatal* forms that continues in vv. 34-35. The question is what to make of this. Some scholars suggest emending ויקם to וקם on the assumption that the י was added by partial dittography.[13] This is possible, but it is just as likely that the י in ויקם could have been dropped because a copyist was not expecting a *wayyiqtol* form in the midst of a series of *weqatal* verbs.[14] The retention of the *wayyiqtol* reading has been proposed for various reasons. As Smith notes, the *wayyiqtol* form breaks the consecution of the *weqatal* chain, which is only natural in the story where now David is recounting not when bears or lions would steal a sheep from him, but when they would rise up against him.[15] Tsumura analyzes the text from a discourse perspective and suggests that the *wayyiqtol* form "is 'off

---

[11] On the difficult use of the DO marker in את־הדוב ("the bear") see S.R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel With and Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 144; McCarter, *Samuel*, 287; Ceresko, "David's 'Boast,'" 63-64; and Tsumura, *Samuel*, 456.

[12] Fokkelman, "Iterative Forms," 47, notes this feature which he calls "enumeration" and lists 1 Sam. 17:34c as an example of it.

[13] See Ronald Hendel, "Plural Texts and Literary Criticism: For Instance, 1 Samuel 17," *Textus* 23 (2007) 107. Cf. McCarter, *Samuel*, 293.

[14] See P.A.H. De Boer, "1 Samuel XVII: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions," *OTS* 1 (1941) 94, who suggests that the Targum's reading of וקם is due to this kind of harmonization.

[15] Henry Preserved Smith, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1912) 161. See also A.B. Davidson, *An Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Hebrew Syntax* (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1896) §54 Rem. 1; and Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text*, 145.

the main line' information."[16] What each of these options notes is that the *wayyiqtol* in v. 35 breaks the *weqatal* chain. This *wayyiqtol* verb provides essential information for the narrative to continue with the next set of *weqatal* verbs in v. 35. It is somewhat awkward in the context but a break in the *weqatal* chain is not unfitting at this point and should probably be retained.

2. David's Boast in Greek

In Hebrew, David's boast began with a periphrastic construction that communicated something like perfective past time. The translator of 1 Reigns correctly identified this construction and translated with a periphrastic construction of his own, rendering רעה היה ("was shepherding") as ποιμαίνων ἦν ("was shepherding"), communicating the same kind of force as the Hebrew construction.[17] Perhaps clued in by this periphrastic construction, the translator of 1 Reigns successfully recognizes the iterative nature of the Hebrew *weqatal* forms and translates them as imperfects (ἤρχετο . . . ἐλαμβανεν . . . ἐξεπορευόμην).[18] These Greek forms have the same iterative force as does the Hebrew.[19] Thus far the translator of 1 Reigns has distinguished himself as quite capable in his handling of verb forms in David's boast. The difficulty comes in the varying use of tenses in the next several verbs.

Having translated the first three *weqatal* verbs as Greek imperfects, the translator now renders the next two *weqatal* forms with Greek aorists (ἐπάταξα . . . ἐξέσπασα). Why the

---

[16] Tsumura, *Samuel*, 458.

[17] On the periphrastic use of a present participle with an imperfect indicative verb see Wallace, *Greek Grammar,* 648; and *BDF* §353. F.C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, *Grammar of Septuagint Greek With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* (repr.; Hendrickson Publishers, 1995) §72, note that this construction is very common in the LXX.

[18] Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 136, notes this skillful use of the Greek imperfect.

[19] On the iterative use of the Greek imperfect see *BDF* §325; and Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 546-48. If the use of the imperfect tense in Greek was not enough to communicate the iterative nature of these actions the translator has also added the conjunction ὅταν ("when") to the initial string of imperfects, clearly marking the iterative nature of the action.

translator suddenly changed from imperfect to aorist verb forms in rendering the Hebrew *weqatal* chain will demand the majority of our inquiry so we will return to it shortly.

When the translator comes to the *wayyiqtol* form ויקם, he is left with a difficulty. The normal practice would be to render a Hebrew *wayyiqtol* form with a Greek aorist indicative. But the translator has used the aorist indicative to translate the previous two Hebrew *weqatal* forms and presumably wishes to reflect that ויקם is in a different verb form than the previous verbs. Recognizing that the Hebrew *wayyiqtol* form breaks the pattern in the Hebrew narrative, the Greek translator uses his own device to break the pattern by introducing a new element to the text: he renders ויקם עלי as καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ. He introduces the conjunction εἰ ("if") and turns the following part of the narrative into a conditional statement,[20] and renders the *wayyiqtol* form as an imperfect indicative.[21] Contextually, this is a very sensible rendering. The conditional nature of the clause is required (cf. almost any English translation), and the use of the imperfect both breaks the chain of verb forms and retains the iterative nature of the discourse. In short, while it is not a grammatically faithful rendering of the Hebrew word ויקם, it must be understood as a very good contextual reading of the Hebrew clause.

Following this conditional clause, as the Hebrew narrative returns to a series of *weqatal* forms, the Greek translation returns to rendering these with aorist indicatives (ἐκράτησα . . . ἐπάταξα . . . ἐθανάτωσα). Thus, the translator's rendering of verbs in vv. 34-35 is as follows:

---

[20] Anwar Tjen, *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax* (LHB/OTS 515; London: T & T Clark, 2010) 100-02, finds the same phenomenon of a paratactical Hebrew clause being turned into a conditional in the Greek Pentateuch and remarks that "In most of these instances, the resultant translation will be unnatural if the paratactic structures are retained" (p. 100).

[21] The use of an imperfect form of –ἵστημι is not common in the LXX, being used only 11 times (Gen. 31:40; Ex. 33:9; 1 Sam. 6:12; 16:23; 17:35; 2 Sam. 2:23; 1 Macc. 6:36; 15:32; 3 Macc. 1:19; 4:1; 6:32). However, when an imperfect of –ἵστημι is used, it is always used with a middle voice, as here.

Verbal Variation in David's Boast - vv. 34-35

Qotel + qatal	רעה היה	Ποιμαίνων ἦν	PAPtc + Impf
weqatal	ובא	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο	καὶ + x + Impf
weqatal	ונשא	καὶ ἐλάμβανεν	καὶ + Impf
weqatal	ויצאתי	καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην	καὶ + Impf
weqatal	והכיתו	καὶ ἐπάταξα	καὶ + Aor
weqatal	והצלתי	καὶ ἐξέσπασα	καὶ + Aor
wayyiqtol	ויקם	καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο	καὶ + x + Impf
weqatal	והחזקתי	καὶ ἐκράτησα	καὶ + Aor
weqatal	והכתיו	καὶ ἐπάταξα	καὶ + Aor
weqatal	והמיתיו	καὶ ἐθανάτωσα	καὶ + Aor

The above chart clearly shows the difficult variation. What remains now is to attempt to discern why the Greek translation switched to aorist verb forms in vv. 34-35.

When trying to discern a translator's reasons for applying something other than the most obvious equivalent for rendering his source text the first step is to theorize all of the options that were available to the translator. Only then can we put ourselves in the translator's shoes and attempt to see why he did what he did.[22]

The first possibility for explaining the varying verb forms is that the translators were using a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from what we have in the MT. Given the consistent and logical pattern of the *weqatal* forms in the Hebrew, and the fact that there are five different verbs that would require a different reading in the *Vorlage*, this seems unlikely.

The second possibility is that lexical constraints forced the translator to use an aorist form where he otherwise would have preferred an imperfect. The translator of 1 Reigns

---

[22] See Theo A.W. van der Louw, "Linguistic Or Ideological Shifts? The Problem-Oriented Study of Transformations as a Methodological Filter," in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo* (ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 107-25.

prefers the verb πατάσσω to translate the Hebrew נכה ("strike"), using it to translate נכה in 33

of its 46 occurrences in Samuel. This would lead the translator to use the aorist form because

the verb πατάσσω is exceedingly rare in the imperfect. It never occurs in the imperfect in the

LXX, and very rarely in other Greek literature, one of the earliest being the *Shepherd of*

Hermas (83:4).[23] *LSJ* (s.v. πατάσσω) notes that in Attic Greek and the LXX πατάσσω is used

mostly in the future and aorist with τύπτω and πλήσσω being used in other tenses. However,

the translator seems willing to use rare imperfect forms when it suits him since he uses the

imperfect form of ἐπανίστημι in 17:35, which is nowhere else used in the imperfect in the

LXX. It is also apparent that had the translator truly wished to use the imperfect form of

πατάσσω he could have since this is the form we find in the Antiochene tradition (mss boc₂e₂):

επατασσον. Furthermore, another common equivalent for נכה in 1 Reigns is τύπτω, which the

translator uses to render נכה in 17:36, using the imperfect form. So this option was available

to him as well. Therefore, though lexical constraints could have forced the translator to shift

his verb forms from imperfect to aorist without any signal from his source text, it seems that

there were options available to him had he wanted to stay with the imperfect form.

A third reason for the variation between imperfect and aorist forms in these verses

could be accredited to a freedom in the use of tenses. Since both the imperfect and the aorist

forms are typically used with reference to past actions,[24] it may be that the uses of the

imperfect and aorist are variations that are not meant to carry much difference in their usage

---

[23] A *TLG* search shows only 16 occurrences of πατάσσω in the imperfect, at least 5 of which are referencing the present text, which suggests their authors are using Lucianic manuscripts, which read επατασσον here.

[24] By claiming that imperfect and aorist forms are used with reference to past actions I do not mean to weigh in on the debate about Greek verbal aspect, as especially presented by Porter, who argues that the Greek verb does not express time (Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* [New York: Peter Lang, 1989]). The fact remains that whether it is a function of the verb or the context, the vast majority of the uses of the aorist and the imperfect are used in a context meant to convey past actions. I find Evans' critique of Porter's theory helpful (Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 13-51, esp. 40-51).

here.[25] However, this seems unlikely because, as Aejmelaeus has noted, the translator of 1 Reigns uses the Greek imperfect with skillful nuance.[26] As we noted, the use of the imperfect to render the *weqatal* forms at the beginning of the sequence in vv. 34-35 is an appropriate translation. This is not an isolated case. For example, the translator uses imperfects to render the *weqatal* forms in 16:23 which gives a summary of what would happen whenever Saul was seized by an evil spirit: "And it was, when an evil spirit was upon Saul, that David *would* take up the lyre and he *would* play what was in his hand, and Saul *would* be relieved, and it was good for him, and the evil spirit *would* turn away from him" (ἐλάμβανεν . . . ἔψαλλεν . . . ἀνέψυχεν . . . ἀφίστατο). Furthermore, it seems that the fact that the mss boc₂e₂ are uncomfortable with the aorist forms in 17:34-35 and change them to imperfects, suggests that those responsible for boc₂e₂ saw significant difference between the aorist and the imperfect forms in this context.

