Translators as Storytellers

A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique

JOHN A. BECK

Studies in Biblical Literature | 25

Translators as Storytellers

Studies in Biblical Literature

Hemchand Gossai
General Editor

Vol. 25

PETER LANG
New York • Washington, D.C./Baltimore • Boston • Bern
Frankfurt am Main • Berlin • Brussels • Vienna • Oxford

John A. Beck

Translators as Storytellers

A Study in Septuagint Translation Technique

PETER LANG
New York • Washington, D.C./Baltimore • Boston • Bern
Frankfurt am Main • Berlin • Brussels • Vienna • Oxford

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Beck, John A.
Translators as storytellers: a study in
Septuagint translation technique / John A. Beck.
p. cm. — (Studies in biblical literature; vol. 25)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Bible. O.T. Greek—Versions—Septuagint. 2. Bible. O.T.—Translating—
History. 3. Bible. O.T.—Criticism, Narrative. I. Title. II. Series.
BS744.B43 221.4'8—dc21 99-048695
ISBN 0-8204-4850-8
ISSN 1089-0645
ISBN 978-1-4539-1008-5 (eBook)

Die Deutsche Bibliothek-CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

Beck, John A.:
Translators as storytellers: a study in
Septuagint translation technique / John A. Beck.
–New York; Washington, D.C./Baltimore; Boston; Bern;
Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Brussels; Vienna; Oxford: Lang.
(Studies in biblical literature; Vol. 25)
ISBN 0-8204-4850-8

The paper in this book meets the guidelines for permanence and durability
of the Committee on Production Guidelines for Book Longevity
of the Council of Library Resources.

Printed in the United States of America

Dedicated to
the memory of my father
John G. Beck
who taught me the values of
courage, strength and independence

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

Tables

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge several people for their invaluable direction and encouragement on this writing project. My thanks go to Dr. John Sailhamer and Dr. Dennis Magary who first cultured my interest in the study of translation technique. I also wish to thank Dr. Barry Beitzel who brought my love of the outdoors into companionship with my love for the Bible by stimulating my interest in biblical geography. I am thankful for my work with Dr. James Martin and for our frequent and stimulating conversations about the Land of Israel throughout the Land of Israel. I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Patrick Ferry, president of Concordia University Wisconsin, who has strongly encouraged and supported the publishing of this research. And finally I wish to thank all my colleagues at the university and beyond who have challenged me to think carefully on this interdisciplinary topic.

This page intentionally left blank

Editor's Preface

More than ever, the horizons in biblical literature are being expanded beyond that which is immediately imagined; important new methodological, theological, and hermeneutical directions are being explored, often resulting in significant contributions to the world of biblical scholarship. It is an exciting time for the academy as engagement in biblical studies continues to be heightened.

This series seeks to make available to scholars and institutions, scholarship of a high order, and which will make a significant contribution to the ongoing biblical discourse. This series includes established and innovative directions, covering general and particular areas in biblical study. For every volume considered for this series, we explore the question as to whether the study will push the horizons of biblical scholarship. The answer must be *yes* for inclusion.

In this volume, John Beck explores the translation techniques of the translators of the Septuagint. Using primarily three methods of analyses, linguistic, narrative-critical and narrative geographical, he examines select narrative texts. Here is a volume that fills an important need in the area of biblical scholarship, and students and scholars alike will find much here to further expand the discourse on translation technique.

The horizons have been expanded.

Hemchand Gossai
General Editor

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER ONE
Introduction

Not just anyone can write a great story. For great stories are more than mere words and grammar. Great stories are more than the reporting of events. Great stories are carefully crafted pieces of art that have a literary soul and life. They are produced by authors who carefully select content and manipulate form to maintain their reader's interest and to shape their reader's response. Narrative is art with a message. But what happens to that art and its message when it is translated into another language? What kind of storytellers are the translators? Translation technique analysis must pursue this question.

The Hebrew Bible is a book of great stories, stories that many value as communication from God. In the third century B.C.E., the great stories of the Hebrew Bible needed to live at Jewish dinner tables where Greek, not Hebrew, was the language of choice. Thus the Septuagint was born and translators became storytellers. Scholars have carefully analyzed the translation style of the Septuagint translators. Like all translators, their work may be viewed as a series of decisions. For example, the Septuagint writer would regularly encounter a series of waw-consecutive clauses in his Hebrew text. No single Greek equivalent would be appropriate for translating all of them. Since the original language and target language lacked absolute parity in their linguistic structure, the translator was required to make a decision.[1] When that same translator encountered a metaphor whose literal sense no longer communicated well in the culture of the target audience, the

translator had to make a decision that affected the artful form of the text. Those types of decisions, and others like them, combine to form a translation style.[2] Thus, we define translation technique as the pattern of conscious and subconscious decisions made by the translator when transferring a text from the parent language to the target language.[3]

These translation decisions involve all facets of the text from individual lexical choices to more extended tasks like the characterization of key participants in the narrative. And all those choices accumulate to shape the literary experience of the reader and ultimately influence the reader's response.[4] In this century, translation technique analysis of the Septuagint has almost exclusively focused on the linguistic decisions in describing Septuagint translation technique. But were those early translators thinking about linguistics or were they merely attempting to retell a story? We presume the latter. And this leads us to assess the translation technique of the Septuagint in a unique way. We are viewing the translators as storytellers and assessing the literary sensitivity of their work.

This approach will take into account more than just linguistic decisions. It will take into account such matters as characterization, the use of time, the patterning play of words and the artful use of geography. Using this matrix, we will measure the literary experience that is inherent in both the parent text and in the receptor text. Then by comparing the literary dimension of parent and receptor text, we will survey the literary sensitivity to Hebrew narrative strategies within the translation technique of the Septuagint. Or to put it more simply, we will meet the translators as storytellers.

Rationale

This unique approach makes sense in view of the following syllogism. (1) Hebrew narrative has a literary dimension. (2) Translations have a literary dimension. (3) Translations may mimic or alter the literary dimension of the parent text. Hence, it is legitimate to survey the Septuagint translator's literary sensitivity to Hebrew narrative strategies.

First, Hebrew narrative has a literary dimension. Sensitivity to the literary dimension of biblical narrative was significantly advanced

under the hands of Robert Alter. In his seminal work, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, Alter defined such analysis in this way.

> By literary analysis I mean the manifold varieties of minutely discriminating attention to the artful use of language, to the shifting play of ideas, conventions, tone, sound, imagery, syntax, narrative viewpoint, compositional units, and much else; the kind of disciplined attention, in other words, which through a whole spectrum of critical approaches has illuminated, for example, the poetry of Dante, the plays of Shakespeare, the novels of Tolstoy.[5]

Biblical narrative criticism was born and a significant number of scholars have rallied to contribute toward this growing field.[6] These scholars have added questions like the following to the set of questions that a linguist would ask. How is the plot developing? Through which devices of characterization do we meet the participants in the plot? In what way has the narrator shaped our reading experience? How has the writer contrasted the passage of narrated time and real time?

This same type of analysis is now being extended to the *translation* of such a text. Translations also have a literary dimension. Translation theory, as it was articulated in the 1960's and 1970's, gave most of its attention to linguistic phenomena in the text and related to the text at the level of sentence.[7] While Nida's goal of dynamic equivalence (i.e. the closest natural equivalent) took into account the literary dimension, he despaired of its replication in cross-cultural translation.[8]

More recently, theorists have given increasing attention to translation at the level of discourse and to the literary dimension of the discourse. Barnstone identifies "literary translation" as the subject of his 1993 monograph, *The Poetics of Translation*. He asserts that translation is analogous to writing.

> Writing is translation and translation is writing. The very essence of the activity of writing is that at every millisecond of the writing process the writer is simultaneously interpreting, transforming, encoding and translating data into meaningful letters and words, and at every millisecond of the translation process the translator is the writer, performing the same activities. Because literary translation is a work of literature, its existence and formation can be studied only within a theory of literature.[9]

Rabassa speaks with a similar tone when he says that

> language learning and the study of literature are two completely different things, and translation has to be a part of the latter if it is to receive the breadth that is inherent to it.[10]

Edward L. Greenstein brings this sentiment to the evaluation of Bible translations when he observes that both the original and translation are in fact literature which "entail tone, mood, attitude, feeling, the voice of a speaker, not merely information."[11] Thus it is increasingly affirmed that translations, even Bible translations, have a literary dimension which invites analysis.

The literary dimension of the translation may either be a product of the translator mimicking the cues of the parent text or it may represent a dynamic initiated by the translator. Within the translation of the Septuagint, it is apparent that the legal material is translated in a more literal fashion but that the narrative material is translated in a more dynamic fashion.[12] Those narrative sections reveal a variety of interpretive changes from minor clarifications to wholesale revisions.[13] The first clear observation in this regard comes to us from the second century before Christ. At this time, the grandson of Joshua Ben Sirach translated Ecclesiasticus into Greek. The grandson comments in the prologue about his struggle in translating Hebrew into Greek. And he notes that his struggle was akin to that of the Septuagint translators.

> You are urged therefore to read with good will and attention, and to be indulgent in cases where, despite our diligent labor in translating, we may seem to have rendered some phrases imperfectly. For what was originally expressed in Hebrew does not have exactly the same sense when translated into another language. Not only this work, but even the law itself, the prophecies, and the rest of the books differ not a little as originally expressed.[14]

Centuries later, the noted Septuagint scholar Emanuel Tov remarked that such changes in the Septuagint text might be motivated by the "literary taste" of the translator.[15] Nevertheless, he directed his attention to a linguistic analysis of the text, seeking to define the exegetical motivation that lay behind the changes rather than analyzing the literary form and the implications of those changes to the literary form.[16] This monograph will experiment by planting in the soil broken by Tov's comment.

Hebrew narrative has a literary dimension. Translations have a literary dimension. Translations may either mimic or alter the literary dimension of the parent text. Thus we may survey the literary sensitivity to Hebrew narrative strategies within the translation technique of the Septuagint. We may measure the translators as storytellers.

Significance of the Research

This investigation promises a contribution to several areas of scholarship: historical interpretation of the Hebrew Bible, lower text criticism, geography, narrative criticism and translation technique analysis.

No translation is free from interpretation.[17] Since this is also true of the Septuagint, it stands as a witness to the translator's understanding of their text. Thus the Septuagint is not only a translation it is also a "commentary" which reflects the interpretation of its time.[18] Such interpretation is motivated by both cultural[19] and theological presuppositions.[20] Here, we will avoid the discussion of such motivation.[21] Instead, we will address the way in which a *literary reading* of the text shapes the interpretation of the story. V. Philips Long has asserted that the narrative texts of the Hebrew Bible have three basic impulses: historical, theological and literary. He contends that the careful interpreter must take into account all three impulses if the text is to be correctly interpreted.[22] If literary analysis plays a significant role in interpreting the text of the Hebrew Bible, a similar value must be seen for literary analysis of the translated text.

Because no complete witness to the pre-Tiberian Hebrew text exists, scholars must rely upon the ancient versions for clues to its nature and form. The Septuagint plays a very important role in this process since "it reflects a greater variety of important variants than all the other translations put together."[23] By retroversion, we presume to reconstruct the *Vorlage*. But the degree of assurance that an accurate *Vorlage* has been produced depends upon the ability to discriminate between what is the *Vorlage* and what is a product of the translation style.[24] Tov asserts that of the thousands of differences between the Massoretic Text and the versions, the great majority are produced through translation style and not the *Vorlage*.[25] Consequently, the

definition of translation technique is critical to the discipline of textual criticism. This study will contribute to that process of definition.

The translators of the Septuagint also found it necessary to engage with the geography employed in Hebrew narrative.[26] That geography[27] may be used to provide the setting for a story or it may rise to play a significant role in creating the narrative shape of a discourse. (The latter will be discussed in chapter four.) Once we have defined the literary role of geography in the Hebrew text, we will determine if the Septuagint edition of the story is similarly shaped by the use of geography. In this process, we will be measuring the geographical sensitivity, sophistication and accuracy of the translators. The biblical geographer wishing to employ evidence from the Septuagint would be able to use that evidence more judiciously if this predisposition of the translator were better known.

This study will expand the use and nature of narrative criticism in two ways. First, we will be expanding the application of narrative criticism beyond the parent text to the translated text. The definition and defense of that type of narrative analysis will be found in chapter three. Secondly, we will be expanding the nature of narrative criticism beyond the traditional categories to include the artful use of geography. The definition and discussion of narrative geography will occur in chapter four.

Finally, our study will expand the boundaries of translation technique analysis. A significant amount of energy has been directed at defining the translation technique of the Septuagint. The great majority of this research has flowed from a linguistic approach to the texts. That analysis is designed to measure the predictability of the translator in handling small, text elements so that a percentage of literalness may be posited for a given translator. Here, we will experiment with a literary model of translation technique analysis. This is in conjunction with a more recent trend that has welcomed approaches that move beyond the linguistic model.[28] Barnstone sums up the sentiments of those proposing a new approach.

> The approach of most conventional linguists to translation theory, although of indispensable analytical importance, only minimally concerns art, intuition, language mastery or mystery, and all those qualities that compose the genius and flaws of the writer. The failure of the linguistic approach to the practice, if not to the theory, of translation lies in a fundamental misconception of the

> aims of the literary translation, which is not a normative science but, like any form of original literature, an art.[29]

Limitations

As with all academic research, this study faces certain limitations. We have accepted limitations in the following areas: attention to linguistics, selection of text editions, selection of pericopes and translator motivation.

As noted above, virtually all translation technique research has focused on the linguistic dimension of the translation process. The great majority of the studies (including this writer's Th.M. thesis) has measured the consistency with which individual linguistic items were handled by a translator.[30] In the interest of balance, this study will limit the amount of space dedicated to pure linguistic analysis and focus more broadly on the replication of the literary experience.

Both the Hebrew and Greek text editions have a transmission history of their own[31] leaving an associated family of texts from which pericopes for this study must be selected. We must also deal with the issue of how to handle variants within the text editions we select for the analysis. This study will not embroil itself in the debate over which may represent the purer form of the text. Rather the most well-received text editions will be adopted for the investigation.[32] This study will use the Massoretic Text as it is found in *Biblica Hebraic Stuttgartensia* and the Göttingen reconstruction of the Septuagint where it is available. Where that text edition is not yet available, Alfred Rahlf's *Septuaginta* will be employed.[33] It will be assumed that the Hebrew text we use was the *Vorlage* of the Septuagint translation.[34]

These text editions will also have variant readings. It is striking that very few of the scholars, whose methods of analysis we will discuss in chapter two, speak to this issue. John Sailhamer does. He disregards any portion of the text edition that is challenged by a variant reading.[35] Removing any word or phrase that is challenged by a variant would work well if a large number of verses were being considered. But the employment of this approach in our study would decimate the pericopies under analysis.

By contrast, we could take into account all variant readings and make text critical decisions both on the Hebrew and Greek verses. But

this adjusting of the text editions would add another layer of complexity and subjectivity to the analysis. First of all, it would be necessary to define what challenges to the text edition ought to be considered. Is it only those variants cited in the footnotes of the edition we are using or is it all possible variants that must be collected from a variety of sources? In addition, we would have to define what is meant by a "strong variant" which would influence us to change the reading of the text edition.

The approach we intend to use will not take variants into consideration. We plan to operate only with the unadjusted texts of the editions we select. This will mean that we will overlook opportunities to modify the text edition, even if there is evidence of textual corruption. This is not to deny the reality of textual corruption nor to ignore the need for textual criticism. But rather than add another layer of subjectivity to the analysis, we will allow for a small level of uncertainty to attend our findings. This approach has precedent in other translation technique studies.[36]

The texts investigated will be limited to a sampling of narrative texts from the three stages of the Septuagint's translation history.[37] These texts were chosen because of their length, literary unity and the suggested diversity of translating style. Combined, they provide approximately 325 verses for the analysis (approximately 100 verses per major text division). Additionally, each text may be viewed as a literary unit with approximately four pericopies per division. This allows for the analysis of linguistic and literary features within an interacting unit of text. Thirdly, the texts represent the full range of translation categories for each canonical division as they are suggested by Thackeray.[38] The reader may also observe that two sets of parallel texts have been chosen to investigate and illustrate the harmonizing tendencies of the translators.[39] The texts are listed below.

Pentateuch		**Prophets**		**Writings**	
Gen	22:1–19	Judg	4:1–24	Job	1–2
Gen	34:1–31	1 Sam	31:1–13	Ruth	1–2
Exod	3:17–14:31	2 Sam	6:1–23	I Chr	10:1–14
Num	13:1–33	Jonah	1, 3–4	I Chr	13:1–14

The final limitation we must observe relates to our ability to discern the motive for distinctive translations. Are they intentional, strategic shifts in the telling of the story, are they mechanical misreading of the *Vorlage*[40] or are they readings which represent a *Vorlage* which differs from the Massoretic text? All are possible. But our analysis will not attempt to define the motivation for unique renderings. We will assume that the differences we see are related to the translation style. We may inadvertently include a case of textual corruption under the heading of translation technique. But as noted above, we accept this risk and make our goal the measure of the reading experience in the final form of the text.

Methodology

Our goal is to study the translation technique of these translators. We wish to measure their literary sensitivity as storytellers. In doing so, we will experiment with three different methods of analysis. The first is based on a linguistic model. The second is based on a narrative-critical model. And the third is based on a narrative-geographical model. A specific introduction and defense of each model will be necessary in the following chapters. Here, we will limit our discussion of method to a few general comments.

It would be most desirable for us to have a written record of the translator's philosophy of translation. But the translators of the ancient versions left little or no formal description of their translation procedures.[41] Thus any evidence of their translation technique must be inductively obtained by examining the product of their work.[42] That examination may take one of two forms. Translation technique analysis could be done intuitively. One could merely wander about in the receptor text making random observations about the nature of the conversions. In fact, the majority of early translation technique analysis was reflective of this approach.[43] But this method is unsatisfactory.[44] The analyst may either consciously or subconsciously seek out data to prove an unsubstantiated presupposition. That potential prejudice is reduced when a predetermined system is applied to the text. This research project will investigate the literary experience evident in each text. But rather than wander about in the texts making random

observations, we will proceed into the analysis of each text with a predetermined model for analysis in hand.

Chapter Summary

What type of analysis is most likely to provide the clearest picture of the translator's literary sensitivity? That is the question we are seeking to answer. Thus, each of the chapters will experiment with a different type of analysis.

Chapter two resembles the more conventional approach to translation technique analysis. This chapter will survey the method of translation technique analysis which is broadly represented in the literature. A specific method of linguistic analysis will be derived from that literature and applied to the texts. A representative sampling of the data that was generated by applying that method will be presented to the reader. That data will suggest a level of consistency with which the translator operated. It will also make some contribution to the literary assessment of the text. Thus, we will be able to evaluate the ability of current translation technique methodology to provide a picture of translator's literary sensitivity.

Chapter three will introduce and defend a method for sampling the texts through the traditional categories of narrative criticism. A brief survey of narrative criticism will provide the background for the type of investigation we will undertake. In summary, that analysis will take into account characterization, the use of time and patterning play of words. A representative sampling of the resulting data will show the types of literary continuity and discontinuity reflected in the translated texts.

Chapter four will propose a role for geography in the literary analysis of translation technique. We will begin by arguing that a writer may have made strategic, literary use of geography within the narrative. A system for analyzing both parent and receptor texts for this artful use of geography will be presented and defended. The data from the texts will be surveyed. And the literary sensitivity of the Septuagint translator will again be assessed.

Chapter five will bring together the data from the three methods of analysis for comparison and contrast. This will help us evaluate and

critique the three models of translation technique analysis demonstrated in the previous chapters.

NOTES

1 James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Göttigen, no. 15 (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979), 291.

2 "Choice is the essence of 'style'." Chaim Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Textus* 6 (1968): 2.

3 Tov defines translation technique as the special techniques used by translators when transferring the message. Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint in the Past and Present," in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of the Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 339.

4 Rhetorical criticism asserts that such artful use of language is designed to solicit a particular reading response. "Rhetorical criticism is a form of literary criticism which uses our knowledge of the conventions of literary composition practiced in ancient Israel and its environment to discover and analyze the particular literary artistry found in a specific unit of Old Testament text. This analysis then provides a basis for discussing the message of the text and the impact it had on its audience." Duane F. Watson and Alan J. Hauser, *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible, A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method*, Biblical Interpretation Series 4 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1994), 4.

5 Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 12–13.

6 Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series 70, ed. David M. Gunn (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1989); Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1983); David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Leland Ryken and Tremper Longmann III, *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993); and Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).

[7] John Beekman and John Callow, *Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), 25–32.

[8] Eugene A. Nida, *Toward a Science of Translating* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), 176.

[9] Willis Barnstone, *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory and Practice* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 7–8. For a similar view see Henry G. Schogt, *Linguistics, Literary Analysis and Literary Translation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988), 122–23.

[10] Gregory Rabassa, "If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Possibilities," in *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives*, ed. William Frawley (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984), 27.

[11] Edward L. Greenstein, "Theory and Method in Bible Translation," in *Essays on Biblical Method and Translation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 88–89.

[12] Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 31 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990), 8.

[13] Sebastian P. Brock, "Translating the Old Testament," in *It is Written*, ed. D. Carson and H. Williamson (Cambridge: University Press, 1988), 89.

[14] Bruce M. Metzger, ed., "Ecclesiasticus," in *The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha of the Old Testament* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), 128–29.

[15] Emanuel Tov, "On 'Pseudo-variants' Reflected in the Septuagint," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975): 166.

[16] Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint" in *Mikra*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder, Compendia Rerum Iudicarum Ad Novum Testamentum (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 173–78.

[17] Sebastian P. Brock, "Translating the Old Testament," 87; Ernst Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979), 47.

[18] Albert Pietersma, "A New English Translation of the Septuagint," in *Ninth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Bernard A. Taylor, Society of Biblical literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 45 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 180.

[19] Edward L. Greenstein, "Theory and Method," 128.

[20] Staffan Olofsson, *God is My Rock, A Study of the Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 31 (Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell International, 1990), 2.

