BENJAMIN J. M. JOHNSON

Reading David and Goliath in Greek and Hebrew

Mohr Siebeck

Forschungen zum Alten Testament
2. Reihe

Benjamin J. M. Johnson

Reading David and Goliath in Greek and Hebrew

A Literary Approach

Mohr Siebeck

BENJAMIN J. M. JOHNSON, born 1982; 2012 PhD in Theology, University of Durham; since 2012 Tutor in Biblical Interpretation at Wycliffe Hall, Oxford and member of the Faculty of Theology and Religion at Oxford University.

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

καὶ νῦν ἄρξαι καὶ εὐλόγησον τὸν οἶκον τοῦ δούλου σου τοῦ εἶναι εἰς
τὸν αἰῶνα ἐνώπιόν σου
(2 Reigns 7:29)

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 my work 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 דּוֹר־וָדוֹר שְׁאַל אָבִיךָ וְיַגֵּדְךָ זְקֵנֶיךָ וְיֹאמְרוּ לָךְ׃
(Deuteronomy 32:7)

Preface

The present work is a revision of my doctoral thesis, titled "A Reading of the David and Goliath Narrative in Greek and Hebrew," completed at the University of Durham in 2012. I am grateful to the *Forschungen zum Alten Testament II* series editors Prof. Dr. Konrad Schmid, Dr. Mark Smith, and Prof. Dr. Hermann Spieckermann for accepting this work for publication

Academic writing 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 monograph is a misconception. It takes the support of many people 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 doctoral 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 are too many friends to name but I would like especially to thank Charlie and Helen Shepherd, Steven and Angie Harvey, Ruth Perrin, and all of our friends at King's Church. I would also like to thank all of my fellow doctoral students who provided such a wonderful and engaging community in which to study. I miss our informal seminars.

This step of my academic journey has only been possible because of the steps that came before it. To that end, I would like to thank those who have

helped shape my academic career: the faculty at Western Seminary, especially Dr. Jan Verbruggen, Dr. James De Young, and Dr. Marc Cortez, the faculty of Multnomah University, especially Dr. Barry Davis, and all of my undergraduate teachers from Trinity Western University, especially Cal Townsend, who made me try teaching in the first place.

I must name in the finale my wife Sarah, son Samuel, and daughter Genevieve. I would not be the person I am today nor would I have been able to complete a project like this without Sarah's endless loving support. Thank you for believing in me. Finally, though they came along late in this academic journey, my son Samuel and daughter Genevieve are an endless source joy and inspiration.

July 2015   *Benjamin Johnson*

Contents

List of Abbreviations

In addition to the abbreviations found in Patrick H. Alexander, John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen, eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999), 89–152, the following abbreviations are used.

AJPA	*American Journal of Physical Anthropology*
ANES	*Ancient Near Eastern Sutdies*
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.
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, 1986.
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BTS	Biblical Tools and Studies
CATSS	Tov, Emanuel and Frank H. Polak. *The Revised Computer Assisted Tool for Septuagint Studies Hebrew Greek Parallel Text.*
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.
EI	*Eretz Israel*
GELS	Muraoka, Takamitsu. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain: Peeters, 2009.
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*
JHebS	*Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*
Joüon–Muraoka	Joüon, Paul and T. Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Subsidia Biblica Vol. 14. 2 Vols. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 2005.
JSCS	*Journal of Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (formerly *BIOSCS*)
LEH	Lust, J., E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Second Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003.
LXX	Septuagint (Greek Jewish Scriptures)

LXX^B	Codex Vaticanus as reproduced by Brooke, Alan E., Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray. *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	Antiochene Text Type as reproduced by Fernández Marcos, Natalio, and J.R. Busto Saiz. *El Texto Antioqueño de la Biblia Griega. 1–2 Reyes*. Madrid: Instituto de Filología, 1989.
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.
LXX.D.Kom	Kreuzer, Siegfried, and Martin Meiser. "Basileon I: Das erste Buch der Königtümer / Das erste Buch Samuel." Pages 745–808 in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungun und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament I: Genesis bis Makkabäer*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011.
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.
NETS	Pietersma, Albert and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation Of The Septuagint*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
OTS	*Old Testament Studies*
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*
UBW	Understanding the Bible and its World
WHS	Williams, Ronald J. Revised and Expanded by John C. Beckman. *Williams' Hebrew Syntax*. Third ed. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press, 2007.