Therefore, it seems that we are left with the fact that the translator of 1 Reigns did not vary his verb forms from imperfect to aorist because of his *Vorlage*, or because of lexical restraints, or for simple freedom in the use of tenses. Thus, we look to the context of the narrative to discern his reasons.

A first clue towards understanding the verbal variation in 1 Rgns. 17:34-35 is observed by Aejmelaeus in commenting on a similar phenomenon in 1 Rgns. 2:13-14. Here an action sequence is begun with a Greek imperfect with an iterative sense: καὶ ἔρχετο ("and he would go"), but continued with an aorist indicative: καὶ ἐπάταξεν αὐτὴν ("and he struck it"), despite the fact that both of these forms are translating iterative *weqatal* forms in the

---

[25] Cf. the grammatical category of "aoristic imperfect" sometimes proposed by grammarians, e.g., Vasileios G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri* (Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sciences, 1972) §§288-92; and Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 542-43. Wallace notes that in narrative literature this phenomenon is limited to the us of ἔλεγεν. Cf. the critique of this category by Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, 208-09.
[26] Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 136.

Hebrew. Aejmelaeus first notes that the variant reading of καθίημι ("set down, drop") is most likely original, and the use of πατάσσω was inserted as the normal equivalent of the Hebrew נכה ("struck"). The variant reading, however, has two forms: an aorist, καθηκεν (supported by efmsw MNahnvb$_2$ z) and an imperfect, καθίει (supported by boc$_2$e$_2$). Aejmelaeus comments, "The aorist of καθιέναι was perhaps more likely to be the form chosen by the translator to express sudden movement within a series of imperfects expressing repeated action, whereas the Lucianic text represents consistent use of the imperfect."[27]

The main significance of Aejmelaeus' observation for the purpose of the present study is her recognition of the variation between imperfect and aorist forms for the purposes of rhetorical effect. In other words, the translator of 1 Reigns has varied his verb forms in 1 Rgns. 2:13-14, not because of cues from his source text, but because of his own literary sensitivity. Furthermore, Aejmelaeus notes that this sensitivity was not evidenced in the Lucianic text, which prefers consistency in verb forms similar to what occurs in 17:34-35.

This variation between imperfect and aorist forms has been observed in other Greek narrative. In his grammar on the verb in Classical Greek, Albert Rijksbaron remarks that the varying usage of the imperfect and aorist indicative in narrative texts "serve as the most important structuring elements in a story."[28] He continues,

> This difference in value between imperfect and aorist indicative is significant for the way in which a story is told. The imperfect creates a certain expectation on the part of the reader/hearer: what else happened?; the aorist indicative, on the other hand, does not have this effect: the state of affairs has simply occurred.[29]

---

[27] Aejmelaeus, "Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 138.
[28] Albert Rijksbaron, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction* (3rd ed.; Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2006) 11.
[29] Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 11.

Different uses of this dynamic shifting between imperfect and aorist forms have been documented in Classical Greek literature.[30] One example of this kind of structuring device is the use of imperfect verbs to set up a narrative framework for the action that is depicted with aorist verbs.[31] The imperfect verb is also used in instances where it signals the continuation of a narrative, either continuing something that has gone before or signaling that more information will follow.[32] On a larger narrative level, then, it can be observed that in many cases information that is *backgrounded* tends to be expressed by verbs with imperfective aspect and information that is *foregrounded* tends to be expressed by verbs with perfective aspect (in Greek the aorist form).[33] Though this is something of a simplification of the way these verb forms frequently function in Greek narrative, they nevertheless express a general usage that is found in Classical Greek narrative.[34]

In Koine Greek Alviero Niccacci has observed a similar phenomenon in his analysis of the discourse-level structuring of New Testament narrative where the aorist tense is used to communicate the primary level of narration, while the imperfect is used to communicate

[30] See Rutger J. Allan, "Sense and Sentence Complexity: Sentence Structure, Sentence Connection, and Tense-aspect as Indicators of Narrative Mode in Thucydides' Histories," in *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 13; ed. R.J. Allan and M. Buijs; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 106-07; Michel Buijs, "Aspectual Differences and Narrative Technique: Xenophon's *Hellenica* & *Agesilaus*," in *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 13; ed. R.J. Allan and M. Buijs; Leiden: Brill, 2008) 122-53; Egbert J. Bakker, "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides," in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts* (ed. Egbert J. Bakker; Mnemosyne Supp.; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 7-54; C.M.J. Sicking, "Aspect Choice. Time Reference or Discourse Function?" in *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* (C.M.J. Sicking and P. Stork; *Mnemosyne Supplement* 160; Leiden: Brill, 1996) 1-118; idem, "The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative, Part I" *Glotta* 69 1/2 (1991) 14-43; idem, "The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative, Part II" *Glotta* 69 3/4 (1991) 154-70; and Albert Rijksbaron, "The Discourse Function of the Imperfect," in *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner* (ed. A. Rijksbaron, H.A. Mulder, and G.C. Wakker; Amsterdam: J.C. Grieben, 1988) 237-54.

[31] Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 11; Sickling, "Aspect Choice," 70, speaks of the imperfect "setting the scene for events about to be mentioned, introducing an embedded story, providing a frame of reference for what is to follow &c." See also the use of this category by Allan, "Sense and Sentence Complexity," 106-07.

[32] See Buijs, "Aspectual Differences and Narrative Technique," 130-31.

[33] See Bakker, "Verbal Aspect," 13-14.

[34] Even those who want to see more than a simple background/foreground distinction in the usage of imperfect/aorist forms admit that this function does work in many instances. See Bakker, "Verbal Aspect," 14; and Sicking, "Aspect Choice," 70.

secondary or background narrative information.[35] He shows the success of this kind of analysis of Koine Greek literature with an examination of John 11.[36]

Analyzing the verbal patterns in 1 Rgns. 17:34-35 from this kind of usage in mind yields the following result. The narrative begins with a periphrastic participial phrase setting the scene: ποιμαίνων ἦν ὁ δοῦλός σου ("your servant was shepherding"). The narrative proper begins with a series of imperfect verbs: καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο . . . καὶ ἐλάμβανεν . . . καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην ("whenever they would come . . . and they would take . . . then I would go out"). On the one hand, this is backgrounded information that sets up the narrative for the actions that will be the main events that carry the narrative forward. On the other hand, as Rijksbaron noted, the imperfect forms create a sense of anticipation:[37] what would happen when a lion or bear would come and take a sheep? What would happen when David went out after them? The scene is set for David's action. The narrative then continues with what would be considered the *foregrounded* or main line narrative with David's actions, depicted with a quick succession of aorist verbs: καὶ ἐπάταξα . . . καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I struck . . . I pulled out"). What happened when David went out after the lion or bear? He struck it and pulled the sheep from its mouth.

The narrative then sets a new scenario: καὶ εἰ ἐπανίστατο ἐπ᾽ ἐμέ ("and if it turned against me"). This clause adds new background information that is essential to understand the action that follows. When David would deliver a lamb from the lion or bear, if the beast turned on him: καῖ ἐκράτησα . . . καὶ ἐπάταξα . . . καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αὐτόν ("and I seized . . . and I struck . . . and I killed it").

---

[35] A. Niccacci, "Dall'aoristo all'imperfetto o dal primo piano allo sfondo: Un paragone tra sintassi greca e sintassi ebraica," *LASBF* 42 (1992) 85-105.
[36] Ibid., 101-106.
[37] Rijksbaron, *Syntax and Semantics*, 11. Cf. Sicking, "Aspect Choice," 70.

The verb tenses of the next verse are fairly straightforward. David explains that just as he "slew" (ἔτυπτεν) both lion and bear, so it "will be" (ἔσται) with this Philistine. Thus, the reality of David's actions against the lion and the bear are the background information that prepare for the actions that will happen to Goliath: πορεύομαι καὶ πατάξω . . . καὶ ἀφελῶ ("I will go and I will strike . . . and I will remove"). The action of these verses can thus be set out as follows:

Verbal Variation Outlined

Background	καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο ("whenever they would come")	Impf
	καὶ ἐλάμβανεν ("and they would take")	Impf
	καὶ ἐξεπορευόμην ("then I would go out")	Impf
Foreground	καὶ ἐπάταξα ("I struck")	Aor
	καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I pulled out")	Aor
Background	καὶ εἰ ἐπανιστατο ἐπ' ἐμέ ("and if it turned against me")	Impf
Foreground	καῖ ἐκράτησα ("and I seized")	Aor
	καὶ ἐπάταξα ("and I struck")	Aor
	καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αυτον ("and I killed it")	Aor
Background (what has happened)	ἔτυπτεν ("slew")	Impf
Foreground (what will happen)	πορεύομαι ("I will go")	Fut
	καὶ πατάξω ("and I will strike")	Fut
	καὶ ἀφελῶ ("and I will remove")	Fut

Thus, in response to Saul's statement to David that "you are not able to go to the Foreigner, to fight with him, for you are a boy, and he, a man of war from his youth," David tells a story that details the following in the foreground: "I struck . . . I pulled out . . . I seized . . . I struck . . . I killed . . . I will go . . . I will strike . . . I will remove."