[21] This study will be observing divergence in the Septuagint text that suggests interpretation but be very cautious about discussing motivation since such observations are intuited and subject to significant conjecture. Ibid., 13.

[22] V. Philips Long, *The Art of Biblial History*, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 5, ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 167.

[23] Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 142.

[24] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "What Can we Know About the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX?" *Zeitschrift Für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 60; James Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 245; and Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Study," 352.

[25] Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 123.

[26] Sebastian P. Brock, "Translating the Old Testament," 88.

[27] For the purposes of this research, geography is understood to encompass: physical topography, hydrology, geology, climate, urbanization, land use, roadways and transportation. Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), 25–71.

[28] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator," in *Seventh Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 23.

[29] Willis Barnstone, *The Poetics of Translation*, 46.

[30] See the next chapter for a representative sampling of that literature.

[31] With regards to the Hebrew Bible, see Martin Jan Mulder, "The Transmission of the Biblical Text," in *Mikra*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder, Compendia Rerum Iudicarum Ad Novum Testamentum (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 87–136; and Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 164–97. With regards to the Greek text, see Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint" in *Mikra*, 173–78.

[32] Joseph, A. Fitzmyer, *An Introductory Bibliography for the Study of Scritpure*, 3rd ed., Subsidia Biblica 3 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1990), 38-39; and Frederick W. Danker, *Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 44-48 and 71-73.

[33] It is clear that this approach may well take into account editing of the primary translation since the texts we have were undoubtedly subject to some editing. See James Barr, *Comparative Philology*, 247 and Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 76.

[34] "At the present state of research, we cannot reconsturct the *Vorlage* of any of the LXX books in its entirety, because there are too many unknown factors with regard to this *Vorlage* and to the techniques of the translators." Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 67. John Sailhamer observes that the matter of translation technique analysis and the discussion of the *Vorlage* to the Septuagint exists in a "hermeneutical circle." John H. Sailhamer, *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint*, 7-8. "The scholar finds himself in a vicious circle of evaluating the character of the translator's source on the one hand and his translation technique on the other. It is impossible to ignore one aspect when concerned with the other since they are interactive." Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development and the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the Septuagint," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 31 (1986): 301.

[35] John H. Sailhamer, *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint*, 20.

[36] This approach is confirmed in the work of Barret, Olofsson and Tov. Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophy and Techniques of the Septuagint," 10 and Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 66. Tov asserts that the use of this approach will result in an error of only 1-2%. Emanuel Tov, "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX," *Textus* 12 (1985): 156.

[37] Limiting this study to a relatively small number of verses will mean that the results may not be statistically representative. Thus they can not be used to predict the occurrence of phenomena which we describe. The intentions of this study are not to *predict* but rather to *illustrate* the value of various methods of analysis.

[38] The Greek Pentateuch is identified with Good Koine Greek. The Prophets are a combination of Indifferent Greek and Literal Greek. And the Writings are a combination of Literal Translations, Indifferent Greek and Literary Greek. Henry St. John Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint*, 13-14. The purpose of this study is not to critique the work of Thackeray. His work is cited merely to demonstrate that the texts selected for this

study may demonstrate a variety of translation styles. The categorization is generally in agreement with a more recent study by Sollamo. Raja Sollamo, *Renderings of the Hebrew Semi-prepositions in the LXX* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 288.

[39] The text of the Greek 1 Samuel will require special attention at the time we analyze the text. It is now widely held that this translation was made from a different *Vorlage* than the Massoretic text. However, this is not true of all chapters and this has not prevented analysis of the translator's craft. See Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen, Netherlands: KOK Pharos Publishing House, 1993), 131–49.

[40] Barrett observed that some translations which differ from the expected reading of the Massoretic text may be a product of a different vocalization tradition, confusion between similar letters or the misreading of abbreviations in the *Vorlage* Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophy and Techniques of the Septuagint," 72–84.

[41] The first translator to formally comment on his translation style was Jerome. "Jerome's rule was to adopt a literal style of translation where sacred texts were concerned, but a free style for all others." Sebastian P. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," in *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions and Interpretations*, ed. Sidney Jellicoe (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974), 556.

[42] Aejmelaeus calls this "following the trail of the Septuagint translators." Anneli Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen, Netherlands: KOK Pharos Publishing House, 1993), 1. Szpek refers to this as "literary archaeology." Heidi Melissa Szpek, "Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1991), 1.

[43] Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development," 302.

[44] Tov expresses pointed criticism of this approach. Emanuel Tov and B. G. Wright, "Computer-Assisted Study," 151.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER TWO

The Storyteller and Linguistics

Septuagint translation technique has enjoyed a considerable amount of attention during this century. And a review of the bibliography reveals a prominent trend. This research set out to measure the consistency with which the translators handled the linguistic components of the Hebrew text. By measuring this consistency, the analyst could posit a percentage of consistency or "literalness" for the translation unit. And it is this measure of literalness that was of particular value to the lower text critic. We will begin our search in this linguistic arena in order to measure the ability of such analysis to illuminate the translators as storytellers.

In this chapter, we will survey the linguistic methods of translation technique analysis associated with the Septuagint. That survey will not be comprehensive but will be highly representative of the historic and current trends in translation technique research. From that literature, we will assemble a method via which to measure a Greek text for translation style. In the final portion of the chapter, we will sample the data generated by the application of this method to our texts.

In the end, this chapter will position us to answer three questions. (1) What percentage of literalness can be assigned to each text? (2) Is there a correlation between the measure of linguistic literalness and fidelity to the narrative experience? (3) Is the current methodology adequate for defining the literary sensitivity of the Septuagint translators?

Introduction to Translation Technique Research

We begin with an overview of the methods currently employed to analyze Septuagint translation technique. The approaches may be categorized under three headings: lexical evidence, grammatical evidence and quantitative representation of content.

Lexical Evidence

Analysts have examined seven features of the translated text under the heading of lexical evidence. They are: transliteration, lexical selection, concordance, treatment of *hapax legomena*, preservation of noun number, maintaining the pleonastic personal pronouns and morpheme preservation.

Transliteration occurs when the translator creates an acoustic symbol of the word in the parent text by using the graphemes of the receptor language. Thus a piece of vocabulary is created which mimics the sounds produced by the word in the parent text. Translators may opt for this style when they are uncertain about a lexeme's meaning, when depicting proper names or when translating a technical term.[1]

A second lexical area that has been addressed is the selection of lexemes. In his study of literalness, Barr views the selection of lexical equivalents and the "correct estimate of semantic range" as one of the chief indicators of a literal translation.[2] Olofsson also views this as a key to investigating translation technique[3] and shapes an entire monograph around the investigation of lexical equivalents.[4] The most helpful introduction to this topic is provided by Tov in "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?"[5]

A third area of focus is lexical concordance. Concordance occurs when a word in the source document is translated in each of its occurrences with the same word in the receptor document.[6] The most detailed discussion of this phenomenon may be found in Barr's *The Typology of Literalism* where he refers to this translation feature as "stereotyped equivalence."[7] Both Barr and Tov regard this as one of the keys to investigating the literalness of a translator.[8] Following the lead of Barr and Tov, Galen Marquis developed a mathematical formula around this analysis whose output is a percentage of literalness.[9] The most comprehensive application of this analysis is found in the work of

Raija Sollamo. This work examines the handling of Hebrew semiprepositions throughout the Septuagint.[10]

The fourth area of research involves the study of rare words and true *hapax legomena*. Such words may have been a more regular part of the oral vernacular, but they were not commonly used in the Hebrew Bible. Thus the translators had little experience with them and limited ability to consult the work of their predecessors in translating them. Tov and Muraoka offer us the most comprehensive discussion of this phenomenon while Barrett and Phelan deal with examples in their respective dissertations.[11]

A fifth lexical feature that is addressed in the translation technique literature is that of noun number. Hebrew nouns are represented in singular, plural and dual forms. Both Talshir and Szpek examine the consistency with which the number of Hebrew nouns is preserved in translation.[12]

A sixth lexical dimension studied is the preservation of the pleonastic pronoun. Sollamo directed his analysis at the use of the resumptive personal pronoun that is employed by the Hebrew writer when the indeclinable relative pronoun is to be construed with a preposition.[13] By contrast, Phelan and Soisalon-Soininen address the way in which the Septuagint translator preserved the independent personal pronouns.[14]

The final lexical feature that receives attention in translation technique analysis is the morpheme. A morpheme is "the minimal unit of speech that is recurrent and meaningful."[15] A count of the morphemes represented in the parent text may be compared with the morphemes present in the receptor text to determine if the overall tendency of the translation is inflationary or reductionistic.[16] Given the structure of Hebrew and Greek, we presume that the translator will need to increase the morpheme count to some degree. Thus it would not be the increase but the size of the increase in morphemes that would summon the attention of the analyst.

Grammatical Evidence

Analysts of translation technique have also examined the grammatical evidence. We will consider contemporary research under

three headings: clause connection, translation of the verbal system and word order.

Anneli Aejmelaeus is closely associated with translation technique analysis which is attentive to the matter of clause connection. This dimension of analysis is particularly telling due to the fact that natural Hebrew expression uses paratactic connection while natural Greek expression employs hyptotactic clause connection.

> Hebrew possesses very few clause connectors and is most sparing in the employment of connectives other than *waw*. Greek, on the other hand, has plenty of connectives and an ideal which is the direct opposite to parataxis, the ideal of composing well-organized periods of subordinate clauses and main clauses. In addition to this, it is worth noting that Greek frequently uses participial constructions instead of full clauses, which further deepens the discrepancy between the simple Hebrew style and the elaborate Greek structure of the period.[17]

Aejmelaeus has collected evidence of clause connection in the Septuagint as a measure of the instinctive response of the translator to the text.[18] The percentage of literalness is based on the consistency with which the paratactic structure is maintained in the translation.

A second dimension of grammatical analysis involves the translation of the verbal system. Once again the verbal systems of Hebrew and Greek do not fully correspond in their structure. Thus there is not a natural Greek equivalent for every Hebrew verb form employed in the parent text.[19] Yet, the translation of the verbal elements is critical. "Readers could tolerate, and could overcome, their numerous peculiar expressions in lexical matters; but if a mess had been made of the tenses in the Greek, much of the Bible would have been unreadable."[20] Thus considerable research has been directed at the translation of the verb by scholars like Sailhamer, Soisalon-Soininen and Thackeray.[21]

A third grammatical feature that receives attention in the literature of translation technique analysis is word order.[22] If the text is segmented for analysis at the word level, then the translator must make a decision about the order in which to put those words.[23] And this is particularly the case when the parent and receptor texts do not employ word order in exactly the same fashion. Since Hebew has a more fixed word order than Greek, a translation decision may be made here.[24] The preservation of the parent text's word order is viewed as a key

indicator of literalness[25] so long as the target language has the capacity to accept the word order of the parent text.[26]

Quantitative Representation of Content

The final way in which translation technique analysts have measured the text relates to the quantitative representation of semantic content. A translator may amplify the text by adding new material, subtracting old material or replacing material that appeared in his copy of the parent text. James Barr asserts that this measurement must be semantic.

> Quantitative divergence from the original in either direction means loss of literality. A literal translation will express only the linguistic elements that are sent in the original, and will express all of them. The measure of this is of course semantic; there is no way in which a Greek text can be merely quantitatively equivalent to a Hebrew text, except that it expresses meanings that stand for the meanings of each element in the Hebrew.[27]

The motivation for such divergence in content is associated with theological agenda, actualization,[28] clarifications and harmonization with other biblical texts.[29]

A Method of Linguistic Analysis

We now must define a method of translation technique analysis that we may apply to texts we have noted in chapter one. Space would not permit us to explore our texts using all dimensions of analysis noted above. Instead, we will construct a method of linguistic analysis that employs the most frequently analyzed components of the text. That means that our analysis will represent the spirit if not the exact form of contemporary translation technique analysis. We will conduct a lexical analysis that consists in attention given to: morpheme count, preservation of noun number and preservation of the nominative form of the independent personal pronoun. We will conduct a grammatical analysis which gives attention to: the finite verb forms (including volitional forms) and clause coordination.

Rationale for the Method

We have limited the research to a representative sampling of the more frequently investigated and more easily quantified linguistic features. Lexical semantics, concordance, word order and the quantitative preservation of semantic content are decidedly more difficult to quantify and analyze statistically. Thus they are employed less frequently, if at all, when it comes time to apply these theoretical schemes to biblical texts.

Secondly, these linguistic features were chosen in order to provide some measure of balance between lexical and grammatical elements in the text. A system that measures only one of the categories (lexical or grammatical) may paint an errant picture. James Barr has noted, "There are different ways of being literal and of being free, so that a translation can be literal and free at the same time but in different modes or on different levels."[30] Since we may get differing results depending on the lexical or grammatical items we select for the analysis, we have chosen several phenomena under each major category that may serve as correctives to one another.[31]

And thirdly, since the text features are those most frequently investigated in translation technique analysis. We may discern the adequacy of the linguistic approach in defining the translators as storytellers.

Since the percentage of literalness will be one of the primary observations in this chapter, it will be of value to comment further on the matter of measuring literalness. We are making literalness our point of departure under the assumption that this was the goal of the translator. Barr asserts.

> "Free" translation, in the sense in which this might be understood by the modern literary public, scarcely existed in the world of the LXX .... The modern "free" ideal, the idea that one should take a complete sentence or even a longer complex, picture to oneself the meaning of this entirety, and then restate this in a new language in words having no necessary detailed links with the words of the original, then scarcely existed.[32]

But that point of departure needs definition. Marquis defines literalness as "the degree of adherence to the source language reflected in the language of the translation, measured relative to a perfectly literal translation."[33] Tov and Wright correctly observe that we are then

measuring "consistency" as a way of defining a percentage of literalness.[34]

But was it always possible for the translator to be consistent? Olofsson offers a helpful corrective when he observes that this could be misleading unless the capabilities of the target language are factored in.[35] For example, we will see that the Greek translators regularly represented the Hebrew perfect with the aorist tense-form. This consistency could not persist in translating the perfect of the Hebrew verb "to be." Since there is no corresponding aorist tense-form in the Greek verb "to be," the translator often used the closest natural equivalent, the imperfect tense-form. This may appear to be "inconsistent" but is in fact the only option available. Thus, we will regard consistency as an indication of the percentage of literalness only when the target language had the capacity to duplicate the parent text. In all other cases, the failure to be consistent will not count against the writer's percentage of literalness.

Description of the Method

We will now define the way in which each dimension of the analysis will be applied to the texts beginning with a discussion of morpheme preservation.

Morpheme Preservation. Since the morpheme is defined as the minimal unit of speech that is meaningful, a morpheme can be a word or part of a word. For example, the Hebrew expression יְדִ֫ימִינוֹ is composed of two words but three morphemes: hand, right and his. The more literal the translator, the more careful the translator will be to represent every morpheme of the source text in the receptor text.[36] This may even be done when the surface structure of the receptor language contains a morpheme that would not be translated in the receptor.[37] By contrast, "a translator who tends to restylize his source according to the standards of the target language, is likely to obliterate unintentionally the smaller elements."[38]

Because of the complexity that can be encountered in identifying every morpheme, our analysis will take into account only those morphemes that are suggested by the root, prefix and suffix of each

word.[39] This will mean that some morphemes are not counted, but it will mean that the count of both Hebrew and Greek texts is conducted in the same way. The total number of morphemes for each chapter will be logged and compared. The percentage of increase or decrease will be recorded. The overall percentage of literalness will always move downward from 100% whether the translation's tendency is inflationary or recessionary in its morpheme count. The Greek translation is expected to be somewhat inflationary even if the translation is very literal. This increase in morpheme count will be due to differences in the surface structure of Greek and Hebrew. Thus, it is not the increase but the amount of increase to which we will be paying attention.

Noun Number. Another piece of evidence that the Greek translator leaves behind for us is his preservation of noun number. The percentage of compliance has been regarded as an indicator of literalness.[40] Each noun in the source text will be marked and its number noted. A corresponding noun will be sought in the receptor text. In every instance where such a corresponding partner exists, a record will be kept of the preservation of noun number. The percentage of preservation will be regarded as a percentage of literalness. Any alteration in noun number will also be examined for its affect on the literary experience of the reader.

In addition, the following constraints will be observed. Hebrew dual forms will be counted as plurals in Greek since the Greek does not have a corresponding dual form. Proper names will not be included in the analysis since number is not an issue with them.

Nominative Independent Personal Pronouns. Most languages have a set of personal pronouns that serve the need for language economy. Both Hebrew and Greek have a corresponding set of independent personal pronouns. The consistency with which the pronouns of the source text are reproduced in the receptor text can be used to measure the literalness of the translation style.[41]

Hebrew uses the independent personal pronoun in two instances. It is used as the expressed subject of a finite verb form.[42] In this case, special emphasis is being directed at the subject so marked. Greek may use the independent personal pronoun in the same way. Since its finite

verb forms are also monolectic, the addition of the nominative pronoun suggested some unique emphasis.[43] In the study of Soisalon-Soininen, the Greek translators of the Pentateuch were quite consistent in handling the personal pronoun as the subject of a finite verb.

> Im Hebräischen wird beim finiten Verb das Personalpronomen als Subjekt nur dann gebraucht, wenn es ausdrücklich hervorgehoben wird. Da auch im Griechischen die Personalpronomina als Subjekt zunächst nur bei Gegensätzen order mit besonderem Nachdruck gebraucht werden, ist es natürlich, dass die Übersetzer der Septuaginta in diesen Fällen meistens der hebräischen Vorlage folgten.[44]

The other nominative use of the Hebrew independent personal pronoun is to function as the subject of a nominal sentence.[45] Since the nominal sentence is a less natural phenomenon in Greek, the translators either had to maintain the surface structure of the Hebrew and create an unnatural Greek expression or change the surface structure of the sentence in translation. Again Soisalon-Soininen's work in the Septuagint is instructive.

> Dasselbe gilt natürlich auch für die griechischen Nominalsätze, aber die Tendenz, Nominalsätze mit Verbalsätzen wiederzugeben, macht auch die Wiedergabe des Subjekts zu einem Problem.[46]

> Wo der Gebrauch des Pronomens unnatürlich wäre, ist es oft eliminiert worden, and zwar in gewissen Fällen durch die Wiedergabe des hebräischen Pronomens mit der Kopula, in anderen Fällen durch die Auslassung des Pronomen.[47]

The instances in which the Hebrew writer uses a nominative independent personal pronoun will be noted and recorded. The preservation of those personal pronouns will be observed in the Greek text. Once again, we will regard the consistency with which the Greek translator preserved the independent personal pronoun as a percentage of literalness. We will also observe the literary consequences of these translation decisions.

Verb Forms. It is imperative that a representative system of translation technique analysis gives attention to the handling of the verb forms. It

was this translation decision which was faced most frequently by the Septuagint translators. Consequently, the success of their translation is closely linked with their success in translating the verb forms.

> The handling of the tense was generally well done in the LXX. And so much depended on this. Readers could tolerate, and could overcome, their numerous peculiar expressions in lexical matters; but if a mess had been made of the tenses in Greek, much of the Bible would have been unreadable.[48]

Therefore, we will take a significant sample of this dimension of the translator's work as Sailhamer did in his analysis.[49]

Our method will focus upon that part of the verbal system most frequently used to construct independent clauses. It is in those types of clauses that the plot of the story will flow. Occurrence of the finite Hebrew verb forms will be noted in the text: perfect (*qatal*), *waw*-consecutive perfect (*weqatal*), imperfect (*yiqtol*) and the *waw*-consecutive imperfect (*wayyiqtol*). The volitional forms will also be included: jussive, cohortative and imperative. The participle will be included when it is functioning as a predicate.[50] When a corresponding Greek form can be identified in the translation, a record will be kept of the way in which the translator presented the form and preserved the person and number.[51] This will provide not only a percentage of consistency in handling text phenomenon, it will also point to any significant literary impact on the text which came through the handling of these verbal elements.

In assessing the literary impact of verb form choices, we will be taking into account the contribution of discourse (text) linguistics.[52] Discourse analysis has changed the level at which communication is examined. The traditional approach to grammar focuses on communication at the level of the sentence. Discourse grammar focuses both at and above the level of sentence taking into consideration the interaction of the word or syntagm in a larger unit of interacting text. This research has had an impact on both the Greek and Hebrew grammarian's view of verb form selection.

The Hebrew or Greek writer's motivation for selecting a particular verb form is certainly a complex affair. Traditional grammatical study has identified the opposition between verb forms and hence the reason for their selection. A writer may select a verb form to express time (tense), *Aktionsart* or verbal aspect.[53] Text linguistics has introduced the

idea of prominence (emphasis). The theory of prominence, as it is associated with the verb forms, suggests that a writer selects a verb form in order to indicate a greater or lesser emphasis on that verb in the literary unit. In Greek, the aorist tense-form is associated with background information, the present and imperfect tense-forms with foreground information and the perfect and pluperfect with frontground information.[54]

In Hebrew, the selection of verb form depends upon whether one is reading in narration or in dialogue. In general, the *waw*-consecutive imperfect is the foreground choice for narration and *waw* + perfect, *waw* + X + perfect and nominal sentences for either background or frontground data. Direct speech uses *waw* + perfect for foreground and other forms for background and frontground data.[55]

This writer shares the reservations of M. Silva who questions whether this theory should replace the traditional approach.[56] Yet as Silva allows, it is at least a criterion that we ought to consider. When our analysis of the verbal system shows a conversion that is out of the norm for that discourse. We will consider the possible change in time, aspect or prominence and so the change in literary experience apparent in the translation.

Preservation of Parataxis. The final linguistic dimension of the text that will be analyzed in our method is that of parataxis. Aejmelaeus dedicated an entire monograph to the study of this phenomenon. In that study of the Pentateuch, he observed that well over 50% of the clauses in the Hebrew Bible begin with a *waw*.[57] Clauses that are united in this way are not marked for hierarchical relationship in the surface structure.[58] Such clauses present the Septuagint translator with an important decision since parataxis is a style that is "repugnant by and large to the spirit of the Greek language."[59] Aejmelaeus said it in this way.