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 icon-ic stories in the Bible. It has probably been portrayed and retold as often or more often than any other story: from the trilogy of paintings by Caravaggio to the popular children's 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 readily referred to as a "David and Goliath" contest with no need to explain what that reference means. De-spite 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 prob-lems which pose a serious challenge to interpreters. One particularly thorny problem is that we do not have one version of the story of David and Goliath but two, a short version found in Codex Vaticanus (LXX^B) and a longer version reflected in the MT.

The present study is a literary examination of this justly famous story in both of the versions that it has been preserved. Along the way we will reflect on 1) how one reads a biblical text that has two distinct versions and 2) how one offers a literary reading of a translation as a text in its own right. We will enter this discussion by sketching the textual status of the story.

The best starting point into this issue remains the joint research venture of Barthélemy, Gooding, Lust and Tov (BGLT).[1] It is a helpful example of the difficult issues surrounding the text of 1 Samuel 16–18 and how different ap-proaches to the problem produce different results. For our purposes, in order to introduce 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] Dominique Barthélemy, David W. Gooding, Johan Lust, and Emanuel Tov, *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism* (OBO 73; Göttingen/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht Göttingen, 1986).

1.1. Two versions of 1 Samuel 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 in the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (*BHS*) which represents the text of the Leningrad Codex B19A.[2] 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[3] edition of the Septuagint.[4] A few other Greek manuscripts witness this shorter version of the story.[5]

Other manuscript traditions generally follow the long version of the story found in MT.[6] 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.[7]

---

[2] It is also available in a facsimile edition, David Noel Freedman, et. al. eds., *The Leningrad Codex: A Facsimile Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

[3] Alan E. Brooke, Norman McLean, and Henry St. John Thackeray, *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* II.I (Cambridge, England: Cambridge at the University Press, 1927). It is also available in a recent facsimile edition, *Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecorum Codex Vaticanus B* (Roma: Istuto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1999) and is now available online from the Vatican Library: http://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.gr.1209.

[4] 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 A. C. Sundberg, Jr., "The Septuagint: The Bible of Hellenistic Judaism," in *The Canon Debate* (eds. L.M. McDonald and J.A. Sanders; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Pub., 2002), 68–90. 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.

[5] 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]. In the absence of a Göttingen edition of 1 Reigns, manuscripts will be listed according to their identification in the Brooks-McLean edition.

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

[7] It is becoming increasingly apparent that the Antiochene tradition (represented by boc₂e₂, and demarcated as LXX[L]) is an important witness to OG, even in 1 Reigns (see e.g., Siegfried Kreuzer, "Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns*,*" *BIOSCS* 42 [2009]: 34–51). In chs. 17–18, however, it contains the MT pluses which, as Lestienne has shown, bear the marks of a different translator, including translating נלית הפלשתי as Γολιάθ ὁ Φυλιστιαῖος in 17:23, despite the consistent use of ἀλλόφυλος to translate פלשתים in Reigns (see *BdA* 40–42). Auld notes that Lestienne's observations about LXX[A] must be nuanced in a few cases in reference to LXX[L] but the conclusion of the secondary nature of the LXX minuses in 17–18 still stands. See A. Graeme Auld, "The Story

Finally, the fragmentary witness of 4QSam[a] appears also to contain the longer version of the story as found in MT.[8] The early witness of 4QSam[a] (*c.* 50–25 BCE[9]) means that the two versions of this story existed very early on as competing traditions.

The textual complexity of the story is further complicated by the fact that the books of Samuel have one of the most textually complex histories in the Bible.[10] For the purposes of 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.[11]

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)

---

of David and Goliath: A Test Case for Synchrony *Plus* Diachrony*,*" in *David und Saul im Widerstreit – Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit* (ed. W. Dietrich; Fribourg: Academic Press & Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 122–23. Thus, our primary textual witness will be LXX[B], nevertheless, we will continually keep an eye on LXX[L] because it is such an important witness.

    [8] 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.

    [9] *DJD* 17, 5.

    [10] 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., P. Hugo and A. Schenker; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 1–19. The rest of the collected volume contains 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: Reconstruting 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. A. Voitila and J. 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. M. Nissinen; Leiden: Brill, 2012), 185–205.