303

Putting these actions on the foreground of David's narrative about his qualifications
enhances the rhetorical power of David's response to Saul, and effectively foreshadows what
will happen between David and Goliath. But this foreshadowing is further enhanced in the
Greek version of the story by the LXX plus in v. 36b:

17:36 – MT/LXX[B]

גם את־הארי גם־הדוב הכה עבדך	καὶ τὴν ἄρκον ἔτυπτεν ὁ δοῦλός σου καὶ τὸν λέοντα,
והיה הפלשתי הערל הזה כאחד מהם	καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀλλόφυλος ὁ ἀπερίτμητος ὡς ἓν τούτων·
--	οὐχὶ πορεύσομαι
--	καὶ πατάξω αὐτόν,
--	καὶ ἀφελῶ σήμερον ὄνειδος ἐξ Ἰσραήλ;
כי חרף מערכת אלהים חיים:	διότι τίς ὁ ἀπερίτμητος οὗτος ὃς ὠνείδισεν παράταξιν θεοῦ ζῶντος;

In the Hebrew, David merely states that the Philistine will be like one of the lions or bears
that David has so heroically dispatched. In the Greek the three future verbs that further detail
what David will do, are pluses in the LXX. Thus, between the foregrounded verbs in David's
speech and the plus in 17:36, the foreshadowing of David's action with Goliath is further
emphasized:

David's Boast and David's Actions

What David Did	What David Will Do	What David Does
V. 35 (2x) καὶ ἐπάταξα ("I struck")	V. 36 καὶ πατάξω ("I will strike")	V. 49 καὶ ἐπάταξεν ("he struck")

V. 35 καὶ ἐξέσπασα ("I pulled out") / καῖ ἐκράτησα ("I seized")		V. 51 καὶ ἔλαβεν ("he took")
V. 35 καὶ ἐθανάτωσα αυτον ("I killed it")		V. 51 καὶ ἐθανάτωσεν ("he killed")
	V. 36 καὶ ἀφελῶ ("I will remove")	V. 51 καὶ ἀφεῖλεν ("he removed")

We must briefly comment about the originality of the LXX plus. McCarter tentatively accepts that it was original and that the MT has suffered haplography, where the scribe's eye has skipped from (כאחד מהם) הערל הזה to כי חרף based on the similarity of some of the letters of כאחד מהם and כי חרף.[38] Other scholars suggest that the LXX plus is a secondary expansion based on the almost-identical phrasing in v. 26.[39] However, it would be surprising, as McCarter points out, to see a secondary expansion based on a part of the text that is part of the large LXX minus.[40] Based on our analysis, I am inclined to see this LXX plus as a secondary expansion, not on the basis of the antecedent text in v. 26, but as an expansion based on the antecedent text in v. 35 and the subsequent text in vv. 49 and 51 (see table above). This, however, requires some explanation, for it goes against the grain of some views about the role of the translator in the Septuagint.

As Voitila argued in his study of the handling of tenses in the LXX and numerous other scholars have noted, "the translators were seldom conscious of the following context, which had not yet been translated, and were better informed on the part of the text they had just translated."[41] While I do not intend to disagree with this assumption as the default

[38] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 287.
[39] Smith, *Samuel*, 161; and Hans Joachim Stoebe, *Das erste Buch Samuelis* (KAT; Stuttgart: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1973) 331.
[40] McCarter, *1 Samuel*, 287.
[41] Voitila, "Translation of Tenses," 186. See also, Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer," in *Studein zur Septuaginta Syntax* (ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus and Raija

tendency in many of the books in the Septuagint, there may well be exceptions to this rule. Furthermore, the "segmentation" theory is largely dealing with the level of grammar and syntax, not on a larger discourse level of story. Thus it is plausible that while a translator, working on short segments of translation at a time, may not be sensitive to larger syntactical structures at the sentence level, he may yet be attentive to the larger narrative unit which is being translated. After all, we should not assume that a translator is approaching this text as a first time reader. It is much more likely that a translator, as an educated individual, has a fair amount of familiarity with the texts that he is translating. Therefore, we should not assume that a novice translator is also a novice interpreter. If the iconic stature of the David and Goliath narrative in modern times is anything to go by, it is not surprising that a translator would be familiar with the narrative before they even turned their hand to translating it, even being aware of the fact that David's actions against Goliath include "striking," "killing," and "removing."

3. Conclusions

The proposal of this paper is then, that the translator of 1 Reigns, who has shown himself willing to adapt his text in order to produce better Greek and who has at times been willing to adapt his text for theological reasons, varied the tense of the actions recorded in David's speech in order to bring his actions into the foreground. This was not something that was suggested by his source text, but based on his own reading of the source text and rendering it using his own narrative sensitivity to produce a more dynamic Greek narrative. His rendering is still a faithful translation, for he only had to vary his tense forms in v. 35 in

---

Sollamo; AASF B. 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987) 28-39. For a recent argument for this "segmentation" technique from a different perspective, namely a dictation theory of the Septuagint translation, see Theo A.W. van der Louw, "The Dictation of the Septuagint Version," *JSJ* 39 (2008) 211-29.

order to produce the intended result. This reading of these varying verb tenses is consistent with the view that the LXX plus in v. 36 is a later expansion that succeeds in further foreshadowing David's actions with Goliath. The consistency of these two adaptations in the Greek text makes for a compelling argument that these were, in fact, intentional adjustments by the translator who had the whole of the narrative in mind as he was translating.

This study proposes that at times the translator was aware of larger discourse units. The translator's awareness of larger discourse units of texts has been noted by others.[42] What is suggested here is that this kind of awareness can also be seen in the occasional verbal variation utilized by the translators. In the case of David's boast in 1 Rgns. 17:34-37, the translator has varied his verb forms, not because of cues from his source text, but because of his own Greek literary sensitivity. This study is only a preliminary observation of this phenomenon; more examples are needed.[43] The examination of translational phenomena like the varied use of verbal tense, especially the variation between the imperfect and the aorist but also the so-called historic present, is an area for future research which would greatly aid our understanding of the narrative sensitivity of the Septuagint translators.

---

[42] E.g., Frank H. Polak, "Context Sensitive Translation and Parataxis in Biblical Narrative," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. Shalom M. Paul et. al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 525-40.

[43] One potential example of a similar translational move is in 1 Rgns. 18:13-15, where a series of *wayyiqtol* verbs are translated with a variation of aorists and imperfects. The purpose of this variation appears to be to foreground some actions and background others, where the aorists move the action of the main narrative forward and the imperfects tell of repeated action that is essential to the narrative but does not directly carry the main plot forward.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrahams, Israel. "Numbers, Typical and Important." Pages 333-337 in vol. 15 of *Encyclopaedia Judaica.* New York/London: Thomson/Gale, 1972.

Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Verb Love—*'aheb* in the David-Jonathan Narratives—A Footnote." *Vetus Testamentum* 25/2 (1975): 213-214.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "Function and Interpretation of כי in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105/2 (1986): 193-209.

_____. "OTI *Causale* in Septuagintal Greek." Pages 11-29 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays.* Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

_____. "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel." Pages 123-142 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays.* Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

_____. "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator." Pages 59-70 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays.* Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

_____. "What Can We Know About the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?" Pages 71-106 in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays.* Leuven: Peeters, 2007.

_____. "A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek–Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus.*" Pages 353-366 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Edited by Anssi Voitila, and Jutta Jokiranta. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. "How to Reach the Old Greek in 1 Samuel and What to Do with It." Pages 185-205 in *Congress Volume Helsinki 2010.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Edited by Martti Nissinen. Leiden: Brill, 2012.

Aitken, James K. "Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 38 (2005): 55-77.

_____. "The Significance of Rhetoric in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 507-521 in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Edited by James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.

Allan, Rutger J. "Sense and Sentence Complexity. Sentence Structure, Sentence Connection, and Tense-aspect as Indicators of Narrative Mode in Thucydides' Histories." Pages 93-121 in *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts.* Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology. Edited by R.J. Allan, and M. Buijs. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Poetry.* New York: Basic Books, 1985.

_____. *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel.* New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 1999.

_____. *The Art of Biblical Narrative.* Revised ed. New York: Basic Books, 2011.

Amit, Yairah. "'The Glory of Israel Does Not Deceive or Change His Mind': On the Reliability of Narrator and Speakers in Biblical Narrative." *Prooftexts* 12/3 (1992):

201-212.

Anderson, John E. *Jacob and the Divine Trickster: A Theology of Deception and Yhwh's Fidelity to the Ancestral Promise in the Jacob Cycle*. Siphrut 5. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011.

Angel, J. Lawrence. "Skeletal Change in Ancient Greece." *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 4/1 (1946): 69-97.

Armstrong, James I. "The Arming Motif in the Iliad." *American Journal of Philology* 79/4 (1958): 337-354.

Arthur, Joseph Scott. "Giving David His Due: An Investigation of Text, Structure, and Chronology in 1 Samuel 16-18." Ph.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 2005.

Auld, A. Graeme. "The Story of David and Goliath: A Test Case for Synchrony *plus* Diachrony." Pages 118-128 in *David und Saul im Widerstreit - Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 206. Edited by Walter Dietrich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

_____. *I & II Samuel: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2011.

Auld, A. Graeme, and Craig Y.S. Ho. "The Making of David and Goliath." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 56 (1992): 19-39.

Aurelius, Erik. "Wie David ursprünglich zu Saul kam (1 Sam 17)." Pages 44-68 in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Textaments: Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik*. Edited by Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, and Christoph Levin. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002.

Austin, J.L. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Avalos, Héctor. "ΔΕΥΡΟ/ΔΕΥΤΕ and the Imperatives of הלך: New Criteria for the 'Kaige' Recension of Reigns." *Estudios bíblicos* 47 (1989): 165-176.

Avioz, Michael. "The Motif of Beauty in the Books of Samuel and Kings." *Vetus Testamentum* 59/3 (2009): 341-359.

Baden, Joel S. "The Tower of Babel: A Case Study in the Competing Methods of Historical and Modern Literary Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 128/2 (2009): 209-224.

Baker, David W. "Further Examples of the *Waw-Explicativum*." *Vetus Testamentum* 30/2 (1980): 129-136.

Michael Holquist, ed. *The Dialogical Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bakker, Egbert J. "Verbal Aspect and Mimetic Description in Thucydides." Pages 7-54 in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*. Mnemosyne Supp. Edited by Egbert J. Bakker. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Bakon, Shimon. "Jonathan." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 23/3 (1995): 145-150.

Baldwin, Joyce G. *1-2 Samuel*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentary. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1988.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Das Erste Buch Samuel: Ein narratologisch-philologischer Kommentar*.

Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament Stuttgart: Verlag W. Kohlhammer, 1996.