> When the target language for the translation of the Pentateuch was a language like Greek, which possesses ample means for expressing the logical relations of clauses through different conjunctions and subordinate constructions, the need for free renderings of coordinate clauses must have been stronger in contexts where coordination prevailed in the original than in contexts where the original already contained subordinate expressions.[60]

Aejmelaeus did research in the Pentateuch. That research indicated five ways in which the paratactic clauses were commonly handled. They were translated by: καί, δέ, a circumstantial participle, various subordinating conjunctions and through omission.[61]

We will identify each of the paratactic clauses in the Hebrew text that are introduced by *waw*. If a corresponding clause can be identified in the receptor text, we will note the method used to translate that clause. Once again, we will not be making a value judgment on the method of conversion, but noting the consistency with which the surface grammar of the Hebrew was maintained in the Greek translation. This will provide us with a percentage of literalness. When the translator elected to subordinate a clause that was coordinated in the Hebrew, the literary impact of that translation decision will be observed.

Measuring the Texts with Linguistics

We will now present a representative sampling of the data that we obtained after applying our method to the selected pericopies. We will present the reader with tables that report on the percentage of literalness that was derived from each segment of the analysis. In addition, we will provide a brief discussion of the data. This discussion will reflect on the general literalness of the text as well as call attention to distinctive conversions. We will also consider the potential shift in literary experience that attends the unique translation patterns.[62]

Genesis 22

We begin with the data from Genesis 22. The lexical information that we gathered from Genesis 22 is noted in table 1. The lexical data paints the picture of a very literal translation style. The translator increased the morpheme count by 3%. This allows just a small amount of room for additions in content that may affect the literary experience of the reader.[63] This literal picture painted by the lexical data stands in contrast to what we find in the grammatical data. The grammatical features are handled in a less literal way. See table 2.

Table 1. Lexical Features Genesis 22

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	97%
Noun Number	97%
Independent Personal Pronoun	100%

Consider the verb forms. In this section, the Hebrew perfects are regularly represented by a Greek aorist, 9 of 11 times (82%). Thus the perfect וַיַּסֶּה in 22:1 which is translated as an imperfect calls attention to itself. The Hebrew perfect is used in an antecedent sentence that provides background for the following dialogue.[64] According to prominence theory, the Greek imperfect is used for foreground data.[65] Thus the translator has changed the literary experience of the Greek reader by giving the notion of God's testing a more prominent role.

Table 2. Grammatical Features Genesis 22

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	82%
Waw-C. Perfect	1
Participle	0
Imperfect	73%
Waw-C. Imperfect	74%
Volitional	100%
Person/Number	81%
Clause Coordination	76%

The literary experience is also impacted in 22:14. The translator usually represents the Hebrew imperfect with a Greek future (73%). But the two imperfects in 22:14, יִרְאֶה and יֵרָאֶה are translated by aorists (εἶδεν and ὤφθη). The Hebrew is prospective, the Greek is retrospective.

With regard to clause coordination, the translator of Genesis 22 marked and maintained parataxis 76% of the time. But in at least twelve instances, the translator subordinated clauses. In most of those instances, the deep grammar of the Hebrew was preserved. But in at least four instances, in 22:5 and 22:8–10, the subordination did change the literary experience of the Greek reader.

In 22:5, Abraham tells his servants that he and his son would go, worship and return. The three verbs are parallel in form. They point to Abraham as a man of fixed determination. He will execute his orders with precision. But these three verbs also introduce significant tension. For the fact that he would "go" and "worship" would seem to preclude the possibility of joint "return." In the Septuagint, "worship" is reduced to a participle. This diminishes the literary impact of the three-verb chain, thus altering the literary experience for the Greek reader.

In 22:9–10, a chain of 7 *waw*-consecutive clauses characterize the actions of Abraham as he prepares to sacrifice his son. That chain provides dramatic intensity while characterizing the meticulous obedience of Abraham. In the Septuagint, that chain is broken by three circumstantial participles. And once again the literary experience of the Greek reader is affected.

In summary, the average literalness of Gen 22 at 85% is second lowest of all the chapters we studied.[60] Only Job 1–2 had a lower overall literalness. (See table 25 for a comparison of the chapters.) And we have begun to see that the study of linguistic components may make a contribution to a text's literary analysis.

Genesis 34

On average, Genesis 34 is slightly more literal (92%) than the average of the chapters we have studied (90%). But that ranking has much more to do with the grammatical features than the lexical features. This is particularly apparent in the translator's handling of the personal pronouns. The lexical data is presented in table 3.

The inflation of the morpheme count by 9% clearly exceeds the 2% that is necessary for linguistic adjustments. This would allow room for semantic adjustment to occur. The consistency in preserving noun number is also below 93% (the average of all chapters studied). While many of the changes are a result of exchanging collectives for plurals as in 34:23, there are two changes that change the literary experience of the Greek reader. The word אֶרֶץ is used twice in verse vv. 1 and 2, both times in the singular. The two uses of the singular in such close proximity suggest that the "land" Dinah visited was Shechem. In the Greek, two different lexemes are used. The first is represented with a plural and the second with a singular. The plural diminishes the

connection between the two uses of אֶרֶץ suggesting that Dinah was in the habit of visiting multiple foreign "locations." This change in the Greek text shapes the character of Dinah in a slightly more negative way.

Table 3. Lexical Features Genesis 34

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	91%
Noun Number	90%
Independent Personal Pronoun	60%

The other noteworthy change is found in 34:17. Here the sons of Jacob prescribe the alternatives for Hamor and Shechem. If they don't accede to the demand that they be circumcised, then Jacob's family will take their "daughter" and will go. While the Hebrew has a singular here referring to Dinah, בִּתֵּנוּ, the Greek translates with a plural, τὰς θυγατέρας. Was Dinah being held hostage by the family of Shechem while this bargaining was going on or not? If she is being held, that illuminates the nature of the dialogue and the coming attack on the residents of Shechem. The Hebrew with a singular implies she is a hostage. The plural referring to the hypothetical "daughters" of 34:16 does not imply that any hostage is being held.

The translator's consistency in preserving grammatical features is higher. It is the statistics in table 4 that allow for this chapter to achieve an above-average, literal ranking.

Table 4. Grammatical Features Genesis 34

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	88%
Waw-C. Perfect	75%
Participle	I
Imperfect	88%
Waw-C. Imperfect	97%
Volitional	100%
Person/Number	97%
Clause Coordination	87%

In all grammatical categories, the translator is as literal or more literal than we saw in Genesis 22. Most of the verb adjustments are in the direction of Koine Greek idiom. Yet several specific items stand apart from this picture of consistency.

While the translator is very careful in the preservation of person and number (97%), there are two striking instances of change. In 34:11, Shechem invites the family of Dinah to request compensation. He says that no matter what they ask he will give it. In this instance, אֶתֵּן construes the action with a one common singular subject. The Greek translation shifts this to a one common plural, δώσομεν. While the Hebrew text implicates only Shechem in the deal, the Greek implicates a larger group.

The second change has parallels with the first. It is in 34:13. The brothers use a singular verb to describe the one who "defiled" their sister, טִמֵּא. The reader assumes that the subject is Shechem. But in the Greek, the subject of that verb is construed in the plural, ἐμίαναν. This spreads the blame more broadly for what happened to their sister and perhaps lays the foundation for the attack of Simeon and Levi. Both instances affect the way the reader of these texts perceives who is to blame for the defiling of Dinah and who should pay the consequences. Thus, the literary experience of the Hebrew and Greek reader differs at this juncture.

One other matter surfaces from the analysis of the verbs. The translator regularly translated second person volitional forms with the aorist imperative. There is a string of seven volitional forms in 34:9–10. The first three are translated with the aorist imperative, the next three with present imperatives and the last with an aorist imperative. The translator is not responding to changes in Hebrew form but rather appears to be making a literary statement. Since the aorist imperative is the default form (used seven times in this chapter), the present imperatives have a distinct verbal aspect and are receiving emphasis that is not programmed into the Hebrew text.[67] This affects the rhetoric of Hamor's bargaining placing more emphasis on the verbs that speak to what Jacob and his family have to gain in this deal.

The translator was very consistent in maintaining clause coordination. There were only three instances in which the translator subordinated clauses that we examined. In all three instances, the translator followed the deep grammar of the Hebrew and subordinated less significant verbs with predicate participles.

Exodus 13–14

The data gathered from the selected verses of Exodus 13–14 is similar to that of Genesis 34. The two chapters are nearly identical in overall literalness. (See table 25). The percentages for the lexical components are seen in table 5. Here we see that the lexical features again display a less literal trend than the grammatical features.

Table 5. Lexical Features Exodus 13–14

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	92%
Noun Number	90%
Independent Personal Pronoun	71%

The 8% increase in the morpheme count is again more than necessary to accommodate linguistic adjustments. Thus, we will be attentive to semantic additions to the text. The translator preserved noun number 90% of the time. In 13 instances, the translator did not cause the number of the Hebrew noun to correspond with the number of the matching Greek noun. Each change was a shift from a plural to a collective or a collective to a plural. These are instances that largely relate to the thought structure of the language and do not significantly affect the literary experience. The preservation of the personal pronouns was less consistent but the changes in surface structure did not appreciably affect the literary experience projected in the Greek text.

The grammatical data is presented in figure 6. Once again the handling of the verb forms invites comment. The Hebrew perfect was translated with a Greek aorist in 15 of 17 instances. That makes the selection of the imperfect in 14:10 unique. There הִקְרִיב is translated by προσῆγεν. The Hebrew construction, *waw* + subject + perfect, creates a Hebrew adversative clause[68] in the background plane of discourse.[69] The Greek imperfect is not formally marked as adversative and the tense-form selection moves the verb's content to the foreground.[70] This tense-form choice puts emphasis on the approach of the Pharaoh which affects the way in which the Greek reader is prepared to hear the people complain in 14:11.

Table 6. Grammatical Features Exodus 13–14

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	88%
Waw-C. Perfect	88%
Participle	43%
Imperfect	75%
Waw-C. Imperfect	94%
Volitional	94%
Person/Number	87%
Clause Coordination	94%

The participles were translated predictably 86% of the time by the present and imperfect tense-forms. That makes the single instance of an aorist in 14:10 stand out. The Hebrew clause is marked for emphasis both by הִנֵּה and by the choice of the participle.[71] Not only Pharaoh but the entire Egyptian contingent was approaching. The Greek places the verbal activity into the background thus muting this prominence. Once again, this shift also will influence the comments made by the people in 14:11.

The Hebrew imperfect was translated 75% of the time with a future tense-form. Against that consistent rendering, we must examine the choice of the aorist in 13:22. There יָמִישׁ is translated by ἐξέλιπεν. The Hebrew narrative that flows with *waw*-consecutive imperfects is emphatically interrupted by this Hebrew imperfect. The Greek aorist tense-form eliminates the emphasis and thus does not speak as strongly about the resolute position of the pillar of the cloud.

We will also wish to examine the chain of volitional forms used in 14:13. In this section, the translator used seven aorist imperatives and two present imperatives. In 14:13, we find two present imperatives surrounding an aorist imperative. Again, the translator's decision is not responding to the form of the Hebrew verb. Rather the translator has struck out on his own emphasizing the instructions given in the present imperatives. The people are *not to fear* and but are *to look*.

The consistency with which the translator preserved the person and number of nouns is 87%. As with the nouns, virtually all of these are adjustments akin to what we see in 13:17. There the subject of the verbal chain is the noun עָם. The first verb in the Hebrew chain is

singular. The second is plural. The Septuagint renders both with the singular.

The translator of this section connected clauses in a very paratactic fashion. We note only two instances of subordination. In both cases, the Greek uses a predicate participle to create the dependent clause. Neither instance makes a strong literary impact on the final product.

Numbers 13

Numbers 13 has an average literalness of 88%. This places it between the Gen 22 text and Exod 13–14. The translator of Numbers 13 would display the highest lexical literalness of all the texts if it were not for the personal pronoun data. See table 7.

The first two items speak about a very literal translator. The 5% increase in morphemes is only slightly more than what we regard as necessary to make linguistic adjustments. That places it among the least inflationary of the texts we studied. The translator's consistency in handling noun number is also very high. Only three adjustments were observed. All three are the substitution of a collective for a plural or a plural for a collective.

In contrast to this marked picture of consistency, the translator preserved the personal pronoun in only one of ten instances. The Hebrew used the personal pronoun eight times in nominal clauses. Each of the eight was changed to a verbal clause and the pronoun was eliminated. The Hebrew writer used the personal pronoun twice in a verbal clause, each with a participle serving as the verb.

Table 7. Lexical Features Numbers 13

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	95%
Noun Number	97%
Independent Personal Pronoun	10%

Here the personal pronoun is required in the Hebrew surface structure and no special emphasis is intended. That makes the one time that translator *does* preserve the personal pronoun emphatic. We find that in 13:2. While no special emphasis would attend the personal pronoun in the Hebrew, the translator stressed the fact that *the Lord* was giving the

land to the people in 13:2. He translated אֲנִי נֹתֵן with the emphatic ἐγὼ δίδωμι.

An interesting substitution for the personal pronoun is seen in 13:27. There the nature of the land was being described. The Hebrew has זָבַת חָלָב וּדְבַשׁ הִוא. The translator emphasizes the land by putting the antecedent, "land," in place of the personal pronoun, γῆν ῥέουσαν γάλα καὶ μέλι.

The grammatical dimension of the translation is sampled in table 8. Note that the Hebrew writer used *waw*-consecutive imperfects (23), perfects (14) and a few participles (8) to tell the story. The Hebrew perfect is translated in predictable ways. The Greek aorist tense-form is used 64% of the time. In contrast, the Greek perfect tense-form is used three times and all in conjunction with the *same topic*. The perfect is used in 13:28, 13:32 and 13:33. Each time it is used in translating the verb רָאִינוּ. Each time it is used by those wishing to dissuade the people from going up into the land. And each time it deals with seeing the threatening people who live in that land. Since these are the only perfects in the discourse, they clearly draw attention to themselves.[72] Thus the use of the perfect tense-form provides both rhetorical emphasis on these statements and linkage between them. This emphasis is not part of the surface structure of the Hebrew and thus represents a unique literary experience.

Table 8. Grammatical Features Numbers 13

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	64%
Waw-C. Perfect	I
Participle	75%
Imperfect	I
Waw-C. Imperfect	96%
Volitional	I
Person/Number	85%
Clause Coordination	93%

Only four Hebrew imperfects are used in this chapter. Two are translated by futures, one is translated by a predicate participle and one with a present subjunctive. The last of the list has significance for the literary impact of the verse. Ten spies are dissenting from Caleb's view

that the people will be able to go up and take possession of the land they explored. The Hebrew surface structure does not mark their response for emphasis. The Greek structure does. The subjunctive is part of a grammatical construction that shows strong future negation.[73] In 13:32 (MT 13:31), the Greek has οὐ μὴ δυνώμεθα. Thus the rhetoric of the 10 spies is given a measure of energy which is not part of the Hebrew surface structure.

Both the *waw*-consecutive imperfects and the participles are translated in conventional ways which align with the literary agenda of the Hebrew. The Greek translation agrees with the person and number of the verbal forms in 85% of the instances. Of the seven instances where there is not agreement, six involve the exchange of a collective for a plural or a plural for a collective. One instance may impact the literary force of the discourse.

In 13:2, the Lord gives instructions about the exploration of the land and selection of the spies. He employs the verb שׁלח twice. The first time the instruction is given in the singular, the second time the instruction is in the plural, תִּשְׁלְחוּ. The Greek represents both with the singular, תִּשְׁלְחוּ is translated ἀποστελεῖς. The Hebrew would view the sending agency as the people while the Greek parallels the first volitional form and assigns Moses to the task. In the Greek, this is Moses' expedition. That may have implications for the way in which the people received the report.

The translator was very consistent in preserving the paratactic linking of clauses (93%). The three clauses that were subordinated were matters of lesser importance. Thus the literary experience of the Hebrew is duplicated in this dimension of the translation.[74]

Judges 4

Both the A and B text version of Judges 4 will be considered in this section. Both texts have an average literalness of 93% which places them slightly above the average of the chapters we examined (90%). Table 9 presents the lexical data. The 13% and 10% increase in morphemes found in the Greek texts suggest that both will contain significant semantic additions that may impact their readers in a unique way.

The translator showed sensitivity to noun number. The changes that we see in both texts are connected to collective/plural exchanges that have no affect on the literary experience. The translator was also extremely sensitive to the reproduction of the personal pronoun in both texts.

Table 9. Lexical Features Judges 4 A and B

Lexical Features	Text A % Literalness	Text B % Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	87%	90%
Noun Number	90%	90%
Independent Personal Pronoun	100%	100%

The grammatical features present a more mixed picture. See table 10. Ten of twelve Hebrew perfects are translated by the aorist tense-form. The one striking exception is found in 4:14 of both texts. Deborah is encouraging Barak to take his forces and attack. She uses two Hebrew perfects to make her argument. The Lord has "given Sisera into your hand" and the Lord has "gone out before you." In the first case, the translator uses an aorist and in the second the Hebrew perfect is translated with a future. This changes Deborah's rhetoric and so the literary experience of the reader. Virtually all other verb forms are translated in ways that duplicate the deep grammar if not the surface structure of the Hebrew text.

Table 10. Grammatical Features Judges 4 A and B

Grammatical Feature	Text A % Literalness	Text B % Literalness
Perfect	83%	85%
Waw-C. Perfect	78%	78%
Participle	50%	50%
Imperfect	100%	100%
Waw-C. Imperfect	100%	98%
Volitional	100%	100%
Person/Number	100%	99%
Clause Coordination	98%	98%

The translator demonstrated the same remarkable consistency in preserving the Hebrew clauses marked for coordination (98%). There was only one instance in both texts where such marked coordination was not duplicated.

Judges 4 presents us with a very interesting situation. We see evidence of very consistent translation style in handling the nouns, pronouns and clause coordination. This may lead us to expect the translator will be just as cautious with the semantic content. But when the morpheme count is observed, we are led to expect significant changes in the content.

1 Samuel 31

The text of 1 Samuel 31 is briefer than some of the others we have examined to this point. Thus there are fewer criteria with sufficient forms to contribute towards our study. This discourse has an average literalness of 88%. That is slightly below the average for all texts which is 90%.[75] The lexical data is found in table 11.

Table 11. Lexical Features 1 Samuel 31

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	92%
Noun Number	98%
Independent Personal Pronoun	0

The increase in the number of morphemes is 8%. While this is about average for the chapters we studied, it leads us to expect semantic adjustments.[76] The translator consistently represented the noun number in 41 of 42 cases. The exception is worthy of note. It is found in 31:12. When the residents of Jabesh-Gilead heard about the death of Saul and his sons, they came to Beth-shan to remove the bodies from the city wall. But whose bodies were attached to the wall? The Hebrew says that they removed the body of Saul and his sons (plural) from the wall, גְּוִיַּת בָּנָיו מֵחוֹמַת . The Greek translation treats this fact differently. The body of Saul and *Jonathan his son* (singular) were removed from the wall, τὸ σῶμα Ιωναθαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τείχους.

Table 12 address the grammatical elements of the text. The preservation of person/number and clause coordination is about as high

as it can go. Of the 49 verbs marked for our study in this chapter, the majority were either Hebrew perfects (7) or *waw*-consecutive imperfects (35). The translator regularly represented the Hebrew perfect with an aorist in six of eight instances. The only exception was the shift to a Greek perfect tense-form in 31:5 and 7. This may be to highlight and parallel the consequences of Saul's suicide. In v. 5, the weapons' bearer dies. In v. 7, the army is in flight.

Table 12. Grammatical Features 1 Samuel 31

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	75%
Waw-C. Perfect	I
Participle	I
Imperfect	I
Waw-C. Imperfect	54%
Volitional	I
Person/Number	98%
Clause Coordination	100%

The consistency with which the Hebrew perfects were rendered stands in stark contrast to the translation of the *waw*-consecutive imperfects. The percentage of literalness here is only 54%. Sixteen were translated with the aorist tense-form. But 19 were translated with a *present* tense-form. Not only is the percentage of consistency completely out of keeping with the handling of this form in the other texts (see figure 25) it is an extraordinarily unusual conversion pattern within the Septuagint as a whole.[77]

We examined several possible literary motives for his pattern. But the majority of aorist and present tense-forms are intermixed. No special emphasis seems to attend the forms translated with a present tense-form. We did, however, observe that in vv. 4–6, the intermixing found in all other verses is not present. The Hebrew tells the story of Saul's suicide using *waw*-consecutive imperfects. The translator handles each with an aorist tense-form without the shifting to present tense-forms that we see in other parts of this discourse. Thus vv. 4–6 are marked in the Greek translation in a way that causes them to stand out from the rest of the chapter. This literary marking of the text creates a

reading experience that is unique from the reading experience in the Hebrew text.

2 Samuel 6

The average literalness of 2 Samuel 6 stands at 90%. The lexical features are presented in table 13. The translator of this chapter increased the number of morphemes by 7%. This increase is about average for the texts we have studied but is more than necessary if only linguistic adjustments were being made. Once again we expect to find some increase in semantic content which will affect the literary experience of the Greek reader. The translator showed the highest possible level of consistency in preserving noun number, 100%.

Table 13. Lexical Features 2 Samuel 6

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	93%
Noun Number	100%
Independent Personal Pronoun	0

The grammatical data for this chapter is presented in table 14. There we find a level of consistency that is considerably lower than that projected in the lexical section. The Hebrew verbal system was handled with less consistency than we have seen in the previous pericopies. The Hebrew perfect is regularly translated by the aorist tense-form (9 of 13 instances). In 6:20, we have a unique translation. Michel is quoted as she speaks about the unbecoming behavior of her husband. Recall that the Hebrew perfect is regularly translated by the aorist. That makes the translation of the Hebrew perfect with a Greek perfect tense-form distinctive. Michel's quote in the Greek text, "How the king *has honored himself* today," has more emphasis placed upon it than the reciprocal phrase in the Hebrew.