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

--	*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)*
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[12] was a "relatively literal" translator.[13] 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 He-

---

[12] The books generally known as 1–2 Samuel and 1–2 Kings are referred to in the Greek tradition as 1–4 Reigns or 1–4 Kingdoms. In this study we will generally differentiate between 1 Samuel as the Hebrew tradition and 1 Reigns as the Greek tradition, though LXX-1 Samuel is also used in the literature.

[13] This language is the assessment of Emmanuel 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; Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132.1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965), 176–90; Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF B Dss 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 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."

brew. 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.[14]

Second, Tov's argument is that a basically faithful, word-for-word translation would not omit over forty percent of the text.[15] However, this does not necessarily follow,[16] because this faithful word-based translation also shows signs of being in good command of the Greek language,[17] shows some tendencies toward theological exegesis,[18] 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.[19]

1.3. Doublets and inconsistencies

The version of the story in the MT contains many apparent doublets and inconsistencies. This observation is noted by the majority of scholars.[20] The major

---

[14] 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 Expanded edition; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), 59–69.

[15] Tov, "Composition," 341.

[16] 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.

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

[18] 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 Emmanuel 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.

[19] See Benjamin J. M. Johnson, "Narrative Sensitivity and the Variation of Verb Tense in 1 Reigns 17:34–37," *JSCS* (forthcoming). 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.

[20] 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*

doublets that are frequently noted include 1) David's multiple introductions in 16:1–13 and 17:12–31; 2) Goliath's double threat in 17:8–10 and 17:23; 3) David's killing of 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's portrayal as a shepherd at times and a warrior at other times; and 4) Saul's 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.[21] Other problems arise in the short text that are not present in the longer version. For example, LXX[B] is missing the initial interaction between David and Jonathan. This scene is a

---

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 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.

[21] 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.

significant moment in the Jonathan-David relationship and the progression of their relationship makes less sense without it.[22]

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? A number of scholars find it highly suspicious that LXX[B] is lacking precisely those texts from the MT which appear to be problematic.[23] It appears that 1 Samuel 16–18 is a case where the time-honored text-critical principles of *lectio difficilior* (MT) and *lectio brevior* (LXX[B]) conflict with each other.[24] So while it is clear that LXX[B] does not contain many of the apparent doublets and inconsistencies of MT, what we should make of this fact appears less than clear.

1.5. Reading MT as it stands

Despite the apparent problems with the MT there are many reasonable proposals for reading it 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.[25] Other scholars appear to be aware of the possibility that the MT version of the story may be a 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.[26] 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 form of the

---

[22] 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.

[23] 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.

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

[25] 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.

[26] 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.

story and that the MT should be preferred as the more original.[27] 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 to be 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 such as the two versions of the David and Goliath story.

1.6. Textual and literary criticism

The problem of 1 Samuel 16–18 is one of those cases 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.[28] 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 deployed. 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 issue 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. Fernández 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

---

[27] 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.

[28] 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.

the problem. Text criticism and literary criticism each have their methods which must not intrude on each other's analysis.[29]

However, the David and Goliath story is not only 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.[30] Thus understanding the textual history of the David and Goliath narrative is extremely complex. It is perhaps advisable to agree with Garsiel who says that "The question of the primacy of the long or short version seems to me one that cannot be decided as yet."[31]

These six preliminary observations represent the primary issues with which one deals in trying to understand the story of David and Goliath. From these observations, scholars offer a number of theories as to how to understand the relationship between the short and long versions of the story.

2. A 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,[32] so we will keep our comments on the existing

---

[29] 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. Emmanuel 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."

[30] Attempts to allow these two perspectives to engage one another have been helpful in defining the different methodologies but largely 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 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.

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

[32] 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; Auld, "The Story of David and

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, there is the majority view which sees the MT as a combination of two versions of the David and Goliath story.[33]

Table 2: Version 1 and Version 2 of the David and Goliath Story[34]

	Version 1 (LXX and MT)	*Version 2 (MT only)*
16:17–23	David is introduced to Saul as a skillful harper and is made Saul's 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.

Goliath," 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.

[33] 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; J. 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, "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.

[34] Adapted from Tov, "Composition," 351–52.

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.[35] David's successes.

Second, a few scholars hold to the priority of the LXX[B] version but think that the MT pluses do not reflect a separate and 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 alternative version of the David and Goliath story.[36] 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.[37]

2.2. MT Priority

While we may speak of a slight majority holding to LXX priority, a number 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.[38] All these scholars,

---

[35] 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. 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.