_____. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. New York: T. & T. Clark, 2008.

Bardtke, H. "Die Kriegsrolle von Qumran übersetzt." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 80 (1955): 401-420.

Barr, James. "Translator's Handling of Verb Tense in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts." Pages 381-403 in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate SeriesS 23. Edited by Claude E. Cox. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1987.

_____. "'Determination' and the Definite Article in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34/2 (1989): 307-335.

Barthélemy, Dominique. "La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel." Pages 1-44 in *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel, 1980 Proceedings IOSCS – Vienna.* Edited by Emanuel Tov. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

_____. *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament: 1. Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhemie, Esther*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 50/1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

_____. "Trois niveaux d'analyse." Pages 47-54 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture.* Orbis biblicus et orientalis 73. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Barton, John. "Historical Criticism and Literary Interpretation: Is There Any Common Ground?" Pages 127-136 in *The Old Testament: Canon, Literature and Theology: Collected Essays of John Barton.* Society for Old Testament Studies Series. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Publishing Co, 2007.

Beck, John A. *Translators as Storytellers: A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique*. Studies in Biblical Literature 25. Oxford: Peter Lang, 2000.

_____. "David and Goliath, a Story of Place: The Narrative-Geographical Shaping of 1 Samuel 17." *Westminster Theological Journal* 68/2 (2006): 321-330.

Begg, Christopher. "The David and Goliath Story According to Josephus." *Le Muséon* 112 (1999): 4-20.

Bergen, Robert D. *1, 2 Samuel*. NAC 7. Nashville, TN: B&H Publishing Group, 1996.

Berginer, Vladimir M., and Chaim Cohen. "The Nature of Goliath's Visual Disorder and the Actual Role of his Personal Bodyguard: נשׂא הצנה (I Sam 17:7,41)." *ANES* 43 (2006): 27-44.

Berlin, Adele. "Characterization in Biblical Narrative: David's Wives." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 23 (1982): 69-85.

_____. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.

Birch, Bruce C. "The First and Second Books of Samuel." Pages 947-1383 in *The New Interpreter's Bible.* Vol. II. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1998.

Block, Daniel I. "Empowered by the Spirit of God: The Holy Spirit in the Historiographic Writings of the Old Testament." *Southern Baptist Journal of Theology* 1/1 (1997):

42-60.

Bodner, Keith. "Eliab and the Deuteronomist." Pages 10-24 in *David Observed: A King in the Eyes of His Court.* Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008.

_____. *1 Samuel: A Narrative Commentary*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2009.

_____. "Excavating Ideas: The Qumran Scrolls of Samuel." Pages 141-151 in *The World of Jesus and the Early Church: Identity and Interpretation in Early Communities of Faith.* Edited by Craig A. Evans. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2011.

Eberhard Bons, and Thomas J. Kraus, eds. *Et sapienter et eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint.* Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 241. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Borgman, Paul. *David, Saul, & God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Botha, Eugene. "Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation." *Neotestamentica* 41/2 (2007): 274-294.

Boyd-Taylor, Cameron. "A Place in the Sun: the Interpretative Significance of LXX-Psalm 18:5c." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 31 (1998): 71-105.

_____. "Reading Between the Lines: Towards an Assessment of the Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Toronto, 2005.

_____. "In a Mirror, Dimly: Reading the Septuagint as a Document of Its Times." Pages 15-31 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Series 53. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus, and R. Glenn Wooden. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Brewer, William F. "The Nature of Narrative Suspense and the Problem of Rereading." Pages 107-128 in *Suspense: Conceptualisations, Theoretical Analyses, and Empirical Explorations.* Edited by Peter Vorderer, Hans J. Wulff, and Mike Friedrichsen. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates, 1996.

Bridge, Edward J. "Self-Abasement as an Expression of Thanks in the Hebrew Bible." *Biblica* 92/2 (2011): 255-273.

Briggs, Richard S. "The Uses of Speech-Act Theory in Biblical Interpretation." *CR:BS* 9 (2001): 229-276.

_____. *Words in Action: Speech Act Theory and Biblical Interpretation*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2001.

_____. "The Theological Function of Repetition in the Old Testament Canon." *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 28/2 (2006): 95-112.

Brock, Sebastian P. *The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel*. Quaderni Di Henoch 9. Torino: Silvio Zamorani Editore, 1996.

_____. "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint." *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 17 (1972): 11-36.

Brown, John Pairman. "Peace Symbolism in Ancient Military Vocabulary." *Vetus Testamentum* 21/1 (1971): 1-23.

_____. *Israel and Hellas*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 231. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.

Brueggemann, Walter. *David's Truth in Israel's Imagination and Memory*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1985.

_____. *First and Second Samuel*. Interpretation. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1990.

_____. "Narrative Coherence and Theological Intentionality in 1 Samuel 18." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 225-243.

Buijs, Michel. "Aspectual Differences and Narrative Technique: Xenophon's *Hellenica & Agesilaus*." Pages 122-153 in *The Language of Literature: Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts*. Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology. Edited by R.J. Allan, and M. Buijs. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Caird, G.B. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. I." *Journal of Theological Studies* 29/2 (1968): 453-475.

_____. "Homoeophony in the Septuagint." Pages 74-88 in *Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity: Essays in Honor of William David Davies*. Edited by R. Hamerton–Kelly, and R. Scroggs. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

Campbell, Antony F. "From Philistine to Throne (1 Samuel 16:14-18:16)." *Australian Biblical Review* 34 (1986): 35-41.

_____. "Structure Analysis and the Art of Exegesis (1 Samuel 16:14-18:30)." Pages 76-103 in *Problems in Biblical Theology: Essays in Honor of Rolf Knierim*. Edited by Henry T.C. Sun, and Keith L. Eades. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1997.

_____. *1 Samuel*. The Forms of Old Testament Literature 7. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2003.

Campbell, J.Y. "The Origin and Meaning of the Christian Use of the Word ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ." *Journal of Theological Studies* 49 (1948): 130-142.

Caquot, André, and Philippe de Robert. *Les Livres de Samuel*. Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament 6. Genève: Labor et Fides, 1994.

Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2004.

Carmignac, J. "Précisions apportées au Vocabulaire de l'Hébreu biblique par la Guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 345-365.

Cartledge, Paul. "Hoplites and Heroes: Sparta's Contribution to the Technique of Ancient Warfare." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97 (1977): 11-27.

Cartledge, Tony W. *1 & 2 Samuel*. Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary Macon, GA: Smyth&Helwys, 2001.

Ceresko, Anthony R. "A Rhetorical Analysis of David's 'Boast' (1 Samuel 17:34-37): Some Reflections on Method." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 58-74.

Clines, David J.A. "Michal Observed: Introduction to Reading her Story." Pages 24-63 in *Telling Queen Michal's Story: An Experiment in Comparative Interpretation*. JSOTSupp. Edited by David J.A. Clines, and Tamara C. Eskenazi. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1991.

Coats, George W. "Self-Abasement and Insult Formulas." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89/1 (1970): 14-26.

Conybeare, F.C., and St. George Stock. *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes*. Repr. Hendrickson Pub., Inc., 1995 ed. Boston, MA: Ginn and Company, 1905.

Cook, Johann. "On the Role of External Traditions in the Septuagint." Pages 17-36 in *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 127. Edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Cross, Frank Moore. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74 (1955): 147-172.

_____. "Problems of Method In the Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible." Pages 31-54 in *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts.* Edited by Wendy Doniger O'Flaherty. Berkeley, CA: Graduate Theological Union, 1979.

Cross, Frank Moore, Donald W. Parry, Eugene C. Ulrich, and Richard J. Saley, eds. *Qumran Cave 4: XII: 1-2 Samuel*. Discoveries in the Judaean Desert 17. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Cross, Frank Moore, and Richard J. Saley. "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuelᵃ (4Q51)." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 13/1 (2006): 46-54.

Dagan, Yehudah. "Khirbet Qeiyafa in the Judean Shephelah: Some Considerations." *Tel Aviv* 36 (2009): 68-81.

Davidson, A.B. *Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Hebrew Syntax*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896.

Davies, G.I. "The Uses of *R″* and the Meaning of Jonah IV 1." *Vetus Testamentum* 27/1 (1977): 105-111.

de Boer, P.A.H. "I Samuel XVII: Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions." *Old Testament Studies* 1 (1941): 79-103.

de Vaux, Roland. "Single Combat in the Old Testament." Pages 122-135 in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., Inc, 1971.

_____. "Les Philistins dans la Septante." Pages 185-194 in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zur Septuaginta.* Edited by J. Schreiner. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1972.

_____. *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 1997.

de Vries, S.J. "David's Victory over the Philistine as Saga and as Legend." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (1973): 23-36.

Debel, Hans. "Greek 'Variant Literary Editions' to the Hebrew Bible?" *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 41 (2010): 161-190.

Deem, Ariella. "'. . .And the Stone Sank Into His Forehead': A Note on 1 Samuel Xvii 49." *Vetus Testamentum* 28/3 (1978): 349-351.

Deist, Ferdinand. "Coincidence as a Motif of Divine Intervention in 1 Samuel 9." *Old Testament Essays* 6/1 (1993): 7-18.

Dietrich, Walter. "Die Erzählungen von David und Goliat in 1 Sam 17." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 108 (1996): 172-191.

Dietrich, Walter, and Thomas Naumann. *Die Samuelbücher*. Erträge der Forschung 287. Darmstadt, Germany: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995.

Dobbs-Allsopp, F.W. "Ingressive *qwm* in Bibilcal Hebrew." *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 8 (1995): 31-54.

Dover, K.L. *Greek Word Order*. London: Cambridge At the University Press, 1960.

Driver, G.R. "Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament. V." *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1933): 33-44.

Driver, S.R. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions*. Second ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1913.

Eco, Umberto. *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts*. repr. ed. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.

Edelman, Diana Vikander. *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*. JSOT Supp. 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Ehrlich, Arnold B. *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel: Textkritisches, Sprachliches und Sachliches*. Dritter Band: Josua, Richer, I. u. II Samuelis. Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1968.