Finally, the *waw*-consecutive imperfect is regularly represented by the aorist tense-form (30 of 35 instances). The first Hebrew verb in 6:6 וַיָּבֹאוּ and the first verb in 6:17 וַיָּבֹאוּ are both translated by present tense-forms. The concordant use of the Hebrew lemma seems to be marking the specific locations where the Ark of the Covenant stopped (the threshing floor in 6:6 and the tent in Jerusalem with 6:17). The

Greek text uses different lexemes to translate the same Hebrew root, but preserves the concordance between the two events by marking them with the present tense-form. Thus while the conversion of the verb form is unusual, the literary impact remains the same.

Table 14. Grammatical Features 2 Samuel 6

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	69%
Waw-C. Perfect	1
Participle	50%
Imperfect	1
Waw-C. Imperfect	86%
Volitional	0
Person/Number	91%
Clause Coordination	98%

The translator is quite consistent in preserving the person/number of the finite verbs. Two of the five exceptions may have literary significance. They are both found in 6:3. The Hebrew uses plural verbs to note the loading and moving of the Ark. The verbs are וַיִּרְכְּבוּ and וַיִּשְׂאוּהוּ. The Greek translates with singulars, ἐπεβίβασεν and ἦρεν. The implied subject of these verbs is King David. Thus a different literary experience is found in the Greek than the Hebrew. The Greek text gives David a more prominent position in bringing the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem.

The translator was very consistent in preserving the clauses marked for coordination (98%). Thus the literary experience of the Greek and Hebrew reader were nearly identical in this regard.[78]

Jonah

Our investigation of the Book of Jonah is limited to the narrative sections. The average literalness of chapters 1,3–4 is 92%. This places it 2% above the average. We begin with the lexical evidence in table 15. The morpheme count suggests that there will be some additions since a 4% increase in the morpheme count is more than is necessary for linguistic adjustments. But those semantic adjustments will be fewer

than we have seen in many of the other texts.[79] Jonah's translator was among the two least consistent in preserving noun number. Once again, each of the differences in noun number may be attributed to collective/plural adjustments. The translator preserved the personal pronoun in 9 of 10 instances. The sole exception is found in 1:10 where the personal pronoun is the grammatical subject of a participle. The translator represents this construction with a finite verb.

Table 15. Lexical Features Jonah

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	96%
Noun Number	88%
Independent Personal Pronoun	90%

Table 16 presents the grammatical data from Jonah. We see a very literal translator at work in these verses. Note especially the 99% agreement in person/number and the 98% parity in clause coordination. The verbal system is handled in a fairly consistent way as well.

Table 16. Grammatical Features Jonah

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	78%
Waw-C. Perfect	I
Participle	50%
Imperfect	71%
Waw-C. Imperfect	95%
Volitional	100%
Person/Number	99%
Clause Coordination	98%

But we observe an interesting occurrence in 3:8. There the Hebrew writer has done something unusual. The three verbs which communicate the Ninevite response to Jonah are all *waw* + imperfect forms rather than the *waw*-consecutive forms with which the writer has been telling the story. This places emphasis on the content of this verse. The Greek translator has read those same three verbs as *waw*-consecutive imperfects (a different vocalization than the MT). The

result is that the Greek translator uses the aorist tense-form for these three verbs, abandoning the literary emphasis of the Hebrew version.[80]

The *waw*-consecutive imperfects in the narrative are most frequently translated with the aorist tense-form (70 of 74 times). The four instances in which the translator selects the imperfect tense-form will change the narrative experience of the Greek reader. Three of those instances occur in 1:5. That verse contains 5 *waw*-consecutive imperfect forms. Three of them are translated with an imperfect. The sailors *crying out* and Jonah's *lying down* and *sleeping* are presented to the Greek reader by imperfects. This not only distinguishes and emphasizes these actions, it also invites the reader to compare and contrast the actions of the sailors to that of Jonah. This marked emphasis is unique to the literary experience of the Greek reader. The fourth example is found in 1:13 where the sailors' activity of "digging in to turn the ship" receives added emphasis in the Greek. There וַיְחַתְּרוּ is translated by παρεβιάζοντο.

Job 1–2

The translation of Job 1–2 is distinguished by the lowest average literalness of all the texts in our study (81%). Thus we expect to find a literary experience which is very unique from that portrayed in the Hebrew narrative.[81] We begin with the lexical data in table 17.

The translator's handling of the personal pronoun is similar to what we have seen. But the consistency of this translator is considerably lower in the other lexical categories. A 12% increase in morpheme count will yield a number of semantic additions that will change the literary experience of the translation. And while the type of divergence in noun number is again associated with collective/plural exchanges, it is the number of those adjustments which is striking. The percentage of change is higher in Job than in any of the other texts.

Table 17. Lexical Features Job 1–2

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	88%
Noun Number	83%
Independent Personal Pronoun	83%

The evidence in the grammatical categories paints a similar picture. Consider the data in table 18. Evidence from the volitional and participle categories is about the same as we have seen. But the data from the other categories reveals a pattern of very low consistency. Here we note several examples where that style of translation may well affect the literary experience of the Greek reader.

The Hebrew perfect is again regularly translated by the aorist tense-form (21 of 28 times). The shift to the present in 1:18 is striking. There the Hebrew בָּא is translated with ἔρχεται. This is thought provoking because it not only contrasts with the pattern established in these two chapters but also with the formulaic pattern established in 1:14–18. Four messengers are said to have come to Job. Each time the verb בָּא is used. The first three times it is translated by the aorist ἦλθον. The Hebrew places no distinctive emphasis on the arrival of the fourth messenger who brings word of the death of Job's children. The Greek does.

Table 18. Grammatical Features Job 1–2

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	75%
Waw-C. Perfect	I
Participle	58%
Imperfect	56%
Waw-C. Imperfect	80%
Volitional	100%
Person/Number	88%
Clause Coordination	72%

The Hebrew imperfect is most often translated by the future tense-form (5 of 9 times). But three times the Greek writer uses the aorist tense-form in its place. The literary impact of that decision is apparent in 2:10. There וְנִקְבַּל is used twice in a carefully balanced question. "Should we *accept* good from God and not *accept* trouble?" The first is translated with an aorist ἐδεξάμεθα and the second with a different lexeme and a future tense-form, ὑποίσομεν. Thus the carefully balanced question of Job suffers in the Greek due to the lexical and tense-form shifts.

The translator regularly represented Hebrew volitional forms with Greek volitional forms. But one pair of those forms invites attention. Job's wife uses two imperatives that direct him to act to alleviate his suffering. The two parallel imperatives are בָּרֵךְ אֱלֹהִים וָמֻת. The Greek translator differentiates between them by translating εἰπόν τι ῥῆμα εἰς κύριον καὶ τελεύτα. The first is an aorist imperative and the second is a present imperative. Since all imperatives in these two chapters are aorists except for τελεύτα, this imperative is receiving extra emphasis in Greek.

The preservation of marked clause coordination is the lowest of all the material we have examined (72%). There are no fewer than 16 instances in which the translator subordinated clauses that were coordinated in the Hebrew. The most striking result of this shift is apparent in 2:12 where the narrator informs us of how the three friends reacted when they saw Job. That reaction is spelled out in five 5 *waw*-consecutive clauses. The literary affect of that repetition is defeated in the Greek by the intrusion of subordinate constructions.

Ruth 1–2

The total literalness of Ruth 1–2 is 92%. That places it slightly above the average of 90%. This suggests that we might be in for a more literal translation. The lexical data in table 19 supports that notion.

Table 19. Lexical Features Ruth 1–2

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	95%
Noun Number	92%
Independent Personal Pronoun	73%

The translator increased the number of morphemes only 5%. This represents a high degree of literalness and yet allows for some increase in semantic content. The preservation of noun number is about average. All of the changes are again related to exchanges in plural/collective presentation. Six of the twelve number changes are associated with one lexeme, עֵדָה. The preservation of personal pronouns was slightly below average. All the changes maintain the Hebrew deep grammar.

The grammatical data is generally supportive of the translator's consistency as well. Table 20 presents that data. The consistency in handling the *waw*-consecutive, imperfect, volitional forms, person/number and clause coordination rank among the highest percentages in the group for each category. For example, the translator subordinated only one of 119 clauses that were coordinated in the Hebrew.

An interesting story is told in the verb form analysis. The story is told by *waw*-consecutive imperfects (77), perfects (35) and imperfects (35). The translator shows high consistency in handling the *waw*-consecutive imperfects (94%) but more moderate consistency in presenting the perfect (77%) and very low consistency in presenting the imperfect (26%). In the latter two cases, the translator shows a greater tendency to use more natural Koine Greek constructions. For example, the imperfect is represented by the future 9 times, an optative 9 times and a subjunctive 9 times. These transitions change the surface structure but do not change the deep grammar of the Hebrew leaving the literary experience largely unchanged.

Table 20. Grammatical Features Ruth 1–2

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	77%
Waw-C. Perfect	80%
Participle	1
Imperfect	26%
Waw-C. Imperfect	94%
Volitional	100%
Person/Number	97%
Clause Coordination	98%

Yet several instances do require attention because of their influence on the literary experience of the Greek reader. The imperfect is translated by the aorist tense-form in 2:22. As Naomi speaks to Ruth about the Boaz's invitation to remain with his harvesters for the season, she says, טוֹב בִּתִּי כִּי תֵצְאִי עִם־נַעֲרוֹתָיו. The Hebrew places the statement in view of future events while the Greek is retrospective, ἀγαθόν, θύγατερ, ὅτι ἐπορεύθης μετὰ τῶν κορασίων αὐτοῦ.

The Hebrew perfect is regularly represented by the aorist tense-form (27 of 35 instances). The future is used to represent this form only once. That is found in 1:12. The co-text clearly marks Naomi's words as a reference to the future. Yet the Hebrew uses יָלַדְתִּי. The use of the Hebrew perfect where the intention is clearly a reference to the future creates emphasis for the Hebrew reader. The Greek eliminates this emphasis by translating with a future tense-form, τέξομαι.[82]

The *waw*-consecutive imperfect is regularly translated by the aorist tense-form (72 of 77 times). In 1:7, the narrator reports that Naomi and her daughters-in-law headed in the direction of Judah. The Hebrew form וַתֵּלַכְנָה is represented by the Greek imperfect, ἐπορεύοντο. The Hebrew does not mark this event for any special emphasis, but the Greek text does.

The volitional forms regularly represent volitional forms. But the volitional forms in 1:20 invite attention. In speaking to the people who had come to meet her as she returned to Bethlehem, she said, אַל־תִּקְרֶאנָה לִי נָעֳמִי קְרֶאן לִי מָרָא. The Greek translates with two volitional forms. The form of the imperative most frequently used in these chapters is the aorist imperative. It is used six times. The present imperative is unique giving special emphasis. It is used once here. Μὴ δὴ καλεῖτέ με Νωεμιν, καλέσατε΄ με Πικράν. The same lexeme is used but the emphasis is on the first rather than the second volitional form.[83]

1 Chronicles 10

Chapter ten of 1 Chronicles presents an interesting case. Its overall percentage ranks it highest of the texts we examined. We begin with the lexical data in table 21.

Table 21. Lexical Features 1 Chronicles 10

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	88%
Noun Number	93%
Independent Personal Pronoun	0

This narrative again comprises fewer verses leaving fewer components of the text to analyze. The preservation of noun number,

person/number and clause coordination is extremely high. We see also see a high degree of consistency in handling the verbs. The story is primarily told by 12 Hebrew perfects and 35 *waw*-consecutive imperfects. Those are translated by 46 aorist tense-forms.

But before we brand the translation as absolutely literal, we need to consider the morpheme count. Note that the translator increases the number of morphemes by 12%. Thus while the translator is consistent in presenting the data that is in the Hebrew text, he is at the same time inflationary. We will be examining the text for semantic additions that undoubtedly will affect the literary nature of the translation.

Table 22. Grammatical Features 1 Chronicles 10

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	92%
Waw-C. Perfect	1
Participle	0
Imperfect	1
Waw-C. Imperfect	100%
Volitional	0
Person/Number	95%
Clause Coordination	98%

Before we leave 1 Chronicles 10, we would like to look at one instance of change in noun number. It is clear the translator is generally consistent in this regard (93%). That makes the change in 10:13 stand out all the more. Here the narrator interprets the reason for Saul's death. He says, וַיָּמָת שָׁאוּל בְּמַעֲלוֹ. Note that the object of the preposition is in the singular. The Hebrew writer goes on to identify the single event which he had in mind. The Greek translator presents the phrase in this way, καὶ ἀπέθανεν Σαουλ ἐν ταῖς ἀνομίας. Here the object of the prepositional phrase is plural. The implication is that the unfaithfulness of Saul is not tied to a singular event but to a stream of unfaithfulness which characterized his life. In the expansion, the incident at Endor is mentioned as an illustration of a larger pattern of life. One might be able to forgive and forget a single indiscretion on the part of a national leader. But when his life is characterized by such indiscretion, such a leader will receive a less than welcome review in

history. Thus the Greek Saul is portrayed in a more negative light than his Hebrew counterpart.

1 Chronicles 13

The data from the discussion of 1 Chronicles 13 looks very similar to the data from 1 Chronicles 10 with one important exception. Table 23 presents the lexical information.[83] Once again the amount of text limits the amount of data we possess. But the lexical data we have indicates that this translation is the most literal of all the translations we have discussed. The total increase in the morpheme count is only 1.3%. According to our investigations, such a small percentage of increase would be barely enough to cover changes in linguistic structure between the parent language and the receptor language. Thus I Chronicles 13 was translated in a very literal way.

Table 23. Lexical Features 1 Chronicles 13

Lexical Features	% of Literalness
Morpheme Preservation	99%
Noun Number	98%
Independent Personal Pronoun	0

The grammatical data is very supportive of this literal trend. See table 24.

Table 24. Grammatical Features 1 Chronicles 13

Grammatical Feature	% of Literalness
Perfect	57%
Waw-C. Perfect	0
Participle	I
Imperfect	I
Waw-C. Imperfect	100%
Volitional	I
Person/Number	95%
Clause Coordination	100%

The one dimension of the text which indicates a lower level of consistency is the representation of the perfect. Four of seven are translated with an aorist. But all changes are representative of the Hebrew sense of the sentence.

Summary of Statistical Research

Now that we have applied this linguistic model to twelve stories, let's summarize what we know. Table 25 brings all of the data together. Each of the texts is listed together with seven dimensions we had met earlier. The seven were chosen because each discourse contained numerous examples of that feature. In addition to presenting the previous data, the averages are given for each dimension of the text and each discourse unit.

Table 25. Data Summary for All Texts

	Morp	Noun Numb	Perf	*Waw*-cons	Pers/ Num	Cl Coord	Text Avg
Gn 22	97%	97%	82%	74%	81%	76%	85%
Gn 34	91%	90%	88%	97%	97%	87%	92%
Ex 13-14	92%	90%	88%	94%	87%	94%	91%
Nu 13	95%	97%	64%	96%	85%	93%	88%
Ju 4 A	87%	90%	83%	100%	100%	98%	93%
Ju 4 B	90%	90%	85%	98%	99%	98%	93%
1 Sa 31	92%	98%	86%	54%	98%	100%	88%
2 Sa 6	93%	100%	69%	86%	91%	98%	90%
Jonah	96%	88%	78%	95%	99%	98%	92%
Job 1-2	88%	83%	75%	80%	88%	72%	81%
Ru 1-2	95%	92%	77%	94%	97%	98%	92%
1Ch 10	88%	93%	92%	100%	95%	98%	94%
1Ch 13	99%	98%	57%	100%	95%	100%	92%
Column Avg	93%	93%	79%	90%	93%	93%	90%

We may operate vertically in the columns to determine how the texts compare to each other in specific dimensions of the discourse. For

example, we can see that the average percentage of literalness in the morpheme count section is 93%. The 1 Chronicles 13 text ranks considerably above that at 99% while the Judges 4 A text settles below that at 87%. The farther this figure waivers from 100%, the greater the amount of semantic divergence we might expect.

We can also use the table to compare the average percentage of literalness for a given text given all dimensions listed in the table. This statistic is listed in the far right column of table 25 under "text average." According to our records, we may regard the texts of Job 1-2 with an average literalness of 81% and the text of Gen 22 with an average literalness of 85% to be less literal than a text like 1 Chronicles 10 with 94%.

We had considered that it might be possible to discern evolution in the translation style of the Septuagint between the Torah, Prophets and Writings. The data we have collected from this sample of narrative texts does not indicate any clear distinction in the translating style between those sections. What is striking is the similarity of the statistical averages between those larger biblical divisions. The average literalness for the Torah is 88.8%. The average literalness for the Prophets is 90.7%. And the average literalness for the Writings is 89.8%. Given an average of 90% for all chapters, we conclude that the variation from that average is not statistically significant.[85]

The literalness of individual texts and literalness of the biblical divisions varied depending upon the dimension of the text we were examining. See table 26.

Table 26. Biblical Divisions Illustration

Text Division	Morpheme	Waw-C	Clause Coord.
Torah	94%	90%	88%
Prophets	92%	87%	98%
Writings	93%	94%	92%

If one were to rank the divisions by morpheme, the Torah would be seen as most literal. If one were to rank literalness based on translation of the Hebrew *waw*-consecutive imperfect, the Writings would be regarded as most literal. And if one were to rank the literalness based upon clause coordination, then the Prophets would be regarded as most literal.

Conclusion

In the first section of this chapter, we have sampled and summarized contemporary translation technique research. That research directed our attention primarily to the linguistic components of the text. The goal of this research has been to define the literalness of biblical texts and to refine the lower text critic's use of those texts. In the second section of this chapter, we developed and defended a method for investigating the translation technique of a narrative using both lexical and grammatical clues. This method was composed so as to be representative of the approaches suggested in the literature. The third section of this chapter presented the data that we obtained from the texts after applying our method to selected narratives. That data has been presented to the reader in both tabular and narrative formats.

The goal of the chapter has been be to answer three questions. (1) What percentage of literalness can be assigned to each text? (2) Is there a correlation between the linguistic measure of literalness and the replication of the literary experience? (3) Is the current methodology adequate for defining the literary sensitivity of the Septuagint translators? The method of analysis demonstrated in this chapter has proven both helpful and disappointing in this regard. We have already discussed the answer to question one. The complete answer to question two will need to wait for the research of the following chapters to be presented.

The answer to the third question is also clear. We have applied a method that looks very much like what is being done within the arena of translation technique analysis. While this standard analysis provides general evidence about the literalness of the translation, it leaves far more literary questions than it answers. The literary insights we obtained from the analysis were intriguing but incomplete. Certainly, they provide us with insufficient evidence for evaluating the literary sensitivity of the Greek translators. The current methodology would seem to serve textual criticism well. But the only way we may come to fully appreciate the literary sensitivity of the Greek translator is if we develop a method of analysis that exceeds the traditional approach.

This is the most powerful discovery of the chapter. If we only use the methodology that is currently being employed to analyze Septuagint translation technique, we will not come to a clear picture of how the literary experience of the Greek and Hebrew reader cohere or differ

from one another. An expanded approach is required if we are to accurately gauge the literary sensitivity of the Greek translators. Thus in the chapters that follow, we will supplement the traditional linguistic analysis with other types of investigation. It is through this expanded form of translation technique analysis that we will see the translators as storytellers.

NOTES

1 Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques of the Septuagint" Ph.D. diss, Bob Jones University, 1977), 107; Sebastian P. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 84; B. Kedar-Kopfstein, "The Interpretive Element in Transliteration," *Textus* 8 (1973): 55–77; and Emanuel Tov, "Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint," *Biblica* 60 (1979): 227–36.

2 James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*, Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Göttingen, no. 15 (Göttigen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979), 314–18.

3 Staffan Olofsson, *The Septuagint Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica OT Series 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990), 21–22.

4 Staffan Olofsson, *God Is My Rock, A Study of the Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 31 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990).

5 Emanuel Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" in *De Septuaginta*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox (Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications, 1984), 53–70. See also Emanuel Tov, "Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words," *Biblica* 58 (1977): 189–212; and Henry S. Gehman, "Adventures in LXX Lexicography," *Textus* 5 (1966): 102–109.

6 John Beekman and John Callow, *Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974), 152.

7 James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 305–14. See also Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies," 135–44;

J. Lee, "Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings in the LXX," *Revue Biblique* 87 (January 1980): 104–117 and Brock's discussion under the term "lexical correspondence," in Sebastian P. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique," 85–86.

[8] Emanuel Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3 (Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981), 54–57. Tov views this motive for lexical selection as the rule rather than the exception. Emanuel Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators," 67.

[9] Galen Marquis, "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel," in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 405–424.

[10] Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of the Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979).

[11] Emanuel Tov, "Did the Septuagint Translators," 53–70; Takamitsu Muraoka, "Hebrew *Hapax Legomena* and Septuagint Lexicography," in *Seventh Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 205–222; Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies," 144–47 and Thomas Whittredge Phelan, "Translation Techniques of the Greek Minor Prophets," 132–36. In his essay, Tov asserts that such words are generally handled in one of six ways. The translator leaves the word untranslated. The translator guesses at an equivalent based on context. The translator manipulates the Hebrew consonants to create a more familiar word. The translator guesses on the basis of parallelism. The translator uses a more general term from the semantic domain to cover the more specific term he doesn't understand. Or the translator uses the etymology of the Hebrew word to relate it to a known root which he then translates.

[12] Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development and the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the Septuagint," *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 9 (1908): 597–601 and Heidi Melissa Szpek, *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job; A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job*. (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 60-65.

[13] Raija Sollamo, "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch," in *Seventh Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 75.

[14] Thomas Whittredge Phelan, "Translation Techniques of the Greek Minor Prophets," 128–31; Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Wiedergabe des Hebräischen, Als Subjekt Stehenden Personalpronomens im Grieschischen Pentateuch," in *De Septuaginta, Studies in Honor of John William Wevers on His 65 Birthday*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox (Mississauga, Ontario, Canada: Benben Publications, 1984), 115–28. See also Heidi Melissa Szpek "Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job: A Model for Evaluating a Text," 69–72.