[36] 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.

[37] Auld and Ho, "Making of David and Goliath," 24–38.

[38] E.g., De Vries, "David's Victory," 23–24; Dominique Barthélemy, "La qualité du Text

whether they view the MT as a combination of two sources very similar to the two-source theory mentioned above,[39] or whether they view the MT as evidence of continual growth from a core story,[40] find it more plausible that LXX[B] represents a harmonization of the story, than that LXX[B] has retained an earlier version of it.

Others argue that the long text of MT consists of a literary unity, whose poetics were not recognized by the Septuagint translator or its *Vorlage*.[41] Examples of this line of reasoning include arguing 1) that the MT version better fits generic patterns than the LXX,[42] 2) that the MT version is intentionally telling a chronologically disjointed narrative, which was not understood by the translator,[43] 3) that the MT fits a pattern of repetition that is found throughout the Hebrew Bible,[44] or 4) that the MT version is using a "more sophisticated narrative-technique" that was not recognized by the translator.[45]

3. Plan of This Study

3.1. A Literary Approach

In the 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.[46] Lust comments on

---

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; A. Heinrich, *David und Klio: Historiographische Elemente in der Aufstiegsgeschichte Davids und im Alten Testament* (BZAW 401; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2009), 170–87.

[39] E.g., Dietrich, "Die Erzählungen," 180–84.

[40] 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.

[41] E.g., Gooding, "An Approach," 55–86; 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.

[42] Jason, "Story of David and Goliath," 66–67.

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

[44] Wesselius, "A New View," 5–26.

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

[46] 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*

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."[47]

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."[48] He argues that "each edition of 1 Samuel 17 has its own distinctive textual and literary conditions."[49] 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.

The subtitle of this study is "A Literary Approach," which is indicative of the reading strategy employed here. Though the existence of these two versions of the David and Goliath narrative is a classic text-critical problem, we will proceed by offering a close literary reading of the short LXX[B] version of the story as it is contained in 1 Reigns 16–18.[50] Several factors lead us to analyze the Greek version of the story, as opposed to any assumed 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.[51] Second, though it is quite plausible that the version of the story in LXX[B] is based on a short Hebrew *Vorlage*,[52] it is possible that the difference between the two versions is

---

Developments on the Dead Sea Scrolls (ed. Donald W. Parry and Stephen D. Ricks; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 78–105; Emmanuel 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.

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

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

[49] Ibid.

[50] 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.

[51] On the difficulty of reconstructing 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.

[52] 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 Emmanuel Tov, "The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam[a]," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1999): 274–83; Alexander Rofé, "4QSam[a] in the Light of

at least in part the result of editorial activity at the Greek level.[53] We have evidence that there is a different version of the story in the Greek tradition. We have no direct evidence of a 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 Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity.[54] Finally, since the Septuagint was an authoritative text in its own right, and since it contributes its own interpretive[55] and literary[56] elements to the translation, it is worth studying this document as a literary achievement in its own right.[57] The specifics of what is meant by this strategy will be further unpacked in the following section.

Our 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 in the MT, examining all the MT pluses in order to see what literary differences they make to the story (ch. 6). It

———————————

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; Frank H. Polak, "Statistics and Textual Filiation: The Case of 4QSamª/ 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, "Samuel, First and Second Books of," in *Encyclopedia of Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman, J.C. Vanderkam; Oxford, 2000), 819–23; Frank Moore Cross and Richard J. Saley, "A Statistical Analysis of the Textual Character of 4QSamuelª (4Q51)," *DSD* 13 (2006): 46–54. However, 4QSamª likely agrees with MT in 1 Samuel 17–18 in that it includes the long pluses (see Johnson, "Reconsidering 4QSamª," 547–49).

[53] Van der Kooij, "David and Goliath," 129–30.

[54] On the Septuagint as an authoritative text in early Hellenistic Judaism see Tessa Rajak, *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible and the Ancient Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); and Sundberg, "The Septuagint." On the Septuagint as an authoritative text in early 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.

[55] 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 & Ruprecht, 1996), 84–107.

[56] E.g., Takamitsu Muraoka, "Literary Device in the Septuagint," *Textus* 8 (1973): 20–30; and Eberhard Bons and Thomas J. Kraus (eds.), *Et Sapienter et Eloquenter: Studies on the Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint*, (FRLANT 241; Leiden: Brill, 2011).

[57] 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."