Esler, Philip F. "Ancient Mediterranean Monomachia in the Light of Cultural Anthropology: The Case of David and Goliath." Pages 3-37 in *The Idea of Man and Concepts of the Body: Anthropological Studies on the Ancient Cultures of Israel, Egypt, and the Near East*. Oriental Religions in Antiquity. Edited by Anjelika Berjelung et al. Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 2011.

Eslinger, Lyle. "A Change of Heart: 1 Samuel 16." Pages 341-361 in *Ascribe to the Lord: Biblical and other Studies in Memory of Peter C. Craigie*. JSOT Supp. Series. Edited by Lyle Eslinger, and Glen Taylor. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2009.

Evans, T.V. *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

_____. "Some Alleged Confusions in Translation from Hebrew to Greek." *Biblica* 83/2 (2002): 238-248.

_____. "Approaches to the Language of the Septuagint." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 56/1 (2005): 25-33.

Exum, J. Cheryl. *Song of Songs: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

Eynikel, Erik, and Johan Lust. "The Use of deuro and deute in the LXX." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 67/1 (1991): 57-98.

Fanning, Buist M. *Verbal Aspect in New Testament Greek*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. "Reactions to the Panel on Modern Translations." Pages 233-240 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo, 1998*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by B.A. Taylor. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

_____. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Finkelstein, Israel. "The Philistines in the Bible: A Late-Monarchic Perspective." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27/2 (2002): 131-167.

Firth, David G. "'Parallelismus Membrorum' in Prose Narrative: The Function of Repetition in 1 Samuel 5-6." *Old Testament Essays* 15/3 (2002): 647-656.

_____. "'That the World May Know.' Narrative Poetics in 1 Samuel 16-17." Pages 20-32 in *Text and Task: Scripture and Mission.* Edited by Michael Parsons. Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster Press, 2005.

_____. ""Play it Again, Sam" The Poetics of Narrative Repetition in 1 Samuel 1-7." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56/1 (2005): 1-17.

_____. "The Accession Narrative (1 Samuel 27 - 2 Samuel 1)." *Tyndale Bulletin* 58/1 (2007): 61-81.

_____. *1 & 2 Samuel*. AOTC 8. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2009.

_____. "Is Saul Also Among the Prophets? Saul's Prophecy in 1 Samuel 19:23." Pages 294-305 in *Presence, Power, and Promise: The Role of the Spirit of God in the Old Testament.* Edited by David G. Firth, and Paul D. Wegner. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2011.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1980.

Fokkelman, J.P. *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel: Vol. 2: The Crossing Fates*. Assen/Maastricht, The Netherlands/Dover, NH: Van Gorcum, 1986.

_____. "Iterative Forms of the Classical Hebrew Verb: Exploring the Triangle of Style, Syntax, and Text Grammar." Pages 38-55 in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer.* Edited by K. Jongeling. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Fontaine, Carole R. *Traditional Sayings in the Old Testament: A Contextual Study*. Sheffield, England: The Almond Press, 1982.

Fowl, Stephen E. "The Role of Authorial Intention in the Theological Interpretation of Scripture." Pages 71-87 in *Between Two Horizons: Spanning New Testament Studies & Systematic Theology.* Edited by Joel B. Green, and Max Turner. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2000.

Freedman, David Noel. "Review of Stanley Gevirtz, *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel.*" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83/2 (1964): 201-03.

Frolov, Serge, and Allen Wright. "Homeric and Ancient Near Eastern Intertextuality in 1 Samuel 17." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130/3 (2011): 451-471.

Gardiner, E. Norman. "Throwing the Javelin." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 27 (1907): 249-273.

Garfinkel, Yosef, and Saar Ganor. "Khirbet Qeiyafa: Sha'arayim." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 8/22 (2008): 1-10.

Garsiel, Moshe. *The First Book of Samuel: A Literary Study of Comparative Structures, Analogies and Parallels*. Israel: Revivim Publishing House, 1985.

_____. "The Valley of Elah Battle and the Duel of David with Goliath: Between History and Artistic Theological Historiography." Pages 391-425 in *Homeland and Exile: Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies in Honour of Bustenay Oded.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Edited by Gershon Galil, Mark Geller, and Alan Millard.

Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Gauthier, Randall X. "Toward an LXX Hermeneutic." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 35/1 (2009): 45-74.

Gehmen, H.S. "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of 1 Samuel." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 70/4 (1950): 292-295.

_____. "Hebraisms of the Old Greek Version of Genesis." *Vetus Testamentum* 3/1 (1953): 141-148.

_____. "Peregrinations in Septuagint Lexicography." Pages 223-240 in *A Light unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers.* Edited by Howard N. Bream, Ralph D. Heim, and Carey A. Moore. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 1974.

George, Mark K. "Constructing Identity in 1 Samuel 17." *Biblical Interpretation* 7 (1999): 389-412.

Gevirtz, Stanley. *Patterns in the Early Poetry of Israel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.

Gilmour, Rachelle. "Suspense and Anticipation in 1 Samuel 9:1-14." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 9/10 (2009): 1-16.

_____. *Representing the Past: A Literary Analysis of Narrative Historiography in the Book of Samuel*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 143. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Ginzberg, Louis. *The Legends of the Jews*. 5 Vols. Philadelphia, PA: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1946.

Glenny, W. Edward. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 126. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

Glück, J.J. "Merab or Michal." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 77 (1965): 72-81.

Good, Roger Blythe. "The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles." Ph.D. dissertation. University of California Los Angeles, 2003.

Gooding, David W. "An Approach to the Literary and Textual Problems in the David-Goliath Story: 1 Sam 16-18." Pages 55-86 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 73. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

_____. "David-Goliath Project: Stage Four." Pages 145-153 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 73. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

Gordon, Cyrus H., and Gary A. Rendsburg. *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 1997.

Gordon, Robert P. *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*. Exeter, UK: The Paternoster Press, 1986.

_____. "Simplicity of the Highest Cunning: Narrative Art in the Old Testament." Pages 22-32 in *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon.* Hants, England: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2006.

_____. "The Ideological Foe: the Philistines in the Old Testament." Pages 157-168 in

Hebrew Bible and Ancient Versions: Selected Essays of Robert P. Gordon. Hants, England: Ashgate, 2006.

Green, Barbara. *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction.* Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

_____. *How Are the Mighty Fallen? A Dialogical Study of King Saul in 1 Samuel.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series. 365. London: Sheffield Academc Press, 2003.

Greenspahn, Frederick E. *When Brothers Dwell Together: The Preeminence of Younger Siblings in the Hebrew Bible.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Grüneberg, Keith N. *Abraham, Blessing and the Nations: A Philological and Exegetical Study of Genesis 12:3 in its Narrative Context.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 332. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2003.

Gunn, David M. *The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.

Halpern, Baruch. *David's Secret Demons: Messiah, Murderer, Traitor, King.* Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2001.

Hamori, Esther J. "The Spirit of Falsehood." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2010): 15-30.

Hanhart, Robert. "Introduction: Problems in the History of the LXX Text from Its Beginnings to Origen." Pages 1-17 in *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon.* By Martin Hengel. Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2002.

Harding, James E. "David and Jonathan Between Athens and Jerusalem." *Relegere: Studies in Religion and Reception* 1/1 (2011): 37-92.

Harl, Marguerite. "Traduire et Septante en Français: Pourquoi et Comment?" Pages 33-42 in *La Langue Japhet: Quinze Études sur la Septante et le Grec des Chrétiens.* Edited by M. Harl. Paris: Cerf, 1992.

_____. *La Genèse.* La Bible d'Alexadrie 1. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994.

_____. "La Bible d'Alexandrie I. The Translation Principles." Pages 181-197 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo, 1998.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by B.A. Taylor. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001.

Hays, J. Daniel. "Reconsidering the Height of Goliath." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 48/4 (2005): 701-714.

Heinrich, André. *David und Klio: Historiographische Elemente in der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids und im Alten Testament.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 401. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Helbing, Robert. *Die Kasussyntax der Verba bei den Septuaginta: Ein Beitrag zur Hebraismenfrage und zur Syntax der Κοινή.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1928.

Heller, Roy L. *Narrative Structure and Discourse Constellations: An Analysis of Clause Function in Biblical Hebrew Prose.* Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2004.

Hendel, Ronald. "Plural Texts and Literary Criticism: For Instance, 1 Samuel 17." *Textus* 23 (2007): 97-114.

Hengel, Martin. *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon*. Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2002.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. *I and II Samuel: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven, NJ: Yale University Press, 1967.

Ho, Craig Y.S. "The Stories of the Family Troubles of Judah and David: A Study of Their Literary Links." *Vetus Testamentum* 49/4 (1999): 514-531.

Hoffmeier, James K. "David's Triumph Over Goliath: 1 Samuel 17:54 and Ancient Near Eastern Analogues." Pages 87-114 in *Egypt, Canaan and Israel: History, Imperialism, Ideology and Literature.* Culture and History of the Ancient Near East Series. Edited by S. Bar, D. Kahn, and J.J. Shirley. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Hoffner, Harry A., Jr. "Hittite Analogue to the David and Goliath Contest of Champions." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 30/2 (1968): 220-225.

Holmstedt, Robert D. "Headlessness and Extraposition: Another Look at the Syntax of אשר." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 27/1 (2001): 1-16.

_____. "The Typological Classification of the Hebrew of Genesis: Subject-Verb or Verb-Subject?" *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11/14 (2011): 1-39.

Howard, David M., Jr. "The Transfer of Power from Saul to David in 1 Sam 16:13-14." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 32/4 (1989): 473-483.

Hugo, Philippe. "Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of Recent Research." Pages 1-19 in *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 132. Edited by Philippe Hugo, and Adrian Schenker. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Humbert, Paul. "Étendre la main." *Vetus Testamentum* 12/1 (1962): 383-395.

Hutton, Jeremy M. *The Transjordanian Palimpsest: The Overwritten Texts of Personal Exile and Transformation in the Deuteronomistic History*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 396. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009.

Isbell, Charles David. "A Biblical Midrash on David and Goliath." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 20/2 (2006): 259-263.

Isser, Stanley. *The Sword of Goliath: David in Heroic Literature*. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

Jacobs, Jonathan. "The Role of Secondary Characters in the Story of the Anointing of Saul (I Samuel ix-x)." *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 495-509.