[15] Mario Pei, ed. *Glossary of Linguistic Terminology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), 167.

[16] Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development," 305; Emanuel Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 217 and Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies," 127–35.

[17] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Significance of Clause Connectors in Syntactical and Translation-Technique Study of the Septuagint," in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 361–80. See also Anneli Aejmelaeus, "*Participium Conjunctum* as a Criterion of Translation Technique," *Vetus Testamentum* 32 (1982): 385–93.

[18] Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint, A Study of the Rendering of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch*, Annales Academiae Scientarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31 (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982), 5.

[19] James Barr, "Translator's Handling of Verb Tenses in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts." in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of Bibilical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study no. 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 383.

[20] Ibid., 402.

[21] John H. Sailhamer, *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3–41*, Studies in Biblical Greek vol. 2 (New York: Peter Lang, 1991); Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965); Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Konstruktion des Verbs bei einem Neutrum Plural im Grieschen Pentateuch," *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979): 189–99; and Henry St. James Thackeray, "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the Septuagint," *The Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1908): 597–601.

[22] Staffan Olofsson, "Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint: Questions and Possibilities," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996): 217–37.

[23] James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 300.

[24] Galen Marquis, "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel, *Textus* 13 (1986): 61; and Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development," 307–308.

[25] Sebastian P. Brock, "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity," *Greek, Roman and Byzantine* Studies 20 (1979): 81; and Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, Coniectanea Biblica OT Series 30 (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990), 15.

[26] Staffan Olofsson, *The LXX Version*, 14.

[27] James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 303–304. See also Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development," 318–19; Emanuel Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 58–59; and Benjamin Givens Wright III, "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism in the LXX,'" in *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 23 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 311–35.

[28] Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint," in *Mikra*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder, Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 176–78.

[29] Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies," 148–52.

[30] James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 280.

[31] Anneli Aejmelaeus, "*Participium Conjunctum*," 393.

[32] James Barr, *The Typology of Literalism*, 281. For a similar view see Emanuel Tov, *Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint*, 53.

[33] Galen Marquis, "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents," 405.

[34] Emanuel Tov and Benjamin Givens Wright, "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX," *Textus* 12 (1985): 153.

[35] Staffan Olofsson, "Consistency as a Translation Technique," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6 (1992): 22.

[36] Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies," 127–28.

[37] We regard this as the exception to the rule. But it is a strong indicator of literalness. Consider Aquila's Greek version in which the morpheme אֵת is translated with σὺν.

[38] Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development," 305.

[39] The application will be further restricted in this way. The adjective, adverb, article, preposition, pronouns, and conjunctions will all be counted as one morpheme. Noun affixes whose function is to indicate number will not be counted. Finite verb forms will be regarded as having three morphemes: sense, person and number. Participles will also be regarded as having three morphemes: sense, gender and number. Thus we will not penalize the translator who translates a finite verb with a participle. Infinitives will count as one morpheme.

[40] Zipora Talshir, "Linguistic Development," 306–307; and John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Series 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), viii–ix.

[41] Thomas W. Phelan, "Translation Techniques of the Greek Minor Prophets," 129 and Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Wiedergabe des Hebräischen, Als Subjekt Stehenden Personalpronomens," 128.

[42] Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, vol. 2, translated and revised by T. Muraoka (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), par. 146a.

[43] F. Blass and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, translated and edited by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), par. 277; Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 129–30.

[44] Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Wiedergabe des Hebräischen, Als Subjekt Stehenden Personalpronomens," 115.

[45] E. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, revised and translated by A. E. Cowley (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), par. 135a.

[46] Ilmari Soisalon-Soininen, "Die Wiedergabe des Hebräischen, Als Subjekt Stehenden Personalpronomens," 115.

[47] Ibid., 128.

[48] James Barr, "Translator's Handling of Verb Tenses," 402. For some notable exceptions see, Anssi Voitila, "What the Translation of Tenses Tells About the Septuagint Translators," *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996): 183–96.

[49] John H. Sailhamer, *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs*.

[50] Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, par. 121 c–h.

[51] This is not to suggest that there is a *correct* form to use in translating the Hebrew. We are merely observing the consistency with which the translator handled a given Hebrew form. We will not be taking into account the *binyan* (conjugation) since this is often determined by the vocalization of the text. There remains some question about if or how the translators vocalized their text. See James Barr, "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among the Ancient Translators," *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1967): 1–11. The *hiphil* seems most prone to this type of analysis. See Emanuel Tov, "The Representation of the Causative Aspects of Hiphil in the LXX: A Study in Translation Technique," *Biblica* 63 (1982): 417–24.

[52] Robert D. Bergen, ed., *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994); Walter R. Bodine, ed., *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995) and Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, ed. *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, Journal for the Study of the New Testatment Supplement Series 113 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

[53] F. Blass and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, par. 318 and Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), par. 29.

[54] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 22–25. The planes of emphasis are also referred to as background, theme and focus. Jeffrey T. Reed, "Identifying Theme in the New Testament: Insights from Discourse Analysis," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. D. A. Carson, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 113 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 76–85.

[55] Robert E. Longacre "*WeQatal* Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose," in *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. Robert D. Bergen (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 50–98; and Alviero Niccacci, "On the Hebrew

Verbal System," *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, ed. Robert D. Bergen (Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics, 1994), 117–37.

[56] Moisés Silva, "Discourse Analysis and Philippians," in *Discourse Analysis and Other Topics in Biblical Greek*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and D. A. Carson, Journal for the Study of the New Testatment Supplement Series 113 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 105.

[57] Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint*, 2.

[58] Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990), par. 39.2.1c. This does not mean that a deep grammar feel for subordination was not sensed by the Hebrew reader. In fact, such deep grammar sensitivity is clearly noted in Kautzsch's discussion of the use of *waw*. See E. Kautzsch, ed., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, par. 154. See also the discussion of deep grammar in Francis I. Andersen, *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, Janua Linguarum Series Practica, 231 (The Hague: Mouton Publisher, 1974), 29–35.

[59] F. Blass and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, par. 458.

[60] Anneli Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis in the Septuagint*, 171.

[61] Ibid., 179. See also Michael Paul Vernon Barrett, "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies," 113–16.

[62] The percentages recorded in the tables is an indication of the consistency with which the translator handeled a particular text phenomenon. In order to prevent a very small number of forms from leaving a larger impression on the study than is warranted, the following limitations have been imposed. With regard to the verb, the data is reported only if the following minimum numbers of a particular form were present in the discourse unit: 10 perfects, 5 *waw*-consecutive perfects, 5 participles, 5 imperfects, 10 *waw*-consecutive imperfects and 5 volitional forms. If the text under consideration did not possess any of the forms under discussion, they are marked with an "0" which stands for zero forms. If the text under consideration did not possess sufficient numbers to warrant presentation, they are marked with a "I" indicating insufficient forms. In the case of the verb forms, the percentage marks the consistency with which the translator represented a particular Hebrew form with the same Greek form each time it occurred. Inevitably there are some instances in which the standard translation style for that section could not be used by the translator because of linguistic constraints (e.g. the need for a subjunctive in a ἵνα clause). These diversions from the norm are not counted against the translator's consistency. We only count the verb form choice against the translator's literalness when the translator could have used the most frequently employed form of the verb and did not choose to do so. The percentage of

consistency in the clause coordination is a comparison of the number of times a paratactic Hebrew clause marked by *waw* is marked by a coordinating conjunction in Greek.

[63] I regard a 2% increase in morpheme count as the maximum necessary for making linguistic adjustments in the translation. This is based on my work in the Septuagint and Aramaic translation of the Book of Jonah. In the Septuagint, I found that the morpheme count of the entire book increased 3%. In that book, I discovered that while 85% of the verses contained no increase in semantic content, 15% of the verses did. The Aramaic translation had a morpheme count increase of 12% which led to an increase in semantic content in 52% of the verses. Thus I would regard any morpheme increase above 2% as a text which is likely to contain semantic additions which will change the literary nature of the translation. John A. Beck, "Ancient Translation Technique Analysis with Application to the Greek and Targum Jonah" (ThM Thesis, Trinity Ev. Divinity School, 1993), 66, 101 and 108.

[64] Alviero Niccacci, "On the Hebrew Verbal System," 132.

[65] Stanley Porter, Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 22-25.

[66] We discovered two studies on the translation technique of Genesis which come to different conclusions about the literalness of this book. J. Cook investigated the lexical dimension of Gen 1-11. He called it a "relatively literal translation." J. Cook, "The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. C. E. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 91-125. By contrast, A. Schmitt examined the entire book assessing concordance and the adaptation of idioms. He describes Genesis as a free translation. A. Schmitt, "Interpretation der Genesis aus Hellenistischem Geist," *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 137-63.

[67] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 224-26.

[68] Paul Joüon, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, vol. 2, par. 172.

[69] Alviero Niccacci, "On the Hebrew Verbal System," 132.

[70] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 22-25.

[71] Alviero Niccacci, On the Hebrew Verbal System," 132.

[72] Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 22-25.

[73] F. Blass and A. DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament*, par. 365.

[74] Sollamo examined the use of the pleonastic pronoun throughout the Septuagint. He concluded that the last books of the Greek Pentateuch represent a more slavish translation technique than Genesis or Exodus. Our research, which takes in a smaller amount of text but uses a wider array of measures, does not agree with Sollamo's observation. Raija Sollamo, "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch," in *Eighth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Oliver Munnich (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 44–62.

[75] The translator of 1 Samuel has had a reputation for being literal. But Aejmalaeus observes that this translator also has a free side. Anneli Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint in 1 Samuel," In *Eighth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Oliver Munnich (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 124–25.

[76] The discussion about the *Vorlage* of the Samuel texts has a lengthy history. For an overview of that history see, M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "The Book of Samuel -- Hebrew and Greek: Hindsight of a Century," *Textus* 14 (1988): 147–61. Based on the evidence provided by 4QSam^{a}, 4QSam^{b} and 4QSam^{c}, it is a matter of scholarly consensus that the Septuagint edition of 1 Samuel is based upon a different *Vorlage* than that of the MT. Aejmelaeus points to a number of instances in which the LXX and Q agree to disagree against the evidence of the MT. A. Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators*, ed. A. Aejmelaeus (Kampen, The Netherlands: KOK Pharos Publishing House, 1993), 131–32. Nevertheless, a look at table 25 will demonstrate that this particular story and the story we have selected from 2 Samuel remain at or above the average level of literalness in almost all categories. The minimal divergences of these texts supports their connection to the MT.

[77] The use of the "historical present" in 1 Samuel is well documented. Aejmelaeus says that its use points to a dramatic story-telling in the translator. "This is a feature in which the translator did not follow his Hebrew *Vorlage* but gave expression to his own understanding of the events described in the text, highlighting, describing, slowing down in the dramatic turns of the narration." A. Aejmelaeus, "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel," 145.

[78] Thackeray has proposed that the two texts we have explored in 1 and 2 Samuel were translated by the same person. The more recent study by Muraoka supported his findings. It is interesting to note that both studies focused on the lexical dimension of the text. Here the similarities are clearly more prominent. Admittedly, our sample is a small one. But the divergence in handling the verbal system is striking between the texts. It would seem difficult to support a single translator for both discourses. See Henry St. John Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *Journal of Theological Studies* 8 (1907):

262–78; and T. Muraoka, "The Greek Texts of Samuel–Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?" in *Proceedings of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1972*, ed. R. A. Kraft (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), 90–107.

[79] Perkins observes, "Although following a fairly literal translation strategy, the translator reveals different understandings of certain aspects of the plot and characterization from those found in the MT." Larry Perkins, "The Septuagint of Jonah: Aspects of Literary Analysis Applied to Biblical Translation," *BIOSCS* 20 (1987): 43.

[80] The distinction we make assumes that the MT vocalization was authentic. But due to the later date of the vocalization, we may be contrasting a difference in the Hebrew text tradition rather than discussing a translation decision. If the MT vocalization is authentic, then our observation is salient.

[81] We discovered more studies which dealt with the translation of Job than any other text. This is undoubtedly related to the fact that the Septuagint is 1/6 shorter than the MT. Here the scholarly consensus is that the shorter Septuagint text is based on the MT but significiantly edited. Homer Heater, *A LXX Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series (Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1982), 2. Heater's monograph focuses on the additions to the text which are lifted from other portions of the Septuagint. He refers to them as "anaphoric" translations. Both Cox and Gard speak directly to the Prologue. Cox says the changes in the Prologue are designed to make Job look more saintly. C. E. Cox, "Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of Septuagint Job," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. C. E. Cox (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 81. Gard speaks of changes in the Prologue related to theological motivation. D. H. Gard *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*, JBL Monograph Series 8 (Philadelphia: Journal of Biblical Literature, 1952), 91–93. But see the response, H. M. Orlinsky, "Studies in the Septuagint," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 30 (1959): 153–67.

[82] The aorist was an option for the translator since it can be used to indicate a future event. Given the infrequency of this form, it carries the emphasis of the Hebrew and would have been its natural equivalent. See Stanley E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 37.

[83] Jan de Waard worked with the Septuagint version of Ruth examining the semantic adjustments in the text. He concluded that all the adjustments were due to implict data made explicit or explicit data made implicit. "So we should no longer speak of 'interpretive additions' in translation when we mean to say that implicit source information has been made explicit. In such a case nothing has been added to the source text." Jan de Waard, "Translation Technique Used by the Greek

Translators of Ruth," *Biblica* 54 (1973): 515. But if we look at the literary experience of the reader, such changes do have a rhetorical impact on the reader and carry the potential to change that reader's response to the text.

[84] L. Allen has written a detailed analysis of the Greek Chronicles. He investigates the translation under 23 different headings. Unfortunately no statistical data is provided. We observe the following points of connection with our study. The conjunction καί occurs "with monotonous frequency throughout." (41) The verb presents us with a "mixed picture." (42). The number of the verb forms "is not always strictly preserved." (43) With regard to noun number, the "translator feels free to exchange singulars for plurals and *vice versa*." (47) Leslie C. Allen, *The Greek Chronicles, The Relation of the Septuagint of 1 and 2 Chronicles to the Massoretic Text, Part I the Translator's Craft*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 25 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974).

[85] The work of Sollamo is frequently cited as authoritative in the comparison of Septuagint translation literalness. He divides the texts into four divisions with number 1 being the most free and number 4 being the most literal. He links Exodus and Job under number 1. He places Genesis and Numbers under number 2. Chronicles the Minor prophets and 1 Samuel are under number 3. Both Judges texts and 2 Samuel are under number 4. Sollamo's work is based on only one text feature, the Hebrew semiprepositions, which is examined throughout the Old Testament. Our work is based on many more text features but on only a sampling of the biblical texts available. While there are points of similarity, our study does not suggest the wide range of difference that is read into his research. Raija Sollamo, *Renderings of the Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979), 284–86.

CHAPTER THREE

The Storyteller and Narrative Criticism

If we were doing translation technique analysis in the traditional way, this study would be over. But since the traditional form of analysis has failed to fully illuminate the translator as storyteller, we now pursue our investigation with the assistance of narrative criticism. This chapter will begin with a brief introduction to narrative criticism. Following that overview, we will examine the components of narrative criticism that will receive attention in our analysis. Through this analysis, we will identify prominent, narrative features of the Hebrew stories and measure the strategic, literary impact of the composer's artistry. Then the replication, change or elimination of the same features will be pursued in the Greek story. Through this process, we will assess the contribution of narrative criticism in measuring the translators as storytellers.

Introduction to Narrative Criticism

Narrative criticism assumes that the biblical texts are first and foremost literary texts. The authors are self-conscious composers who carefully select both the *content* and the *form* which the reader will experience from the possible historical events and available literary

options.[1] Fundamental to the appreciation of narrative criticism is the realization that an event may be portrayed in more than one way. Thus we will analyze not just *what* is being said (content) but *how* it is being said (form).

In his seminal work on the topic of narrative criticism, Robert Alter defines the literary approach in this way.

> By literary analysis I mean the manifold varieties of minutely discriminating attention to the artful use of language, to the shifting play of ideas, conventions, tone, sound, imagery, syntax, narrative viewpoint, compositional units, and much else; the kind of disciplined attention, in other words, which through a whole spectrum of critical approaches has illuminated, for example, the poetry of Dante, the plays of Shakespeare, the novels of Tolstoy.[2]

This means that a biblical narrative will be read with questions like the following in mind. How is the plot developing? Through which devices of characterization do we meet the participants in the plot? In what way has the narrator contributed to the story? How has the writer contrasted the passage of narrated time with the passage of real time? What figures of speech has the writer employed? The storyteller may be using everyday language, but this language is being used in a carefully nuanced way. Robert Alter calls it "language straining against the decorum of ordinary usage."[3] Again narrative criticism is attentive not only to *what* is being told but also to *how* it is being told.[4] For the *form* of the storytelling contributes to the meaning.[5]

Narrative analysis may serve more than one purpose. The goal of this analysis may be to illuminate the literary artistry of the writer, *ars gratia artis*. By examining the careful crafting of language, we may better appreciate the quality of the art. In addition, the narrative critic may examine the literary artistry to lay bare the rhetorical intentions that they entail. Meir Sternberg has written what many regard as the definitive treatment of narrative criticism, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*. In this monograph, he pursues narrative criticism in order to examine the writer's rhetorical intention. For he is convinced that "the biblical storyteller is a persuader in that he wields discourse to shape response and manipulate attitude."[6] To take it one step further, narrative criticism may be employed in the service of biblical interpretation. For a clearer picture of the rhetorical intentions of a narrative will lead to a sharpened understanding of a text. Alter asserts just this point.

> For a reader to attend to these elements of literary art is not merely an exercise in "appreciation" but a discipline of understanding: the literary vehicle is so much the necessary medium through which the Hebrew writers realized their meanings that we will grasp the meanings at best imperfectly if we ignore their fine articulations as literature.[7]

Two primary objections have been raised against this method of analysis. The first is the concern that narrative criticism is imposing modern, Western categories on the text. The second is that a literary approach denies the historicity of the text.[8] First, are we over reading the text by applying inappropriate categories of analysis? Ryken responds in two ways. First he observes that the Bible has "exerted a strong and formative influence on Western literature from the Middle Ages onward." Thus the Western narrative will undoubtedly have stylistic connections with the biblical model. Secondly, he notes that "literary forms tend to have certain inherent characteristics quite apart from the cultural situation in which they were written."[9] While caution is called for, the elements of narrative that we will be examining are represented across many cultural boundaries. And it is clear that even remote cultures will have *some* affinities with our own.[10]

The second concern raised in response to narrative criticism is that it may go hand-in-hand with historical minimalism. In 1987, Carl Henry concluded his review of narrative criticism with these words.

> The narrative approach therefore seems not full befitting the historic Christian faith.... One discerns here an enchantment with the affective, a flight from history to the perspectival that enjoins no universal truth-claims.[11]

It is true that the work of narrative criticism is inherently synchronic rather than diachronic. It is more interested in the "being of the text than the becoming of the text."[12] And this can easily degenerate into historical minimalism. But it need not do so. Sternberg has observed that there are "simply no universals of historical vs. fictive form."[13] Thus the fact that biblical narrative uses conventions often associated with fictive forms does not diminish the historical reliability of those narratives.

In assessing the composition of the Old Testament, V. Philips Long has concluded that the historiography of the Old Testament includes a literary dimension. He has asserted that biblical narratives exhibit three basic impulses: historical, literary and theological.[14] Thus a text with a

literary impulse is not necessarily a text that is unhistorical. Inspired writers carefully selected historical events from a larger pool of real happenings and told those stories with artful and strategic intention. Long compares this historiography to the work of a representational artist.

> The production of a representational painting involves a coordination of creativity and constraint, the creativity of the artist under the constraint of the subject. The subject matter does not simply present itself to the artist as a painting waiting to be painted. The artist must make various kinds of choices. First, a subject must be chosen from among the multitude of possible subjects in the world around. Second, a vantage point must be chosen from which to view the subject. Third, compositional decisions must be made: what are to be the boundaries or limits of the painting? Do these boundaries result in an overall sense of balance? Depending on the purpose of the painting, the artist may have some freedom to arrange or rearrange elements of his subject. The portrait artist, for example, enjoys considerable freedom to rearrange object in the setting but is rather constrained when it comes to rearranging the subject's face. Fourth, a medium must be chosen (oil, acrylic, watercolor, etc.), the palette of colors selected, (will it include a limited or full range of colors?), the style decided (will the painting be rendered in intricate detail with small brushes or will it be executed boldly and rapidly with a palette knife?), and so forth.[15]

Thus a literary analysis in itself is not incompatible with a high view of the historicity of the text, "including the view that affirms the inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture in the area of history."[16]

A Method For Narrative Critical Analysis

The carefully composed narrative reaches out to impact the reader even when the reader is not consciously thinking about the way the storyteller is working. But the narrative analyst will read the story consciously looking for the ways the storyteller is at work. Narrative criticism has many different components. Our introduction will survey those components used most frequently in assessing the literary qualities of a Hebrew narrative. We will address: plot, narration, characterization, the use of time and the patterning play of words. The last three components will be discussed at greater length since those are the elements that will be used in our analysis of the texts.[17]

Plot

The plot is "the organizing force or principle" via which the "events are plotted."[18] This stands in contrast to the way we generally experience life "where we are invariably confronted by an endless stream of incidents occurring haphazardly and disparately. (By contrast) the plot of a narrative is constructed as a meaningful chain of interconnected events."[19] The plot consists of definable parts: exposition, conflict, climax and resolution.[20] The exposition serves as an introduction to the story world where the reader meets the characters. We may be told their names, about their physical appearance, their states in life, their relationships and any other details necessary to understand the story.[21]

The storyteller then introduces the conflict or conflicts into the story. It is this complication which makes the story's ending uncertain and solicits the reader's ongoing interest.[22] As long as the reader is kept guessing about the way in which the conflict will be resolved, his or her reading interest is maintained. This is achieved through "gaps." In a section of his monograph entitled, "The Relevance of Absence," Sternberg defines a gap as "a lack of information about the world—an event, motive, causal link, character trait, plot structure or law of probability."[23] Usually, one or two gaps become central to the plot because of the amount of havoc that they play.[24]

The conflict leads to a point of climax and resolution. The plot-line ascends from a "calm point of departure through the stage of involvement to the climax." At this point the tension reaches its height before it rapidly descends to a resolution.[25] "The narrative reaches a point of calmness at the end, the tension drops, the story-line descends and life returns to its former pace and daily routine."[26] Thus the plot serves to "organize events in such a way as to arouse the reader's interest and emotional involvement, while at the same time imbuing the events with meaning."[27]

Narration

Narrative criticism is also interested in the work of the narrator. That work is called "narration." The narrator is the nameless person within the story whom the author has selected to tell the story. The

narrator controls *narration*, i.e. how the story is told.[28] Whenever the characters within the biblical narrative are not speaking directly, the narrator is at work. Alter summarizes the work of the narrator in this way.