Janzen, W. "Land." Pages 143-54 in vol. 4 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Jason, Heda. "The Story of David and Goliath: A Folk Epic?" *Biblica* 60/1 (1979): 36-70.

Jobling, David. *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Three Structural Analyses in the Old Testament (1 Samuel 13-31, Numbers 11-12, 1 Kings 17-18)*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 7. Sheffield, England: JSOT, 1978.

_____. *1 Samuel*. Berit Olam. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Johnson, Benjamin J.M. "David Then and Now: Double-Voiced Discourse in 1 Samuel 16:14-23." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* (Forthcoming).

_____. "The Heart of Yhwh's Chosen One in 1 Samuel." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131/3 (2012): 455-467.

_____. "Reconsidering 4QSamᵃ and the Textual Support for the Long and Short Versions of the David and Goliath Story." *Vetus Testamentum* 62/4 (2012): 534-49.

Joosten, Jan. "1 Samuel XVI 6,7 in the Peshitta Version." *Vetus Testamentum* 41/2 (1991): 226-233.

_____. "Biblical Hebrew *weqatal* and Syriac *hwa qatel* Expressing Repetition in the Past." *Zeitschrift für Althebräistik* 5 (1992): 1-14.

_____. "Source-language Oriented Remarks on the Lexicography of the Greek Versions of the Bible." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 81/1 (2005): 152-164.

_____. "The Disappearance of iterative weqatal in the biblical Hebrew Verbal System." Pages 135-147 in *Biblical Hebrew in its Northwest Semitic Setting.* Edited by S.E. Fassberg, and A. Hurvitz. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2006.

_____. "Reflections on the 'Interlinear Paradigm' in Septuagintal Studies." Pages 163-178 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo.* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 126. Edited by Anssi Voitila, and Jutta Jokiranta. Boston/Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. "Translating the Unstranslatable: Septuagint Renderings of Hebrew Idioms." Pages 59-70 in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Joüon, Paul, and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.* Subsidia Biblica 14. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005.

Kaiser, Otto. "David und Jonathan: Tradition, Redaktion und Geschichte in 1 Sam 16-20, Ein Versuch." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 66/4 (1990): 281-296.

Kellermann, Diether. "Die Geschichte von David und Goliath im Lichte der Endokrinologie." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 102 (1990): 344-357.

Kelly, B.H. "The Septuagint Translators of I Samuel and II Samuel 1:1-11:1." Th.D. dissertation. Princeton Theological Seminary, 1948.

Kessler, Martin. "Narrative Technique in 1 Sm 16, 1-13." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32/4 (1970): 543-554.

Kilpatrick, G.D. "Atticism and the Text of the Greek New Testament." Pages 15-32 in *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G.D. Kilpatrick.* Edited by J.K. Elliot. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

Kim, Uriah Y. *Identity and Loyalty in the David Story: A Postcolonial Reading.* Hebrew Bible Monographs 22. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2008.

King, Philip J. "David Defeats Goliath." Pages 350-357 in *"Up to the Gates of Ekron": Essays on the Archaeology and History of the Eastern Mediterranean in Honor of Seymour Gitin.* Edited by Sidnie White Crawford. Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 2007.

Klein, Johannes. *David versus Saul: Ein Beitrag zum Erzählsystem der Samuelbücher.* Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2002.

_____. "Unbeabsichtigte Bedeutungen in den Daviderzählungen: Am Beispiel von ISam 17,55-58." Pages 129-137 in *David und Saul im Widerstreit — Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit: Beiträge zur Auslegung des ersten Samuelbuches.* Orbis biblicus et orientalis. Edited by Walter Dietrich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004.

Klein, Ralph W. *Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: From the Septuagint to Qumran.* Old Testament Series Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1974.

_____. *1 Samuel.* Word Biblical Commentary 10. Waco, TX: Word Books, 1982.

Korfmann, Manfred. *Schleuder und Bogen in Südwestasien: von den frühesten Belegen bis zum Beginn der historischen Stadtstaaten.* Antiquitas 13. Bonn, Germany: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1972.

Kraus, Wolfgang. "Contemporary Translations of the Septuagint: Problems and Perspectives." Pages 63-83 in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Series 53. Edited by Wolfgang Kraus, and R. Glenn Wooden. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

_____. "*Septuaginta Deutsch* (LXX.D): The Value of a German Translation of the Septuagint." Pages 243-248 in *"Translation Is Required" The Septuagint in Retrsopect and Prospect.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Kreuzer, Siegfried. "A German Translation of the Septuagint." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 34 (2001): 40-45.

Krinetzki, L. "Ein Beitrag zur Stilanalyse der Goliathperikope (1 Sam 17, 1-18, 5)." *Biblica* 54 (1973): 187-236.

Lawton, Robert B. "1 Samuel 18: David, Merob, Michal." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 423-425.

Le Boulluec, Alain, and Pierre Sandevoir. *L'Exode.* La Bible d'Alexadrie 2. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1989.

Lee, J.A.L. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 14. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

_____. "Review of T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint.*" *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 43 (2010): 115-125.

Leider, Nechama. "Assimilation and Dissimilation: Techniques in the LXX of the Book of Balaam." *Textus* 12 (1985): 79-95.

Leivestad, Ragnar. "Ταπεινος - Ταπεινοφρων." *Novum Testamentum* 8/1 (1966): 36-47.

Lemche, Niels Peter. "David's Rise." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 10 (1979): 2-25.

Lestienne, M. *Premier Livre des Regnes.* Bible d'Alexandrie. Vol. 9.1. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1997.

Leuchter, Mark. "'Now There Was a [Certain] Man': Compositional Chronology in Judges-1 Samuel." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 69/3 (2007): 429-439.

Leung, Mavis M. "The Narrative Function and Verbal Aspect of the Historical Present in the

Fourth Gospel." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 51/4 (2008): 703-720.

Levison, John R. "Prophecy in Ancient Israel: The Case of Ecstatic Elders." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003): 503-521.

Lewis, Theodore J. "The Textual History of the Song of Hannah: 1 Samuel II 1-10." *Vetus Testamentum* 44/1 (1994): 18-46.

Long, Burke O. "Framing Repetitions in Biblical Historiography." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106/3 (1987): 385-399.

Long, V. Philips. "Scenic, Succinct, Subtle: An Introduction to the Literary Artistry of 1 & 2 Samuel." *Presbyterion* 19/1 (1993): 32-47.

Longacre, Robert E. "*Weqatal* Forms In Biblical Hebrew Prose: A Discourse-modular Approach." Pages 50-98 in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics.* Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994.

Lust, Johan. "The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and Greek." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 59 (1983): 5-25.

_____. "David and Goliath in the Hebrew and Greek Texts." Pages 121-128 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture.* Orbis biblicus et orientalis 73. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

_____. "Epilogue." Pages 155-156 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture.* Orbis biblicus et orientalis 73. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

_____. "Second Thoughts on David and Goliath." Pages 87-91 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism: Papers of a Joint Research Venture.* Orbis biblicus et orientalis 73. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

_____. "The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and Greek." Pages 5-18 in *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism.* Orbis biblicus et orientalis 73. Edited by Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

_____. "David Dans La Septante." Pages 243-263 in *Figures de David à travers la Bible.* Lectio divina. Edited by Louis Desrousseaux, and Jacques Vermeylen. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999.

_____. "Syntax and Translation Greek." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 77/4 (2001): 395-401.

MacDonald, John. "The Status and Role of the Na'ar in Israelite Society." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 35/3 (1974): 147-170.

MacWilliam, Stuart. "Ideologies of Male Beauty and the Hebrew Bible." *Biblical Interpretation* 17/3 (2009): 265-287.

Matthews, Victor H. *Manners and Customs of the Bible.* rev. ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

Mauchline, John. *1 and 2 Samuel.* New Century Bible London: Oliphants, 1971.

Mazar, Amihai. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: 10,000–586 B.C.E.* New York:

Doubleday, 1992.

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. *1 Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible 8. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1980.

_____. "The Apology of David." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 99/4 (1980): 489-504.

McFall, Leslie. "The Chronology of Saul and David." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53/3 (2010): 475-533.

McKenzie, Steven L. *King David: A Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Mettinger, Tryggve N.D. *King and Messiah: The Civil and Sacral Legitimation of the Israelite Kings*. Lund: CWK Gleerup, 1976.

Millard, Alan. "The Armor of Goliath." Pages 337-343 in *Exploring the Longue Durée: Essays in Honor of Lawrence E. Stager.* Edited by J. David Schloen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Miller, C.L. "Introducing Direct Discourse in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." Pages 199-241 in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics.* Edited by R.D. Bergen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Miscall, Peter D. *The Workings of Old Testament Narrative*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983.

_____. *1 Samuel: A Literary Reading*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Moberly, R.W.L. "The Earliest Commentary on the Akedah." *Vetus Testamentum* 38/3 (1988): 302-323.

_____. "The State of the Art in Biblical Hermeneutics." Pages 247-264 in *Communion Already Shared and Further Steps: 20 Years after the Meissen Declaration.* Edited by Christopher Hill, Matthias Kaiser, Leslie Nathaniel, and Christoph Schwoebel. Frankfurt, Germany: Otto Lembeck, 2010.

_____. "By Stone and Sling: 1 Samuel 17:50 and the Problem of Misreading David's Victory over Goliath." Pages 329-342 in *On Stone and Scroll: Essays in Honour of Graham Ivor Davies.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Edited by James K. Aitken, Katharine J. Dell, and Brian A. Mastin. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2011.

Molin, G. "What is a *Kidon*?" *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1/4 (1956): 334-337.

Moran, William L. "Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 25/1 (1963): 77-87.

Morgenstern, Julian. "David and Jonathan." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 78/4 (1959): 322-325.

Mounce, William D. *The Morphology of Biblical Greek*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994.

Mullen, E.T. *Narrative History and Ethnic Boundaries: The Deuteronomistic Historian and the Creation of Israelite National Identity*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1993.

Müller, Mogens. *The First Bible of the Church: A Plea for the Septuagint*. JSOT Supp. 206. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "The Use of ὡς in the Greek Bible." *Novum Testamentum* 7/1 (1964): 51-72.

_____. "Literary Device in the Septuagint." *Textus* 8 (1973): 20-30.

_____. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1985.

_____. "Recent Discussions of the Septuagint Lexicography with Special Reference to the So-Called Interlinear Model." Pages 221-235 in *Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*. Edited by Martin Karrer, and Wolfgang Kraus. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Na'aman, Nadav. "In Search of the Ancient Name of Khirbet Qeiyafa." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 8/21 (2008): 1-8.

_____. "Shaaraim — The Gateway to the Kingdom of Judah." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 8/24 (2008): 1-5.

Nelson, Jr., William Boyd. "1 Samuel 16-18 and 19:8-10: A Traditio-Historical Study." Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University, 1991.

Niccacci, Alviero. "Dall'aoristo all'imperfetto o dal primo piano allo sfondo: Un paragone tra sintassi greca e sintassi ebraica." *Liber annuus Studii biblici franciscani* 42 (1992): 85-105.

_____. "Analysis of Biblical Narrative." Pages 175-198 in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994.

Nissinen, Martti. "Die Liebe von David und Jonatan als Frage der modernen Exegese." *Biblica* 80/2 (1999): 250-263.

Nitsche, Stefan Ark. *David gegen Goliath: Die Geschichte der Geschichten einer Geschichte zur fächerübergreifenden Rezeption einer biblischen Story*. Altes Testament und Moderne 4. Münster, Germany: Lit, 2002.

Noegel, Scott B. "The 'Other' Demonstrative Pronouns: Pejorative Colloquialisms in Biblical Hebrew." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 33/1 (2005): 23-30.

Patzer, H. "Artistry and Craftmanship in the Homeric Epics." Pages 155-184 in *Homer: Critical Assessments*. Edited by Irene J.E. De Jong. London: Routledge, 1999.

Pedersen, Johannes. *Der Eid bei den Semiten: in seinem Verhältnis zu verwandten Erscheinungen sowie die Stellung des Eides im Islam*. Straßburg, Austria: K.J. Trübner, 1914.

Pego, Alvaro López. "Evolución del Significado de θελημα, "Voluntad", del Antiguo al Nuevo Testamento." *Estudios bíblicos* 48/3 (2000): 309-346.

Pelletier, A. "L'autorité divine d'après le Pentateuque grec." *Vetus Testamentum* 32/2 (1982): 236-242.

Perkins, Larry. "The Septuagint of Jonah: Aspects of Literary Analysis Applied to Biblical Translation." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 20 (1987): 43-53.

Philippe Hugo, and Adrian Schenker, eds. *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of Textual and Literary History*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 132. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Pietersma, Albert. "A New English Translation of the Septuagint." Pages 215-228 in *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Oslo,*

1998. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by B.A. Taylor. Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2001.

————. "A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint." Pages 337-364 in *Bible and Computer.* Edited by Johann Cook. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

————. "Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter." Pages 443-475 in *The Book of Psalms: Composition & Reception.* Edited by Peter W. Flint, and Jr. Patrick D. Miller. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005.

————. "Text-Production and Text-Reception: Psalm 8 in Greek." Pages 487-501 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontext, Lebenswelten.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 219. Edited by Martin Kasser, and Wolfgang Kraus. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

————. "NETS and the 'Upstream–Downstream' Metaphor." Pages 233-234 in *"Translation Is Required" The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright. "To the Reader of NETS." Pages xii-xx in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint.* Edited by Albert Pietersma, and Benjamin G. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Pisano, Stephen. *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts.* Orbis biblicus et orientalis 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Polak, Frank H. "Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSamª/LXX (with a note on the Text of the Pentateuch)." Pages 215-276 in *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by G.J. Brooke, and B. Lindars. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1992.

————. "Samuel, First and Second Books of." Pages 819-823 in *Encyclopedia of Dead Sea Scrolls.* Edited by L.H. Schiffmann, and J.C. Vanderkam. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2000.

————. "Context Sensitive Translation and Parataxis in Biblical Narrative." Pages 525-540 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov.* Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Polzin, Robert. *David and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History: Part 3: 2 Samuel.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993.

————. *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomic History: Part 2: 1 Samuel.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1993.

Pope, M.H. "Number, Numbering, Numbers." Pages 561-567 in vol. 3 of *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible.* Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1962.

Porter, Stanley E. *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood.* Bern: Peter Lang, 1989.

Pritchett, W. Kendrick. *The Greek State at War.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1974.

Prouser, Ora Horn. "Suited to the Throne: The Symbolic Use of Clothing in the David and

Saul Narratives." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 21/3 (1996): 27-37.

Rainey, A.F. "The Biblical Shephelah of Judah." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 251 (1983): 1-22.

Rand, Herbert. "The Biblical Concept of Beauty." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 30/4 (2002): 211-215.

Rendsburg, Gary A. "Confused Language as a Deliberate Literary Device in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 2/6 (1999): 1-20.

Revell, E.J. "Concord with Compound Subjects and Related Uses of Pronouns." *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (1993): 69-87.

_____. "The Repetition of Introductions to Speech as a Feature of Biblical Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 47 (1997): 91-110.

Rijksbaron, Albert. "The Discourse Function of the Imperfect." Pages 237-254 in *In the Footsteps of Raphael Kühner.* Edited by A. Rijksbaron, H.A. Mulder, and G.C. Wakker. Amsterdam: J.C. Bieben, 1988.

_____. *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2006.

Rofé, Alexander. "The Battle of David and Goliath: Folklore, Theology, Eschatology." Pages 117-151 in *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel.* Edited by Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine, and Ernest S. Frerichs. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1987.

_____. "4QSamᵃ in the Light of Historico-Literary Criticism: the Case of 2 Sam 24 and 1 Chr 21." Pages 110-119 in *Biblische und judaistiche Studien: Festschrift für Paolo Sacchi.* Edited by A. Vivian. Frankfurt: Lang, 1990.

Rose, Ashley S. "The 'Principles' of Divine Election: Wisdom in 1 Samuel 16." Pages 43-67 in *Rhetorical Criticism: Essays in Honor of James Muilenberg.* Edited by J.J. Jackson, and M. Kessler. Pittsburgh, PA: Pickwick, 1974.

Roth, Wolfgang M.W. "The Numerical Sequence x/x + 1 in the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 12 (1962): 300-311.

Routledge, Robin. "'An Evil Spirit from the Lord' — Demonic Influence or Divine Instrument?" *Evangelical Quarterly* 70 (1998): 3-22.

Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2010.

Sapir, Edward. "Hebrew 'Helmet,' a Loanword, and Its Bearing on Indo-European Phonology." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 57/1 (1937): 73-77.

Schniedewind, William M. "Textual Criticism and Theological Interpretation: The Pro-Temple *Tendenz* in the Greek Text of Samuel-Kings." *Harvard Theological Review* 87/1 (1994): 107-116.

_____. "The Geopolitical History of Philistine Gath." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 309 (1998): 69-77.

Schroer, Silvia, and Thomas Staubli. "Saul, David and Jonathan—the Story of a Triangle? A Contribution to the Issue of Homosexuality in the First Testament." Pages 22-36 in *A Feminist Companion to Samuel and Kings.* A Feminist Companion to the Bible. Edited by Athalya Brenner. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.

Scott, R.B.Y. "The Hebrew Cubit." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77/3 (1958): 205-214.

Searle, John R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Seger, Joe D. "Azekah." Page 243 in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*. Edited by E.M. Meyers. New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Seidl, Theodor. "David statt Saul: Göttlich Legitimation und menschliche Kompetenz des Königs als Motive der Redaktion von 1 Sam 16-18." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 98/1 (1986): 39-55.

Sellers, Ovid R. "Sling Stones of Biblical Times." *Biblical Archaeologist* 2/4 (1939): 41-44.

Shemesh, Yael. "Lies by Prophets and Other Lies in the Hebrew BIble." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 29 (2002): 81-95.

Short, J. Randall. *The Surprising Election and Confirmation of King David*. Harvard Theological Studies 63. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.

Sicking, C.M.J. "The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative, Part I." *Glotta* 69 1/2 (1991): 14-43.

_____. "The Distribution of Aorist and Present Tense Stem Forms in Greek, Especially in the Imperative, Part II." *Glotta* 69 3/4 (1991): 154-170.

_____. "Aspect Choice: Time Reference or Discourse Function?" Pages 1-118 in *Two Studies in the Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek*. Mnemosyne Supp. Edited by C.M.J. Stork, and P. Stork. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Sicking, C.M.J., and P. Stork. "The Grammar of the So-Called Historical Present in Ancient Greek." Pages 131-168 in *Grammar as Interpretation: Greek Literature in its Linguistic Contexts*. Mnemosyne Supp. Edited by Egbert J. Bakker. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Sipliä, Seppo. "The Renderings of *wyhy* and *whyh* as Formulas in the LXX of Joshua." Pages 273-289 in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992*. Edited by Leonard Greenspoon, and Olivier Munnich. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1995.

Skehan, Patrick William. "Turning or Burning: 1 Sam 17:53 LXX." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38/2 (1976): 193-195.

Smith, Henry Preserved. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. The International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. "Beobachtungen zur Arbeitsweise der Septuaginta-Übersetzer." Pages 28-39 in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus, and Raija Sollamo. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

_____. "Die Widergabe des בְ *instrumenti* im griechischen Pentateuch." Pages 116-130 in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus, and Raija Sollamo. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

_____. "The Rendering of the Hebrew Relative Clause in the Greek Pentateuch." Pages 55-61 in *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax*. Edited by Anneli Aejmelaeus, and Raija Sollamo. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

Sollamo, Raija. "Some 'Improper' Prepositions, Such as ΕΝΩΠΙΟΝ, ΕΝΑΝΤΙΟΝ, ΕΝΑΝΤΙ, etc. in the Spetuagint and Early Koine Greek." *Vetus Testamentum* 25/4 (1975): 773-782.

Speiser, E.A. "On Some Articles of Armor and Their Names." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 70/1 (1950): 47-49.

Sperber, Alexander. *The Bible in Aramaic*. Vol. 2: The Former Prophets. Leiden: Brill, 1959.

Stansell, Gary. "Honor and Shame in the David Narratives." *Semeia* 68 (1994): 55-79.

Stanton, G.R. "Τέκνον, παῖς and Related Words in Koine Greek." Pages 463-480 in *Proceedings of the XVIII International Congress of Papyrology, Athens 25-31 May 1986.* Edited by B.G. Mandilaras. Athens: Greek Papyrological Society, 1988.