> There are three general kinds of function served by the narration that is woven through or around dialogue. These are: the conveying of actions essential to the unfolding of the plot which could not be easily or adequately indicated in dialogue; the communication of data ancillary to the plot...; the verbatim mirroring, confirming, subverting or focusing in narration of statements made in direct discourse by the characters.[29]

The narrator regulates the way in which the story is told by exercising control over the type of presentation the reader will experience. This means controlling both the way the incident is portrayed and the reader's point of view. The narrator presents the plot of the story to the reader in either scenic or summary fashion (really opposite points on a continuum). Scenic presentation is a depiction of the events themselves usually with a mixture of narration and dialogue intermixed. This type of presentation provides a close-up and vividly detailed view of the incident. By contrast, the summary presentation is a more remote, panoramic view of an incident told in summary form without dialogue.[30] The majority of biblical narrative is scenic in its composition.[31]

The narrator also controls the point of view. Point of view may be defined by analogy with the camera in film production.

> The eye of the camera grants perspective as it moves from place to place, coming in for a close-up here and then panning to another shot. The camera guides and limits the audience's insight.[32]

The biblical narrator who controls the position of the "camera" knows all and has access to all the places that the ups and downs of the plot might lead us. The narrator is capable of passing through the closed door of a bedroom and opening the concealed minds of the characters. He knows inner thoughts, motives and hidden desires. But this highly mobile person is highly selective about what he shares with the reader.

> The biblical narrator is omniscient in that everything is at his disposal; but he selects carefully what he will include and what he will omit. He can survey

> the scene from a distance, or zoom in for a detailed look at a small part of it.
>
> He can follow one character throughout or hop from the vantage point of one to another.[33]

Thus the storyteller steps back and uses the narrator to control narration. That narration determines what the reader knows and when the reader knows it.

Characterization

The participants who are involved in the twists and turns of the plot are called characters. The Hebrew Bible is filled with these memorable individuals. David, Goliath, Jonah, to name a few, have a thriving reputation even beyond biblical studies. Characterization analyzes the ways in which the storyteller allows us to meet such biblical figures.

As with the people we meet in our lives, we do not get to know all biblical characters in the same way or to the same degree. Thus it is not uncommon for narrative critics to speak of round and flat characters.

> Flat characters or types are built around a single quality or trait. They do not stand out as individuals. Round characters, on the other hand, are much more complex, manifesting a multitude of traits and appearing as "real people."[34]

The biblical writers use great economy in the process of characterization so that even round characters remain a mystery to us in many dimensions of their lives.[35] That is because we get to meet the biblical characters in much the same way we meet others in our day-to-day living. "We listen to what they say and how they say it. We watch what they do. We note how other people respond to them."[36] And as in real life, "there is usually a distance—and often a clash—between the impression produced on his first appearance and the one left after his last."[37]

The Hebrew storyteller unveils biblical characters to us by allowing us access to certain dimensions of that person's life. Alter describes our introduction to biblical persons in this way.

> Character can be revealed through the report of actions; through appearance, gestures, posture, costume; through one character's comments on another;

> through direct speech by the character; through inward speech, either summarized or quoted as interior monologue; or through statements by the narrator about the attitudes and intentions of the personages, which may come either as flat assertions or motivated explanations.[38]

Such characterization is not haphazard but strategically planned so that the reader will respond in a certain way to the individual being described. For example, the Goliath of David-and-Goliath fame may have had some redeeming qualities. He may have had a family, home life and hobbies. But the writer introduces us to Goliath in a way that invites our distaste. We are to dislike David's rival. Consequently, any redeeming qualities of Goliath are kept out of the reader's sight.

The six most common ways to shape a character are: direct quotations of the character, direct quotations about the character, insights offered by the narrator, actions (including gesture and posture), appearance (including dress) and naming. We will visit each briefly.

Direct Quotations of the Character. As we noted earlier, biblical narrative favors scenic presentation. This results in a significant amount of dialogue. Thus, one of the primary ways in which we get to know biblical figures is through what they say. Their quotations may either be presented as direct speech or interior monologue. The narrator will frequently step aside and let the character speak for him or herself. Both the speech itself and the speech as it stands in contrast to the speech of others can be revealing.

> What characters say and how they say it may tell us much about the kind of people they are. Furthermore, close attention to the context of a character's speech, the circumstances in which the speech takes place, can help us to decide what to make of it. Since biblical characters seldom appear alone, we can compare and contrast characters, take note of how they speak to each other, and in the end, see how one person can help define another.[39]

What appears at first glance to be direct speech by a character may well be interior monologue. That is a depiction of the character's thoughts. Berlin puts the response of Moses to the burning bush in this category.[40] "So Moses thought [וַיֹּאמֶר], 'I will turn aside and see this extraordinary sight—why the bush does not burn up.'" (Exod 3:3)

But the sensitive reader will be aware of more than just what is said

and thought. The analyst must also inquire about how much speaking time is allowed to any one character.[41] More important characters usually are afforded more talk time. Furthermore, Alter suggests we pay careful attention to the first words spoken by such a character. "They will be revelatory...constituting an important moment in the exposition of character."[42] The storyteller may also use speech patterns. Bar-Efrat observes that both a polite style and the absence of polite style have their place in biblical culture. Thus, "deviations from accepted style are of particular importance."[43] And finally, the reader must be aware that the mortal speaking may be "mistaken about themselves or even distort things deliberately."[44]

> What characters say about themselves and about one another cannot always be relied upon since characters in biblical narrative, mimicking real life, speak to specific occasions and convey only limited human viewpoints, frequently prejudiced and self-serving.[45]

Direct Quotations about a Character. We learn about others not only through what they say but also through what others say about them. Characters in the story make comments about one another. If the character speaking happens to be God, his speech has "absolute validity."[46] Thus when God says that Abraham fears God (Gen 22:12), we will accept that accolade at face value. But if a statement originates with a mortal, we must consider its possible fallibility.[47] Thus we will not automatically accept at face value the statement of Shimei about David when he calls him a "man of blood" and a "worthless person." (2 Samuel 16:7)

Insights from the Narrator. The narrator also has a role to play in shaping characters. And the comments made by the biblical narrator carry a reliability that is nearly equal to God's own. The narrator does not "make mistakes, give false or intentionally misleading information."[48] The biblical narrator helps us to know biblical persons by both offering evaluative comments about them and by unveiling their thoughts and emotions.[49] The narrator may offer a direct evaluative comment as in Job 1:1. "This man was blameless and upright. He was God-fearing and turned from evil." (Job 1:1) This type

of direct evaluation is rare and thus invites special attention when used.[50] Somewhat more frequent is the narrator's unveiling of the character's thoughts, emotions and motivations.[51] Much of what we read in the Joseph narrative is related to Jacob's feelings toward Joseph. We learn about that through narrated revelation. "Now Israel loved Joseph more than any of his other sons." (Gen 37:3)

Actions. A fourth way in which we get to know biblical characters is through their actions. The maxim, "actions speak louder than words," often holds true in biblical narrative. Bar-Efrat calls actions the "foremost means of characterization" in the biblical narratives.[52] And the infrequency with which biblical storytellers report daily activities makes such activities stand out all the more.

> People's actions in daily life are hardly mentioned at all in biblical narrative, and we do not usually hear about the minutiae of their day-to-day routine. We meet the biblical characters primarily in special and unusual circumstances.... Whenever, simple, daily tasks are mentioned this is important in shedding light on the character.[53]

Three types of action or inaction get special attention in the literature. "Dense concentrations or unbroken chains of verbs, usually attached to a single subject, indicate intensity, rapidity, or single-minded purposefulness of activity."[54] Gen 22:3 is driven by six *waw*-consecutive imperfect verbs that describe Abraham's response to God's command to sacrifice Isaac. Abraham got up early, loaded his donkey, took his servants and Isaac, split wood, got up and went. The single-minded obedience of Abraham is clearly demonstrated in that chain.

The sensitive reader will also be aware of individual acts.

> In real life not everything people do is characteristic of them, but this is not the case in a literary work of art, or at least in a short story. The short story chooses to relate the particular action which is characteristic of the individual and can exemplify what is considered to constitute the essential nature.[55]

This is particularly true if the action is a drastic action such as Cain's murder of his brother in Gen 4.[56]

The actions that occur within the narrative also invite comparison with one another. Berlin points to three types of contrasts: contrast

between characters, contrast with an earlier action of the same character and contrast with the expected norm.[57] All three are evident in the characterization of Jonah. The reader meets a man who does not act like a prophet of God is expected to act. Thus the reader can contrast Jonah wih the prophetic paradigm. The reader can also contrast Jonah's earlier and later response to God's commissioning in chapters one and two. And since all the characters are reacting to the same storm, the reader is invited to contrast the reactions of Jonah to the reactions of the heathen sailors. Finally, it is not only action but inaction which characterizes individuals.[58] Consider, for example, what the inaction of David, following the rape of Tamar, has to say about David.

Appearance. The biblical texts are very sparing in their physical description of biblical characters. "What is lacking in the Bible is the kind of detailed physical or physiological description of characters that creates a visual image for the reader."[59] But the purpose of such descriptions is not to help us visualize the characters but to "tell what kind of person he is."[60] "Information about someone's outward appearance serves solely as a means of advancing the plot or explaining its course."[61] Thus when we read that Joseph was "well-built and handsome" (Gen 39:6), that Bathsheba was "beautiful" (2 Samuel 11:2) or that Eglon was "fat" (Judges 3:17), we will expect that description to play a significant role in the play of the plot.

Naming. Storytellers do not assign a name to every character in their story. Anonymity tends to demote one to the status of agent while the giving of a proper name confers status and depth.[62] Thus naming is a key ingredient in the process of characterization. Consider the case of David.

> It is no accident that the text consistently withholds David's name, referring to him instead as "one of Jesse's sons" or "the youngest" or "he" until the very moment of anointment (sic) and elevation; nor that Saul, desperately attempting to turn back the wheel, persists in calling him "Jesse's son."[63]

Berlin cites the references to Tamar in Gen 38 as a classic case of how

naming aids in characterization. In this chapter, she is variously referred to as: Tamar, the brother's wife, daughter-in-law, harlot, the woman, she and temple prostitute. "The way in which she is referred to signals who is doing the referring or whose point of view is being given."[64] Thus the giving, changing and withholding of names plays a role in the way the reader is to respond to the character.

The Shaping of Time

In addition to shaping the way in which we meet characters, the storyteller can also shape the way we experience time. In real life, time is an ever-flowing stream. We can not stop it to linger over a relished moment. We can not reverse it to right a past wrong.

> This does not apply to narrated time, which is subjective and expands or contracts according to the circumstances; it is never continuous, being subject to gaps, delays and jumps, nor does it display the meticulous divisions into past, present and future. Time is like clay in the potter's hand as far as the author is concerned, he molds it as he pleases, making it an integral part of the form of the work as a whole. The shaping of time within the narrative is functional and not random or arbitrary, making genuine contribution, in coordination and cooperation with the other elements, to the character, meaning and values of the entire narrative. Apart from its role within the narrative itself, such as providing emphases or implying connections between separate incidents, narrated time can fulfill direct functions for the reader such as creating suspense or determining attitudes.[65]

Duration of Time. Bar-Efrat's discussion of time addresses two topics: the duration of time and the sequence of time. In regards to the duration of time, Bar-Efrat distinguishes between narration time and narrated time. Narration time is the amount of time required for telling or reading the narrative while narrated time is the actual amount of time the narrated event would have taken in real time.[66] This may be illustrated in Genesis 22. In Gen 22:3, the narrator summarizes Abraham's meticulous preparation. All of verse 3 took place on one day. But with the opening words of 22:4, the reader is catapulted three days forward without comment. "On the third day Abraham lifted his eyes and saw the place at a the distance." Here narrated time has moved much more quickly than narration time. By contrast in 22:9-10,

the narrated time slows down considerably as we are forced to experience the slow, painstaking preparation for the sacrifice in the same way Abraham did. "Abraham built an altar there and arranged the wood. He bound his son Isaac and set him on the altar, on top of the wood. He extended his hand and took the knife to slay his son." (Gen 22:9–10)

Why would the writer adjust time in this way? The reader is invited to linger longer over more important elements of the narrative. "If we note the variations in narrated time in relation to narration time, ranging from scenic representation to summary account, we will discover the narrative's focal points and the relative importance of its various subjects."[67]

> Narrated time passes fastest in the empty spaces of time when nothing happens. Naturally, it must be assumed that even in these empty sections of time life goes on, but nothing is reported about it, since the daily routine is of no interest or significance as far as the author is concerned.[68]

The writer may also bring time to a stop. But these instances are infrequent and of little impact. The constant moving of a biblical narrative gives it a "dynamic nature."[69]

Sequence of Time. The storyteller is also able to control the sequence of time or the order in which the reader experiences the elements of the plot. The telling of most biblical stories mimics the order in which we usually experience life. Events move from past to present to future. "The biblical narrator generally ensures that there is agreement between the order of narrated time and that of narration time so that it flows in one direction, from the past to the future."[70] But there are examples within biblical narrative that do not follow this default pattern. "If natural sequence yields rhetorical gains, then its manipulation and discontinuity do so far more perceptibly."[71] Consider the flashback in Judges 11 through which Jephthah is characterized (11:1–3). Thus a close reading of biblical narrative will include attention directed to the writer's use of time. Both the duration and sequence of time can be used to enhance the reader's interest and to mark significant elements in the story.

Patterning Play of Words

The final component of narrative criticism that we will introduce is "the patterning play of words."[72] All language is composed of "words." But the careful selection, repetition and nuancing of words are what separate literature from mundane speech. In their introduction to narrative criticism, Gunn and Fewell dedicate a chapter to this topic. The introduction to that chapter contains this definition of the patterning play of words.

> As words are woven into narrative discourse, they connect to form patterns that are both contained within the text and extend beyond it. Furthermore, the multivalence of language creates a "thick" texture, where words often participate simultaneously in more than one pattern.[73]

We will now briefly review the most commonly discussed types of word-play, repetition and irony, before referencing other figures of speech. As a general rule, English prose composition seeks to avoid repetition.

> The result is that we are constantly looking for synonyms as we write. By contrast Hebrew prose enjoys repetition. The verbatim repetition of a word, phrase, sentence or set of sentences, or even the recurrence of words falling into the same semantic range can function to structure the story, to create atmosphere, to construct a theme or a character, to emphasize a certain point to the reader, or to build suspense.[74]

The storyteller may employ the repetition of a sound. Bar-Efrat dedicates several pages of his monograph to the discussion and illustration of the biblical writer's use of sound. "There are various types of repetitions of sounds, such as paronomasia, alliteration, assonance and rhyme."[75] Since this is artful use of language intimately tied to the phonological system of the parent text, its replication by the translator is extremely difficult.

A second type of repetition involves the intentional paralleling of syntactic units.[76] In Jonah 1, only two sentences in the Hebrew are constructed with the word order, subject + Hebrew perfect. The first is found in 1:4 where the LORD hurls a storm on the sea. The second is found in 1:5 were we are told that Jonah went down into the bowels of the ship. The repetition of this formula amidst the string of *waw-*

consecutive imperfect forms invites the reader to link and contrast the actions of the LORD and Jonah.

Robert Alter adds three more forms of repetition which are closely related. He speaks of motif, theme and allusion. He defines motif as a concrete image, sensory quality, action or object that recurs through a particular narrative. For example, fire in the Samson narrative or water in Moses' story.[77] By contrast, a theme is a repeated idea that is part of the value-system of the narrative. Alter directs us to examples like the obedience versus rebellion theme in the Wilderness stories or the rejection and election of monarch theme in Samuel and Kings.[78] His view of allusion is closely related to but distinct from both theme and motif. Allusion is defined as a reference to an antecedent literary text as in Judges 19. The brutish populace wants to rape the male guest and a woman is offered in his place. The reporting of this event has links with a similar scenario in Sodom (Genesis 19). The story is told in such fashion as to draw attention to the parallels.[79] Another form of repetition is found in the sequencing of action verbs.

> This pattern appears most commonly and most clearly in the folktale form of three consecutive repetitions, or three plus one, with some intensification or increment from one occurrence to the next, usually concluding either in a climax or a reverse.[80]

We see an example of this pattern in Job 1. In highly repetitive language, Job receives dreadful news from three messengers in a row. This is followed by a fourth messenger who brings the worst news of all in reporting the death of his children.

The most frequently discussed pattern of repetition is the *Leitwort* (lead-word) repetition. "A *Leitwort* is a word or root of a word that recurs significantly in a text."[81] Both synonyms and antonyms may be used in the pattern.[82] A *Leitwort* pattern is clearly evident in Jonah 1. There God tells Jonah to קום in 1:2. Jonah's response is a series of actions in which the antonym ירד is regularly used. The repetition of this root characterizes the "decent" of Jonah both physically and morally. It is easy for the reader to begin reading such repetitive patterns lightly. But a close reading of such texts may reveal *variations* in the repetition. Such variations can carry significant semantic weight.

> When repetitions with significant variations occur in biblical narrative, the changes introduced can point to an intensification, climatic development,

> acceleration of the actions and attitudes initially represented, or, on the other hand, to some unexpected, perhaps unsettling, new revelation of character or plot.[83]

Sternberg describes and illustrates the deviance in repetition with the following categories: expansion, ellipsis, change of order, grammatical transformation and substitution.[84]

Biblical writers also enjoy using irony. Gunn and Fewell define irony as "language that can be interpreted as understating or counterstating what, on the surface, it seems to mean, also often bypassing the characters en route from the narrator to reader."[85] A classic example of this may be seen in the response of David to the prophet, Nathan. In 2 Samuel 12, Nathan tells David the story of a wealthy man who lovelessly slaughtered the ewe lamb of a poor man. David offers royal judgment, "The man who did this is going to die." (2 Samuel 12:5) The reader is aware that Nathan presented this case to David because it was David's own case. In pronouncing judgment, David has unknowingly condemned himself.

While repetition and irony may be frequent figures of speech, biblical writers employ dozens of other figures. In Bullinger's noted work on the topic, he dedicates over 1,000 pages to the description and illustration of hundreds of figures![86] Most introductions to narrative criticism illustrate only a few.[87] It is clear from the foregoing that the author's of the Hebrew Bible drew from a rich heritage of literary "brushes and paints." With those tools in hand, the storytellers carefully and strategically reported on the events of divine history. A close reading of Scripture will not only reveal the wonderful artistry of the text but also offer insightful views into the meaning of the work.

This overview of narrative criticism is the environment from which our method of analysis will be drawn. The search for a standard approach in the literature is met by an unfortunate vacuum. In 1993, David Gunn said,

> A mark of current narrative criticism in Hebrew Bible studies is its considerable diversity. The lack of an obvious institutional center is paralleled by the lack of an obvious theoretical or methodological center. This, it seems to me, is probably a healthy, if sometimes confusing, state of affairs.[88]

Things have not changed appreciably since Gunn made that statement. But in general two approaches stand out.

> The first approach analyzes and describes *one* or a *few* stylistic phenomena that are seminal to the narrative and leave their mark upon it. The other concentrates on analyzing and discussing in as systematic and exhaustive a way as possible the *whole* complex of stylistic phenomena in the narrative.[89]

The latter is more inductive. Here one would read the text again and again and again and again watching for the type of features we discussed in the earlier part of this chapter to percolate up. This approach has the advantage of being more comprehensive.

In the interest of space, we will employ the former approach. This calls for the analysis of certain components of the narrative in a more systematic way. The components of that analysis will be: characterization of a main figure in the narrative, the use of time and the patterning play of words. Gunn and Fewell focused upon these components in their monograph. They observed that these three components are the components that *distinguish* narrative from other types of literature.[90] Thus the writer's strategic use of language in these areas promises to give us a picture of the distinctive style found in a particular text.

Measuring the Texts with Narrative Criticism

Now it is time to return to the stories we had analyzed in the previous chapter with a linguistic approach. We will identify the most prominent literary elements involving characterization, the use of time and the patterning play of words in the parent text. We will then examine the Greek text for the replication or alteration of the literary experience in the translation process.

Genesis 22 The Hebrew Story

Genesis 22 plays an important role in relating the life of Abraham. Abraham is called to special service by the LORD in chapter 12. But from the beginning, we have mixed feelings about him.[91] The reader has seen Abraham demonstrate both deep spiritual conviction and equally deep doubt. The man who believes when he is promised children in his old age (Gen 15) is the same man who stands ready to hand over his wife to Abimelech in order to save his own life (Gen 20).

So who is he really? The Old Testament reader does not have the accolades of Hebrews 11 to answer that question, but what the reader does have is Gen 22. Here the man who waivers between faith and doubt is presented as the man of "limitless obedience."[92]

We get to know Abraham in several different ways. Let's begin with what Abraham himself says or rather with what he does *not* say. Verse two of our chapter presents Abraham with an unthinkable task. He is to sacrifice his own son. "Abraham is a man accustomed to arguing with God (Gen 19). And given the importance of Isaac to the covenant promise, he had sufficient rhetorical ammunition at his disposal."[93] But Abraham's quiet obedience speaks louder than words.