Stern, Ephraim. "Azekah." Pages 123-24 in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land.* Edited by E. Stern. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993.

_____. "Zafit, Tel." Page 1522 in *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land.* Edited by E. Stern. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 1993.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Stoebe, H.J. "Die Goliathperikope 1 Sam. xvii-xviii 5 und die Textform der Septuaginta." *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 397-413.

_____. "David und Mikal: Überlegungen zur Jugendgeschichte Davids." Pages 224-243 in *Von Ugarit nach Qumran.* Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Edited by Johannes Hempel, and Leonhard Rost. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1958.

_____. *Das erste Buch Samuelis*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Stuttgart: Gütersloher Verlaghaus Gerd Mohn, 1973.

Stuart, Douglas. "Curse." Pages 218-19 in vol. 1 of *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Sundberg, Albert C., Jr. "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism." Pages 68-90 in *The Canon Debate.* Edited by L.M. McDonald, and J.A. Sanders. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub, 2002.

Sweeney, Marvin A. "Davidic Polemics in the Book of Judges." *Vetus Testamentum* 47/4 (1997): 517-529.

Swete, Henry Barclay. *An Introduction to The Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge at the University Press, 1900.

Swinn, S.P. "ἀγαπᾶν in the Septuagint." Pages 49-82 in *Melbourne Symposium on Septuagint Lexicography.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Edited by Takamitsu Muraoka. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990.

Taylor, Bernard A. "The NETS Translation of 1 Reigns: Lexical Issues." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 36 (2003): 75-85.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge at the University Press, 1909.

Thomas, D. Winton. "Kelebh 'Dog': Its Origin and Some Usages of It in the Old Testament." *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960): 410-427.

Thompson, J.A. "The Significance of the Verb Love in the David-Jonathan Narratives in 1 Samuel." *Vetus Testamentum* 24/3 (1974): 334-338.

Tiller, Patrick A. "Reflexive Pronouns in the New Testament." *Filología Neotestamentaria* 14

(2001): 43-63.

Tjen, Anwar. *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Series 515. London: T & T Clark, 2010.

Tosato, Angelo. "Sulle origini del termine ἀκροβυστία (prepuzio, incirconcisione)." *Bibbia e oriente* 24 (1982): 43-49.

Tov, Emanuel. "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in the Light of the Septuagint Version." Pages 97-130 in *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism*. Edited by Jeffrey H. Tigay. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985.

_____. "The David and Goliath Saga: How a Biblical Editor Combined Two Versions." *Biblical Research* 2/4 (1986): 34-41.

_____. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Second Revised and Enlarged ed. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd, 1997.

_____. "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" Pages 203-218 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16-18 in Light of the Septuagint." Pages 333-362 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSamᵃ." Pages 274-283 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Essays on the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

_____. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Second Revised ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2001.

_____. "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources." Pages 155-170 in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran: Collected Essays*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

Trebolle, Julio. "The Story of David and Goliath (1 Sam 17-18): Textual Variants and Literary Composition." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 23 (1990): 16-30.

Tsumura, David Toshio. "Literary Insertion (AXB Pattern) in Biblical Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 33/4 (1983): 468-482.

_____. "*Hamôr Lehem* (1 Sam xvi 20)." *Vetus Testamentum* 42/3 (1992): 412-414.

_____. "Vertical Grammar – the Grammar of Parallelism in Biblical Hebrew." Pages 487-497 in *Hamlet on a Hill: Semitic and Greek Studies Presented to Professor T. Muraoka on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday*. Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta. Edited by M.F.J. Baasten, and W. Th. van Peursen. Leuven: Peeters, 2003.

_____. *The First Book of Samuel*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2007.

Ullendorff, E. "The Contribution of South Semitics to Hebrew Lexicography." *Vetus Testamentum* 6 (1956): 190-198.

Ulrich, Eugene C. "Multiple Literary Editions: Reflections toward a Theory of the History of the Biblical Text." Pages 78-105 in *Current Research and Technological Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Donald W. Parry, and Stephen D.

Ricks. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1996.

Utzschneider, Helmut. "Auf Augenhöhe mit dem Text: Überlegungen zum Wissenshaftlichen Standort einer Übersetzung der Septuaginta ins Deutsche." Pages 11-50 in *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta: Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der griechischen Bible.* Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament. Edited by H.-J. Fabry, and U. Offerhaus. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001.

van der Kooij, Arie. "The Story of David and Goliath: The Early History of Its Text." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 68 (1992): 118-131.

_____. *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah 23 as Version and Vision.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 71. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

van der Louw, Theo A. W. "Linguistic or Ideological Shifts? The Problem-Oriented Study of Transformations as a Methodological Filter." Pages 107-125 in *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo.* Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism. Edited by Anssi Voitila, and Jutta Jokiranta. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

_____. "The Dictation of the Septuagint Version." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 39 (2008): 211-229.

van der Merwe, Christo H.J. "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar." Pages 13-49 in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics.* Edited by Robert D. Bergen. Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994.

van der Ploeg, J. "La Règle de la Guerre." *Vetus Testamentum* 5 (1955): 373-420.

Van Seters, John. *The Biblical Saga of King David*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Vanhoozer, Kevin J. *Is There a Meaning in This Text? The Bible, The Reader, and the Morality of Literary Knowledge*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1998.

Vermeylen, Jacques. *La loi du plus fort: histoire de la rédaction des récits davidiques de 1 Samuel à 1 Rois 2*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 154. Leuven: University Press, 2000.

Voitila, Anssi. "What the Translation of Tenses Tells About the Septuagint Translators." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10/2 (1996): 183-196.

_____. *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuque grec: Une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001.

Wagner, J. Ross. "The Septuagint and the 'Search for the Christian Bible'." Pages 17-28 in *Scripture's Doctrine and Theology's Bible: How the New Testament Shapes Christian Doctrine.* Edited by Markus Bockmuehl, and Alan J. Torrance. Grand Rapids, MI: BakerAcademic, 2008.

Wainwright, G.A. "Some Early Philistine History." *Vetus Testamentum* 9/1 (1959): 73-84.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.

Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Waltke, Bruce K., and with Charles Yu. *An Old Testament Theology: An Exegetical, Canonical, and Thematic Approach*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2007.

Watson, Wilfred G.E. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. New York: T & T

Clark, 2007.

Weiser, Artur. "Die Legitimation des Königs David: Zur Eidenart und Entstehung Der sogen. Geschichte von Davids Aufstieg." *Vetus Testamentum* 16/3 (1966): 325-354.

Wellhausen, J. *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1871.

Wénin, André. "David roi, de Goliath à Bethsabée: La figure de David dans les livres de Samuel." Pages 75-112 in *Figures de David à travers la Bible*. Lectio divina. Edited by Louis Desrousseaux, and Jacques Vermeylen. Paris: Les éditions du Cerf, 1999.

Wesselius, Jan-Wim. "A New View on the Relation between Septuagint and Masoretic Text in the Story of David and Goliath." Pages 5-26 in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality, Volume 2: Exegetical Studies*. Edited by Craig A. Evans, and H. Daniel Zacharias. London: T & T Clark, 2009.

Wevers, John W. "Sling." Pages 391-392 in vol. 4 of *International Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick et. al. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962.

_____. "The Interpretative Character and Significance of the Septuagint Version." Pages 84-107 in *Hebrew Bible / Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation*. Edited by Magne Saebø. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

_____. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 2011.

Williams, Ronald J. Revised and Expanded by John C. Beckman. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. Third ed. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

Willis, John T. "The Function of Comprehensive Anticipatory Redactional Joints in I Samuel 16-18." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 85 (1973): 294-314.

Wilmshurst, S.M.B. "The Historic Present in Matthew's Gospel: A Survey and Analysis Focused on Matthew 13.44." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25/3 (2003): 269-287.

Wimsatt, W.K., and Monroe Beardsley. "The Intentional Fallacy." Pages 3-18 in *The Verbal Icon: Studies in the Meaning of Poetry*. Lexington, KY: University of Kentuck Press, 1954.

Wolff, Hans Walter. *Anthropology of the Old Testament*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1974.

Wong, G.C.I. "Who Loved Whom? A Note on 1 Samuel xvi 21." *Vetus Testamentum* 47/4 (1997): 554-556.

Wong, Gregory T.K. "Goliath's Death and the Testament of Judah." *Biblica* 91/3 (2010): 425-432.

Woods, F.H. "The Light Shown by the Septuagint Version on the Books of Samuel." in *Studia Biblica, Essays in Biblical Archaeology and Criticism and Kindred Subjects, I*. Oxford: 1885.

Wright, Benjamin G., III. "Access to the Source: Cicero, Ben Sira, The Septuagint and Their Audiences." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 34/1 (2003): 1-27.

_____. "The Septuagint and Its Modern Translators." Pages 103-114 in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontext, Lebenswelten*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Martin Karrer, and Wolfgang Kraus. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck,

2008.

Wright, Christopher J.H. *God's People in God's Land: Family, Land and Property in the Old Testament*. Carlisle: Paternoster Press, 1997.

_____. *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006.

Yadin, Azzan. "Goliath's Armor and Israelite Collective Memory." *Vetus Testamentum* 54/3 (2004): 373-395.

Yadin, Yigael. "Goliath's Javelin and the מנור ארגים." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 86 (1955): 58-69.

_____. *The Art of Warfare in Biblical Lands in the Light of Archaeological Discovery*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963.

Zehnder, Markus. "Exegetische Beobachtungen zu den David-Jonathan-Geschichten." *Biblica* 79 (1998): 153-179.

_____. "Observations on the Relationship Between David and Jonathan and the Debate on Homosexuality." *Westminster Theological Journal* 69 (2007): 127-174.

Zevit, Ziony. *The Religions of Ancient Israel: A Synthesis of Parallactic Approaches*. London: Continuum, 2001.

Ziegler, Yael. "'As the Lord Lives and as Your Soul Lives': An Oath of Conscious Deference." *Vetus Testamentum* 58 (2008): 117-130.

_____. *Promises to Keep: The Oath in Biblical Narrative*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 120. Leiden: Brill, 2008.