We don't hear his voice until verse five where Abraham's voice betrays both an inner tension and an inner strength. We see the tension in the careful avoiding of words that would be too difficult for this father to speak.[94] Both the LORD and the narrator have referred to Isaac as Abraham's "son" (בֵּן). Abraham avoids that language and instead refers to Isaac with a more neutral הַנַּעַר.[95] A second substitution shows a similar sensitivity.[96] God has asked Abraham to offer his son as a whole-burnt offering (עֹלָה). When Abraham puts this mission in his own language, he speaks of that mission with the root חוה. He and the boy are going to "worship."

But in the midst of this tension, there is a note of strength. Even though this "act of worship" would seem to preclude the possibility, Abraham says to the servants he is leaving behind, "we *will* return." This volitional form reflects Abraham's "utter confidence and trust."[97] Thus Abraham's first direct speech betrays the anxiety of a father on an unthinkable mission as well as a father who has confidence in the way it will work out.

The second time Abraham speaks is in response to Isaac's question. "Here are the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for the whole-burnt offering?" (22:7). This penetrating question and Abraham's response are located in a key position within the narrative.[98] Thus we may expect the direct quote of Abraham to have significant semantic weight. The reader is not disappointed. Not only does Abraham voice the thematic point of the narrative אֱלֹהִים יִרְאֶה, he also speaks in a way that stands in contrast to the evasive language he used in 22:5. He even collocates three nouns in a way that is directly reminiscent of the divine command of v. 2, הַעֲלֵהוּ לְעֹלָה בְּנִי. Thus we see a growing conviction in the language which Abraham uses between v. 5 and v. 8.

God also speaks in this narrative and it is instructive to note that the LORD is quoted at greater length than Abraham. What the LORD says about Abraham gushes with praise. In view of his great act of faith, he is certified as one who fears God (יְרֵא אֱלֹהִים) in v. 12. And all the promises of blessing which are given earlier in Abraham's life are again paraded before him in view of his willingness to surrender his son (vv. 16–17). Thus the direct speech of and about Abraham clearly characterizes him as an honored man of God.

"Having spoken, God is silent; having heard, Abraham is silent; witnessing, the reader is silent."[99] The lack of direct speech in this narrative is supplanted by an abundance of action. And when Abraham acts, the reader is to listen because "each humdrum act is loaded with emotional significance."[100] Two bursts of activity are worthy of special note. Earlier we observed that Abraham did not speak in reply to God's directions in v. 2. Instead, he acted. In vv. 3–4, we find a series of 8 *waw*-consecutive imperfects. Abraham got up early, loaded, took, split, arose, went, lifted and saw. We find a similar chain of verbs in vv. 9–10. Abraham arrived, built, arranged, bound, set, sent and took. Such a chain of verbs characterizes single-minded purposefulness and obedience.[101] Thus, the way in which the writer reports on the actions of Abraham is strategically designed to shape the reader's view of Abraham in this way.

Even though Isaac is introduced to the reader by name, he functions as an agent in the narrative. His primary role is to amplify the trial of Abraham.[102] And it is the way in which Isaac is named which contributes most to this role. The LORD's quotation in v. 2 contains a climatic set of references to Isaac each introduced by אֵת.[103] "Take your son, your only one, whom you love, Isaac." We meet Isaac as a son, an only son, a beloved son. Thus from the start the parent-child bond is stressed. Isaac is identified 16 times in 22 verses. Twice he is referred to by name, יִצְחָק. Twice he is referred to as the boy, נַעַר. Three times he is called, "your only one," יְחִידְךָ. And nine times he is referred to as son, בֵּן. It is in the latter two references that the reader is confronted by the close relationship Abraham is asked to sacrifice. This makes the trial all the more vivid and it makes Abraham's quiet obedience all the more resplendent.

The narrative artistry is also apparent in the storyteller's use of time. We will examine both sequence and duration. The sequence of the narrative is largely linear following the steady forward march of

time.[104] One exception to the rule stands out. In the chain of verbs noted within 22:3, all seem to be in chronological order except the splitting of the wood.[105] This likely occurred before the loading of the donkey. But its telling is delayed. In contrast to all the other preparations, it had the closest association with the sacrifice itself.[106] Thus the sequencing of these verb forms adds to the tension developing in the plot.

The storyteller also controls the duration of time spent with any one dimension of the narrative. The narrative generally progresses at a very fast pace. At one point, the reader is catapulted ahead two full days (v. 4). This stands in dramatic contrast to the pace in vv. 9–10. "The breathless pace" gives way to "slow motion."[107] The result is that the reader is allowed to experience time in much the same way as Abraham did. The time he hoped would last forever (the traveling time) went by in the blink of an eye. While the time he hoped would never come (the time of the sacrifice) lingered and lingered and lingered. In vv. 9–10, we are drawn through each agonizing step of the final preparations including the long reach for the knife.

This narrative is also rich in the play of words. Our attention will focus on three. The first is the writer's use of irony in 22:6. Once the servants and donkey were left behind, "he set the wood on Isaac." The irony is found in the fact that he sets the wood on Isaac while in v. 9 he will set Isaac on the wood. The same vocabulary is used in each.[108]

We also see this writer using synecdoche. This is found in 22:17. God tells Abraham that his seed will inherit the gate of his enemy (שַׁעַר אֹיְבָיו). In a synecdoche, part of a thing is put for the whole of the thing. Here the word "gate" is employed to stand for the entire city.[109]

The third patterning play we will examine is associated with the Hebrew root for seeing, ראה. This root plays a *Leitwort* role in vv. 8, 13 and 14.[110] In v. 8, Abraham makes the statement of faith that we discussed earlier, "God will see to it." In v. 13, God did "see to it" when Abraham saw a ram caught in a bush. And so Abraham named the place, "The LORD will see to it" (v. 14). As the root is repeated, the reality becomes more tangible.[111]

Genesis 22 The Greek Story

The Septuagint translator becomes a storyteller as he reproduces a form of Genesis 22 in Greek. We will measure this edition of the story

using the same matrix we used to measure the Hebrew edition. This will help us to evaluate the translator as a storyteller. With regard to characterization, the Greek reader meets an Abraham who is a slightly modified version of the Hebrew character. With regards to speech, the silence of Abraham and his dramatic statements in vv. 5 and 8 are largely preserved. But we see a loss in v. 5. There the three strong volitional forms of Abraham are replaced by two volitional futures and a circumstantial participle. That participle speaks with less energy than the accompanying indicative forms, interrupts the symmetry of the clause and therefore diminishes the resoluteness of the Hebrew, "we will worship." The direct speech about Abraham is preserved both in content and in form. The gushing praise of vv. 12 and 16–18 is intact.

We had seen that the actions of Abraham spoke even more powerfully than his words in the Hebrew narrative. Each action of Abraham is preserved although the important form of presentation is altered. Recall that in vv. 3–4 and vv. 9–10, strings of *waw*-consecutive imperfects were employed. Those strings gave the text its characteristic rhythm. In both strings, the translator interspersed non-finite verb forms with finite forms. Thus each action of Abraham is recorded in the order of the parent text. But the rhythmic flow of obedience found in the repetition of grammar is lost.

The one arena in which the character of Abraham is most altered is in the naming of Isaac. Recall that the naming of Isaac played an important role in stressing the father-son relationship and hence deepened the challenge Abraham faced. The fact that Isaac was Abraham's only son is placed before the Hebrew reader in vv. 2, 12, and 16 with the substantive יְחִידְךָ. In the first two instances, the word is eliminated. In the last instance, it is translated with ἀγαπητός. We also saw that בֵּן was used nine times in this narrative to solicit emotion from the Hebrew reader. In two instances, the "my son" of the Hebrew was replaced with τέκνον (child) and no personal pronoun. Those may be found in vv. 7–8. These references in the Hebrew are clearly designed to deepen the reader's appreciation of the father-son relationship and hence amplify the nature of the trial and Abraham's obedience. The net effect of the Greek translation is to mitigate that outcome.

We also examined the Hebrew narrative's use of time. Both the sequence of time, including its alteration in v. 3, and the changing pace of the narration were preserved in the experience of the Greek reader.

Finally we note three instances of patterning play of words within the Hebrew story. Two of these were replicated in the Greek story. The irony of 22:6 and the *Leitwort* that employed the verb "to see" were preserved in the Greek text. However, the synecdoche of 22:17 was eliminated. The Hebrew has "Your seed will inherit the gate of his enemies." The Greek translator has "Your seed will inherit the cities of the enemies (τὰς πόλεις τῶν ὑπεναντίων)."

In sum, the literary experience of the Greek reader has been moderately adjusted. While the great act of faith is preserved for both readers, the character of Abraham is set in a more powerful frame within the Hebrew text.

Genesis 34 The Hebrew Story

At the heart of Genesis 34 lies a terrible crime. Dinah the daughter of Jacob has been raped by a young Canaanite prince, Shechem. The Hebrew storyteller carefully crafts the presentation of this crime and the reactions to it. The crime is related very briefly. And the chapter quickly becomes a catalog of reactions to Shechem's crime, including that of Jacob. He will be the subject of our characterization study which will focus on his reaction to the crime. And Jacob's reaction is best measured against the background of the narrator's comments, the actions of his sons and the naming of Dinah.

The narrator provides us with a description of the rape itself. The second verse of the chapter presents the act to the reader in a three-verb chain (וַיִּקַּח אֹתָהּ וַיִּשְׁכַּב אֹתָהּ וַיְעַנֶּהָ). "He took her, lay with her and humiliated her."[112] This was not seduction but rape. The impact is furthered by the narrator's subsequent reference to the act with the words טָמֵא in verse 5 and נְבָלָה in verse 7.[113] Thus the narrator conditions the way in which the reader perceives the act of Shechem. It is an immoral and repugnant act of violence.

Jacob's sons further support this perception of the act. Verse 7 gives us the brothers reaction to the news of the rape. They are deeply grieved[114] (וַיִּתְעַצְּבוּ) and they are angry (וַיִּחַר). They formulate a plan to extricate and avenge Dinah which employs deception (מִרְמָה), v. 13.[115] And then they carry out the plan in vv. 25–29. As Shechem, Hamor and the males of their community recover from surgery, the brothers seize the property of the community and put every mature male to

death.[116] The comments of the narrator and the actions of the brothers are designed to define the reader's response to the sexual assault. That shaping continues in the naming of Dinah.

Dinah is named 26 times in this narrative with 10 different designations. Caspi observes that this naming is pivotal to the point in the story.[117] The three most valuable references with regard to characterizing Jacob are treated below. In v. 1, Dinah is called the "daughter of Leah." Leah is regularly portrayed as Jacob's less-favored wife. This designation calls for the reader to ask, "Will her daughter, be treated with more respect?"[118] Dinah was not only the daughter of Leah, she was also the "daughter of Jacob." The reader is formally reminded of that four times, in vv. 3, 5, 7 and 19. And finally, the brothers refer to Dinah as a "prostitute" (זוֹנָה), v. 31. Dinah is the daughter of Leah, the daughter of Jacob and she was treated like a prostitute. That language creates an expectation. We anticipate that Jacob will speak and react in some dramatic way.

In light of all this, what does Jacob do? What does Jacob say?

> Surprisingly, Jacob does not immediately respond to the assault. Does his hesitation necessarily mean that he is not concerned about his daughter? Does he disregard Dinah because she is Leah's daughter? Or is it possible that his hesitation arises from the precarious situation? Might Jacob fear a more serious confrontation?[119]

Gunn and Fewell characterize this action as "caution not apathy."[120] The reader may have regarded his silence as such were it not for the persistence of the silence through out the narrative and the pejorative lexeme (חרשׁ)[121] selected to present his silence. Thus Jacob's silence takes on the form of "passivity and noninvolvement."[122] Jacob's lack of action must clearly be seen in contrast to the flurry of action associated with his sons. The fact that this is Jacob's own daughter and that both Jacob and his sons view the action as טמא (vv. 5 and 13) casts the inaction of Jacob in a very negative light.

The silence of Jacob is not broken until the second-to-the-last verse. But our perception of Jacob does not improve. There Jacob criticizes Simeon and Levi for taking the lead in the violent attack on Hamor's community. He observes that such actions have now placed both he and his entire household at risk of Canaanite reprisal. It is noteworthy that the only time Jacob speaks he does not mention either Dinah or the rape. While everyone else is reacting and responding to what Shechem

did to Dinah, Jacob is responding to what his sons did to Shechem and Hamor. That discontinuity does not place Jacob's sole speech in a favorable light. Commentators have characterized his argument as "shabby,"[123] a "peevish complaint"[124] and the "reaction of an old man who fears and feels vulnerable."[125]

Jacob is mute at beginning and again mute at the end of the story. In v. 31, Jacob fails to answer Simeon and Levi's pointed question. "Should he have treated our sister like a prostitute?" Alter notes that this is "crudest expression in the story and invites some response." But there is none.[126] The silence of Jacob favors the brothers' actions and places Jacob's inaction in the most negative of lights.[127] "Dinah has action and no voice at the beginning. Jacob has a voice and no action at the end."[128]

The storyteller controls both the sequence and the duration of time experienced by the reader. Like most Hebrew narrative, the plot sequence is all forward. The writer does, however, carefully control the amount of time the reader spends with various actions in the plot. The crime committed against Dinah is told with great economy. The rape is related in just five words. Where the reader is invited to linger is not the scene of the crime, but in the various forms of response that the crime solicited.

The offer of Hamor and Shechem (vv. 8–12) is told in dialogic fashion with nearly 59 words. The response of Jacob's sons (vv. 14–17) is also told in dialogic fashion with 51 words. Hamor's dialogue with the men at the city gate is told in (vv. 21–23) with 52 words. And the action of the brothers against Hamor's community is told in vv. 25–29 with 79 words. Note that while the dialogue sections are of about equal size, the reader lingers longer over the brother's vengeful actions.

Genesis 34 contains a number of figures of speech. We will consider instances of irony, word order and *Leitwort*. We find irony at work in contrasting v. 23 and vv. 28–29. In both instances, we find similar lists. As Hamor argues for the intermingling of the clans and for the mass circumcision which Jacob's sons have demanded, he observes that it will mean more animals and personal property for the community (v. 23). The irony of that verse becomes apparent when the sons of Jacob gain for themselves even more than Hamor had promised *his* community. Their list of plunder includes: animals, personal property, land and people (v. 29).

The writer of Genesis 34 uses word order strategically in several places. In particular, we note the word order in v. 16. There the reader meets וְנָתַנּוּ אֶת־בְּנֹתֵינוּ לָכֶם וְאֶת־בְּנֹתֵיכֶם נִקַּח־לָנוּ. The ABB_1A_1 arrangement of direct objects and verb forms creates a chiasm.

Two examples of *Leitwort* are clearly at work in this text. The verb root לקח is used 9 times in this narrative. Sternberg observes that this is a key word in the narrative.

> Consider the semantic fortunes of the verb "take." The context of the rape having charged it with one intimation of violence ("he took her"), this verb now bristles with others ("took each man his sword," "took Dinah out," and then comes a listing of the plunder that Jacob's sons "took"). It is as if one brutal "taking" let to the rest, and what followed Shechem's sexual "taking" was not the legal "taking" for which he had come to yearn but "takings" more analogous to that with which he launched the chain of violence.[129]

A second use of *Leitwort* is evident in the writer's use of the verb "to circumcise" (מוֹל). The reader meets this verb five times within the confines of vv. 15–24. Circumcision did have ritual import for the sons of Jacob. It was a sign and reminder of the covenant that God had made with Abraham and his family. But here, the brothers are using circumcision as a tool with which to disable their opponents. The frequency with which this verb is paraded before the reader in this context has a striking overtone. It is a punishment that is uniquely associated with Shechem's crime.[130] As Robert Alter says, "It is designed to inflict pain on the offending organ."[131]

Genesis 34 The Greek Story

The linguistic analysis of Gen 34, which was a product of our previous chapter, indicated that the Septuagint translation of Gen 34 was fairly literal but might yield some significant quantitative additions in semantic content. We will now see if any of those additions affects the literary elements we have just discussed in the Hebrew text.

Jacob's reaction to his daughter's rape is evident in the Greek text and stands apart from the reaction of others. The description of the rape by the narrator closely parallels the Hebrew. The surface structure of the three-verb chain in v. 2 is slightly altered. One of the *waw*-consecutive forms becomes a predicate participle. Nevertheless, the

content and economy of that description are parallel. The Greek narrator's perception of Shechem's act is defined by lexical choices in vv. 5 and 10 that parallel the Hebrew. In v. 5, טִמֵּא is translated by μιαίνω. In v. 7, נְבָלָה is translated by ἄσχημον. The reaction of Jacob's sons to the news is somewhat altered in the Greek edition. The deceitful plan is mentioned in v. 13. But the Greek storyteller speaks about their response with words that allow their actions to be less easily defended.[132] The naming of Dinah also played an important role in the reader's perception of Shechem's actions. In each case, the naming of Dinah in Greek parallels the naming of Dinah in Hebrew. In the arena's just noted, the Greek storyteller largely parallels the Hebrew storyteller. Thus, the Greek reader also expects a strong reaction from Jacob and is surprised by his resounding silence, his peevish complaint and his dramatic inaction. Thus the Jacob we meet in the Hebrew is very much the same person we meet in the Greek.

The use of time is the Greek is the same as that which the reader experiences in the Hebrew. The sequence of events is always forward. And the amount of time the reader lingers with various text elements is paralleled. The crime itself is told with the same economy seen in the Hebrew. And the reader lingers longer with the responses to the rape. The number of words used to describe any one of the various reactions increases in the Greek text, but the comparable amount of time the reader lingers with the various dialogues and the actions of the brothers is duplicated in the Greek.[133]

The figurative use of language we discussed in the Hebrew story are all apparent and duplicated in the Greek story. There is irony between vv. 23 and 29. The irony is found in the fact that Hamor and the citizens of his community actually lose more than what they hoped to get. That irony is not only repeated in the Greek text it is enhanced. For the list of items the brothers plundered in v. 29 is expanded beyond the language of the Hebrew. In the Hebrew, we also discovered the artful use of word order. In particular, the chiastic pattern of v. 16 is duplicated. The two examples of *Leitwort* which we noted in associate with the roots לקח and מול are preserved by consistent use of λαμβάνω and περιτέμνω respectively.

In sum, the reading of the Greek text with regards to Jacob's character, the use of time and the patterning play of words is virtually the same. The Greek storyteller has presented his readers with a translated story that has only slight narrative adjustments.

Exodus 13:17–14:31 The Hebrew Story

Our next story takes us to Egypt as we turn to the events associated with the crossing of the Red Sea recorded in Exodus 13:17–14:31.[134] The speech and action of God clearly dominate this narrated event. He is the supreme actor.[135] But we will focus our attention on the characterization of Moses. While God is carefully orchestrating this drama to bring glory to himself (14:4), he is also adjusting our perception of Moses' leadership (14:31). The storyteller introduces us to Moses in this chapter via his actions, his speech and via a brief comment from the narrator.

We will focus on two actions of Moses. The first is found in 13:19. In a flashback, we are told that before Moses left Egypt and took the bones of Joseph with him. Durham characterizes this as an "arbitrary interruption of the narrative."[136] It is certainly an interruption, but it is far from arbitrary. Rather it is strategic.[137] This new *leader* of God's people is being linked to a great patriarchal *leader* of the past. And this bond is not only formed between Moses and Joseph, but also between Moses and the promises associated with Joseph.[138] The words in our text are nearly a verbatim repetition of Gen 50:25. The great leader Joseph had caused the children of Israel to take an oath. That oath which involved carrying his remains to a *new land* was an oath based on the promises of God given to all the patriarchs beginning with Abraham. Thus Moses, the new leader, is associated both with Joseph and the hope of life in the Promised Land.

The other action of Moses that we observe is the raising of his hand. This action is found in 14:21 and 14:27. On both occasions, Moses acts in response to clear direction from the LORD. Thus the recording of the action, at minimum, characterizes Moses as an obedient leader. What is more, this action is frequently associated with God's dramatic power demonstration in the Ten Plagues. This allusion to the recent history of the nation recalls Moses' dramatic role and allows the reader to see the miracle of Exodus 14 as an extension of the power demonstrated in the Ten Plagues.[139] This enhances our view of Moses while suggesting that the hand of God is again about to crush the Egyptians.

The writer also uses what and when Moses speaks to characterize him. God speaks to Moses three times (14:1–4; 15–18 and 26). But Moses does not enter into dialogue with God. In these instances, his

only response to God is obedient action. The only time Moses does speak is in response to the people. They speak to Moses in 14:11–12. God had chosen a route out of Egypt that was designed to confuse the Egyptian leadership (14:3). It also confused and worried the Israelites. That confusion turned to fear when they saw the "elite chariot forces of Egypt pursuing them with Pharaoh himself in the lead."[140] They turn on their new leader with two pointed questions. "Is it because there were no graves in Egypt that you have taken us to die in the wilderness? What have you done to us (מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂיתָ) by bringing us out from Egypt?" (14:11) It is ironic that the people have picked up the same language used by Pharaoh in 14:5, מַה־זֹּאת עָשִׂינוּ. "The two reactions are parallel because they both do not take God into account."[141] In 14:11–12, the people mention Egypt five times. Brueggemann observes that this was the name they had come to rely upon in their slavery. What was missing was the name of the Lord.[142] That attitude found in these questions poses a real test of the new leader's skills.

Moses' response is shorter than the quote of his accusers, but is eminently more powerful. "Do not be afraid, stand firm, and see the salvation of the LORD which he will accomplish for you today. Because the Egyptians whom you see today, you will never see again forever. God will fight for you while you are being still." (14:13–14) Moses responds with three imperatives, one for each of the accusatory sentences. And while the people don't mention God at all, Moses mentions him twice.

> "Fear not" is an enormously preemptive statement used to override fear by the giving of assurance that lies outside and beyond fear. His other two imperatives invite Israel to stop and pay attention, to notice a presence in their crisis that they had neither noticed nor acknowledged.[143]

Taken as a whole, Moses response distinguishes him as a faithful leader who "demonstrated the necessity of godly leadership and trust." This rhetoric places him among the great leaders of the Bible.[144]

The final method of characterizing Moses that we will examine can be handled more quickly. It is found in the narrator's comment in 14:31. There we are told that the people "trusted the LORD and Moses, his servant." This simple statement can easily get lost in the drama of this narrative. But it is an important vindication of Moses' leadership given the accusations he faced earlier.[145] When the narrator

calls Moses, "servant of God," he is giving him a unique role in the community of faith.[146] Thus through Moses' actions, his speech and the narrator's comments we meet the developing leader of Israel as a man of vision and faith. He sees what others can not see and he persuades others to view life as he does.

Once again, the sequence of time in this narrative is generally forward moving. Two exceptions will be noted before we discuss the matter of time duration. In two instances, the writer takes us out of the forward flow of time and flashes back to earlier events. The first is found in 13:19. The narrator takes us back to the time when the Children of Israel were preparing to march out of Egypt. We are told that Moses took the bones of Joseph with him. The importance of that flashback for the characterization of Moses was discussed above. The second time the reader is taken back in time is found in 14:29–30. This brief reflection offers a recapitulation of the most salient moments of the narrative and then explains the affect that the Red Sea crossing had on the people. "They feared the LORD and trusted the LORD and Moses, his servant." (14:31)

The duration of time is largely affected by the interplay of dialogue and narrative summary. In this narrative section, we count 13 verses of direct quotation and 24 verses of narration. In 14:1–4 and 14:15–18, the LORD offers an extended monologue. Since there is no dialogic component to this speech, the pace of the narrative is very similar to that of narration. The one place where we encounter true dialogue and a slowed pace is 14:11–14. Here time does slow down long enough for us to listen in on the discussion between the people and Moses. The reader is invited to linger at this moment in time. This strategic break in the narrative's pace allows us to better understand the man whom God has placed in Israel's lead.

The sensitive Hebrew reader will be aware of several word-plays at work in this narrative. We will examine an instance of paronomasia, an instance of irony, an instance of chiasm and an instance of *Leitwort*. The first figure is found in 13:17 and involves paronomasia. The narrator employs two different verb roots which in the forms selected have a similar sound. God did not lead them (נָחָם) on a certain road lest the people change their minds (יִנָּחֵם). The two are related not only in sound but also in logical progression.[147]

The second figure is found in the use of כבד in 14:4 and 14:25. This root is often used in early chapters to describe the change of heart

that Pharaoh has when dealing with divine plagues.[148] Within this chapter the root is used both to describe how God will distinguish himself in the face of Pharaoh (וְאִכָּבְדָה בְּפַרְעֹה 14:4) and the difficulty with which the chariots were driven (וַיְנַהֲגֵהוּ בִּכְבֵדֻת 14:25).[149] Again the two are not only related phonetically but also logically. It is ironic that the difficulty with which the chariot's were driven would result in glory given to God.

The author of this narrative carefully composed 14:6 to create a very tightly unified structure. The unity is both a product of the chiasm and paronomasia. Note both the relationship of the verbs and direct objects in the chiasm and the word-play involving "his people" and "with him." .וַיֶּאְסֹר אֶת־רִכְבּוֹ וְאֶת־עַמּוֹ לָקָח עִמּוֹ

Finally, we observe the use of *Leitwort* employed in 14:13.[150] The Children of Israel "lifted their eyes" (14:10) and saw the Egyptians in pursuit. This led to the fear-filled criticism of Moses in 14:11-12. Moses' response employs the root ראה three times. The people lifted their eyes and were afraid. Moses tells them not to be afraid and see (וּרְאוּ) the salvation of the LORD. For the Egyptians you see (רְאִיתֶם) today you will not see again (לִרְאֹתָם). This careful interplay of language makes the speech of Moses more aesthetically appealing than the criticism directed at him and adds to the power of his response.

Exodus 13:17-14:31 the Greek Story

The Greek translator tells a story that is similar to the Hebrew story in characterization and use of time. But we will see a loss in the patterning play of words. The actions used to characterize Moses, taking the bones of Joseph (13:19) and raising his hand (14:21-27), are both preserved for the Greek reader. The same is true of the comment made by the narrator in 14:31 where Moses is designated as God's servant.

The quotation of Moses in 14:13-14 functions as in the Hebrew. Both the content and the context of the quote match the Hebrew. The complaint of the people has the same parallels with Pharaoh's "What have we done?" The five-fold reference to Egypt is preserved in questions that make no reference to God.[151] Moses' response contains the same powerful language as the Hebrew. Three encouraging imperatives correspond to the three discouraged statements of the

people.[152] And God's presence is brought into the equation as Moses mentions his name twice. The net result of this and the previous characterization in Greek is that the Moses we meet in Hebrew is the same Moses we meet in the Greek text.

The sequencing of time in Hebrew is also the same as we have in the Greek text. The two situations in which the sequence is reordered (13:19 and 14:29–30) are preserved. Summary dominates the Greek narrative as it did the Hebrew narrative. The same amount of direct quotation is used with true dialogue occurring only at 14:11–14.

The two previous areas largely preserved the literary experience of the Hebrew. But investigation of the patterning play of words shows a distinction in the two reading experiences. The two plays on words found in 13:17 and in 14:4 and 25 were not duplicated in the Greek. In both instances, we consulted the semantic domain of the Greek words used. It was clear that the paronomasia could not be duplicated given the lexical choices available to the Greek writer. Thus this failure should not be held against the Greek translator, but the reader of the Greek text is impoverished in this regard.

The grammatical chiasm in 14:6 is also violated. Here the Greek translator makes the subject of the verbs which is implicit in the Hebrew, explicit in Greek (φαραώ). But the addition results in a structural change that obscures the grammatical chiasm.

Finally, we observed the *Leitwort* present in 14:13. Moses repeats the root "to see" three times in the words of encouragement he offers the people (וּרְאוּ, רְאִיתֶם, לִרְאֹתָם). The Greek translator translates with the same root each time. But the repetition is not as aesthetically pleasing due to the changes in the appearance of the three forms used (ὁρᾶτε, ἑωράκατε and ἰδεῖν). This will be regarded as a net loss since the translator could have presented the forms in a way that would have created more visual and phonetic similarity.

Thus, the reading experience associated with the Hebrew and Greek texts is nearly parallel in the characterization of Moses and in the use of time. But the meaningful and aesthetically pleasing figures of speech we noted are lost. This results in a slight adjustment in the Greek edition.

Numbers 13 The Hebrew Story

The fourth discourse from the Pentateuch that we will study is Numbers 13. In this account, we find the Children of Israel poised to enter the promised land. But before they enter, a recognizance unit is sent ahead to peruse the landscape and its residents. This discourse takes into account the identification of the spies, their mission and their report. Since the spies play a central role in this narrative unit, we will examine their characterization.

Although we meet the men who explored Canaan individually, the Hebrew storyteller characterizes them as a unit. Hence, this analysis will take into account their corporate naming, actions and speech. Moses is instructed to send men[153] on this mission who met specific standards. They are called נָשִׂיא and רָאשֵׁי בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל. Both are designations for "significant tribal leaders."[154] These general designations give way to an introduction via a list. In formulaic fashion, we meet the chosen few by tribal designation, proper name and paternal association. The organization of this list remains under discussion.[155] But the fact that they are identified in such a list has import for their characterization.[156] It "grants them a sense of importance and dignity."[157] Thus via general designation and personal introduction, the reader is led to view the spies as esteemed and honored men of the community.

The actions of these men, as they are described by the narrator (vv. 21–26), support this initial impression. In those verses, we read a summary of their travels. When we compare both the instructions of Moses (vv. 17–20) with the actions of the spies, they compare favorably. For the most part, the spies did what Moses asked them to do. Given the stature of Moses, this obedience sustains a favorable impression in the mind of the reader.[158]

But when the spies begin to report on their findings, the impression of the reader changes. The report begins on a seemingly positive note in v. 27. By designating the land as one that "flows with milk and honey," the spies have used language that God himself has used for the land in Exod 3:8 and 3:17. But in each of the antecedent uses of this collocation, the land is being marked as God's intended destination for his people. This is the land to which the Lord had sent them. But the spies characterize it as the "land to which you sent us." They may use a familiar phrase, but one that omits both God's name and his

intentions.

In vv. 28–29, the spies give a report that focuses on the people who live in the land and the threat which they pose to any invader. This report surveys part of what Moses had asked for in vv. 17–20. But the emphasis in Moses' questions is on the nature of the land more than on the people. Not only was the report imbalanced, it failed to take into account the quality of the land. In other words, the report focused on the most discouraging dimension of their experience rather than on the most encouraging. This begins to raise questions about the character of these men in the mind of the reader.

Their character becomes all the more clear as one of the spies suddenly takes center stage and distinguishes himself from the group (v. 30). He assures the people that they will be able to take possession of the land. These words of Caleb were not mere "bravado, but words of faith."[159] And they aptly demonstrate the lack of faith issued in the majority report.

That lack of faith becomes absolutely clear as the majority counters the language of Caleb (v. 31) and as they circulate their bad report more broadly (vv. 32–33). The report contains information that is deliberately provocative.[160] The land is said to "devour" its residents (אֹכֶלֶת) and to be a place where the "Nephilim" live. The initial metaphor has been variously interpreted.[161] But in each case, the interpretation has a negative connotation designed to discourage the people from entering the land. What makes the report even more distressing is that it is unsupported by the travelogue given by the narrator in vv. 21–24.[162] They also speak of the Nephilim. This group is introduced in Gen 6:4 where they are presented as legendary fighting-men of great size and repute. The association of the Anakites with these historic fighters is again designed to discourage the people.

The honor of these men is dissipating in their rhetoric and lies. Since the reader of Numbers is aware that it is God's intentions for this people to enter the land and that God can overcome odds that are much more dramatic than those reported by the spies, the cumulative result of their report works against them. The more positive impression that the reader has of the spies erodes and we view them with increasing suspicion and distrust.

We now turn our attention to the storyteller's use of time. The sequence of the narrative moves forward chronologically. While it is interrupted on occasion to provide editorial comment on the time of

year (v. 20) or on a location (v. 22), time never reverses. The forward movement of the narrative stops for a considerable amount of time in vv. 4–17. The reader is required to linger over the reading of the list that contains the names of the spies. Since this list adds to the positive characterization of the spies, the reading time invested is strategically planned.

The 40-day visit to Canaan (vv. 21–26) is told in very succinct fashion. The spies leave and return within a very short amount of reading time. We have only a brief summary of what they saw. By contrast, we have a considerable amount of reading time dedicated to their report (vv. 27–33). Given the way that this material reshapes the reader's response to the spies and the way in which the report affects the attitude of the people, the reader is strategically invited to linger here longer.

The Hebrew story contains three figures of speech: *Leitwort*, hyperbole and meiosis. A clear example of *Leitwort* may be observed in connection with the use of the root עלה. In v. 17, Moses instructs the spies to "go up" into the land (עֲלוּ). The spies faithfully respond. The root is used both in v. 21 and v. 22 (וַיַּעֲלוּ). Although they were safely able to "go up," their report was strategically designed to discourage the people from doing so. Thus Caleb uses the root twice (v. 30) in a grammatical construction selected to encourage the Israelites to go up (עָלֹה נַעֲלֶה). In the following verse, the majority report selects the same root via which to negate Caleb's certainty and again discourage any advance into this new land (לֹא נוּכַל לַעֲלוֹת).

Verse 33 contains both of the other figures of speech. The first is hyperbole. Within the bad report that they spread, the majority reported, "We saw Nephilim!" Given what we had observed above about these individuals, this is clearly a case of hyperbole[163] used with specific rhetorical intent. We also observe an example of meiosis in this verse. Meiosis (or litotes) is a device via which one subject is diminished in order to magnify another. In this case, we see meiosis in the expression, "We were in their eyes like grasshoppers." By this statement the spies diminish themselves in order to amplify the stature of the residents.[164]

Numbers 13 the Greek Story

Once again the translator tells a very similar story. As in the Hebrew text, the spies who explore Canaan are characterized as a group. Our initial impression of them is positive. The Greek text refers to them twice as ἀρχηγόι (leaders). The Greek text also introduces them individually within a carefully formulated list. As in the Hebrew, this type of introduction grants them a sense of dignity. The positive feelings of the Greek reader are further cultivated as we see them carrying out the instructions which Moses gave to them.

The oral report given by the spies largely parallels the report we read in the Hebrew. Thus the careful Greek reader may begin to puzzle over the biased amount of space spent on the negative experiences of the spies versus the positive. That suspicion is fully fanned when Caleb offers the minority report. Here the Greek makes his direct speech (v. 30) even more emphatic by adding an exclamatory "No!" (Οὐχί) to its beginning.

The response of the spies in Greek is also conditioned by the use of a Greek perfect form in three places where an aorist is expected. They are found in vv. 28, 32 and 33. In each case, the perfect of ὁράω, is used to translate a Hebrew perfect form of ראה. The unexpected tense-form selection provides rhetorical emphasis that is not owned by the Hebrew speakers. In addition, the majority response to Caleb's plea is given extra impetus by using strong future negation in Greek for a Hebrew imperfect. The reader meets that construction in v. 32, οὐ μὴ δυνώμεθα. These language choices strengthen and distinguish the positions taken by Caleb and the majority. The net result is that the majority is cast in a slightly more negative light than it is cast in the Hebrew.

The use of time in the Greek and Hebrew narratives is virtually parallel. Both move forward without reversing. The amount of time the Greek reader spends with any one dimension of the narrative is parallel to the Hebrew narrative.

We consulted the three figures of speech that we discovered in the Hebrew text. All three were replicated in the Greek text. The *Leitwort*, evident in the use of the Hebrew root עלה, is replicated by the use of the Greek root ἀναβαίνω. The meiosis that is employed in the last verse of the chapter is replicated in the Greek. And the hyperbole which is used in that same verse is also duplicated. There the Nephilim

are called γίγαντας.

Once again a comparison of the reading experience associated with the Greek and Hebrew text is nearly identical. The stories are told in much the same way. Even where the literary experience of the Greek reader is slightly enhanced, the enhancement moves in a direction that is complimentary to the Hebrew text.

Judges 4 The Hebrew Story

Judges 4 is a text of strong women and more recessive men.[165] We will focus our characterization study on the storyteller's presentation of Jael. We anticipate meeting her in the speech of Deborah and the comments of the narrator. In addition, we will examine Jael's speech, her actions and naming. Jael is not formally introduced to us until v. 17. Nevertheless, we anticipate meeting her in the antecedent verses. Early in the narrative, Deborah goes to the Israelite general, Barak. Through Deborah, God promises to deliver Israel from the oppression imposed by Jabin of Hazor. When Barak hesitates, Deborah says that the honor of the victory will no longer be his (v. 9). For the LORD will subdue Sisera with the hand of a woman (בְּיַד־אִשָּׁה). Thus the reader anticipates that an unnamed female will play a significant role in the battle.[166]

A very unusual interruption in the flow of the narrative occurs in v. 11. Here the reader is told that Heber, a Kenite, who was related to Moses had left the other members of his clan in southern Judah[167] and had moved north. Since Jael will subsequently be introduced as Heber's husband, the reader is informed in advance why she was residing near the battleground.[168] But more importantly, the mention of Heber allows the formal introduction of Jael to be delayed. This delay increases the tension and allows the reader to be surprised both by the actions and introduction of Jael.[169]

The narrator intervenes again in v. 17 and introduces us to Jael. She is described as the wife of Heber whom we met in v. 11. We are further told that some sort of alliance existed between Heber and Jabin.[170] Since the reader and Sisera do not anticipate that this woman will act independently of her husband,[171] they assume that Jael will be a friend who will provide safe haven for the general.

The reader is further introduced to Jael by what she says. In

contrast to Deborah, Jael speaks very little. We hear her voice only in vv. 18 and 22. Sisera has left behind his chariot to flee the battle scene on foot. As the exhausted Sisera stumbles into Jael's camp, she invites him to turn aside and remain in her tent without fear (v. 18).[172] This brief speech confirms what the reader has been led to expect, namely that Jael will play the role of ally.

Jael is a woman of few words but very powerful actions. In. vv. 18–19, she goes out to meet the fleeing Sisera. She opens her tent to him.[173] When he asks for just a little water, she provides him with milk.[174] And after he has had a drink, she covers him up.[175] "Jael offers to the vulnerable, fleeing Sisera, food, choice food, protection and warmth—a rug under which to hide and sleep."[176] Both the reader and Sisera assume that such actions flow from the friendly relationship that exists between Heber and Jabin. Neither the reader nor Sisera expects that Jael will harm him.

But suddenly the reader sees Jael doing something very suspicious (v. 21). She has taken a hammer and tent peg in her hand. Perhaps she is going to secure a portion of the tent. But no, she goes to the man to whom she has shown hospitality and drives the tent peg through his skull into the ground. Six *waw*-consecutive verbs describe the ruthless efficiency of her actions. This unexpected act of violence shocks the reader and clarifies her true allegiance.

In v. 22, Barak arrives in the camp and Jael speaks again. With language that is reminiscent of Jael's meeting with Sisera,[177] she goes out to meet Barak. Since these two individuals meet within close proximity to Sisera's lifeless body, the reader is invited to compare and contrast the actions of Jael with those of Barak in connection with Sisera. Barak has been called a rather "colorless figure"[178] who does not act until v. 10 of this narrative. The dramatic action taken against Sisera by Jael stands in stark contrast to the wavering Barak in v. 8. There Barak declines to muster forces for an attack against Sisera unless Deborah goes with him. This faithless hesitation[179] stands in dramatic contrast to the dynamic action of Jael. She has done what Barak hesitated to do, eliminate Sisera.

Finally, the storyteller uses naming in characterizing Jael. Sisera is identified by his proper name twelve different times in these twenty-four verses. He is not only mentioned frequently, he is mentioned with honor. He is the general of Jabin's army (שִׂיסְרָא־צְבָאוֹ, vv. 2 and 7). By contrast, Jael is identified by her proper name only four times. She is

called the "wife of Heber" (v. 17), hardly a title of distinction. Since naming of characters creates expectations about them, the naming of these two characters adds to the reader's amazement when it is Jael who ends up with the greatest honor at the end of the day.

Thus the characterization of Jael is a very complex affair. The reader is led to expect with Sisera that she will be a friend. We assume that she will follow in the footsteps which her husband walks. But without warning, our take on her changes. Her language and action of hospitality were really a ruse to put Sisera in a vulnerable position. She is shrewd and efficient. The "wife of Heber" overcomes the "general of the army." And in contrast to Barak, Jael becomes the role model of obedience.

The storyteller of Judges 4 manipulates both sequence and duration in this story to shape the reading experience. The sequence of time flows smoothly forward with the exception of one verse. That is verse 11 which contains a flashback. It speaks about an earlier time when Heber had separated himself from his clan in the south and had taken up residence near Kedesh. We have spoken about the importance of this interruption in the flow of time above.

The passage of time is also strategically controlled. The dialogue between Barak and Deborah slows the reader in vv. 6–9. After that, the battle at the Kishon is told very quickly and colorlessly.[180] The narrative slows down considerably again when we get to the mixed action and dialogue of vv. 18–22 where Sisera and Jael interact. This manipulation of time focuses the reader's attention on the dialogue sections.[181]

The storyteller also shaped the presentation of this story by using several word-plays. We will describe two instances of *Leitwort* and one instance of ironic speech. *Leitwort* is employed in the first dialogue sections where Deborah instructs Barak to go (לֵךְ) in v. 6. Barak's answer in v. 8 uses the root הלך four times. "If you will go (תֵּלְכִי) with me, then I will go (וְהָלַכְתִּי). But if you do not go (תֵּלְכִי) with me, I will not go (אֵלֵךְ)."[182] Deborah's speech continues with three more uses of this root (v. 9). Deborah says, "I will most certainly go (הָלֹךְ אֵלֵךְ) with you. Nevertheless, you will not find honor on the path that you are walking (הוֹלֵךְ)." This invitation to go and failure to go plays a significant role in characterizing Barak.

A second example of *Leitwort* is apparent in the expression, "in the hand" (בְּיַד). It is repeated five times in this narrative, four of which are metaphorical. In v. 2, the narrator says that the Lord sold Israel "into

the hand of Jabin." In v. 7, God tells Barak that he will give Sisera and his forces "into your hand." In v. 9, Deborah tells Barak that God will sell Sisera into the "hand of a woman." And in v. 14, Deborah encourages Barak on Mt. Tabor with these words. "The LORD has given Sisera into your hand." This metaphor is often understood as "in the power of" or "under the agency of." But this metaphor is "shockingly literalized"[183] when Jael physically takes the tent tools "into her hand" and kills Sisera (v. 21). "Jael, the wife of Heber, took the tent peg and placed the hammer *in her hand.*"

In addition to these instances of *Leitwörter*, we also note one use of irony in this narrative. In v. 20, the word for man (אִישׁ) is used twice. Sisera instructs Jael to stand at the door; and if a "man" comes and asks her if there is a "man" here, she is to say "there is not." The act of hiding within a woman's tent may have been a crafty piece of strategy, but it also was far from an act of bravery. Hence there really was "no man" in that tent.[184] Sisera spoke a greater truth than he intended.

Judges 4 The Greek Story

In the earlier linguistic analysis of Judges 4, we discovered that this chapter had an overall literalness of 93%. That analysis indicated that the translators of the A and B text were both very consistent in preserving the linguistic elements of the text. But the translators also felt free to shift content in their translation.[185] We will now explore the ways in which those additions affected the telling of the story.

As the Hebrew storyteller characterizes Jael, he placed a number of antecedent clues which, in retrospect, helped us understand Jael. In v. 9, we are led to anticipate that Sisera will be overcome "by the hand of a woman." This anticipatory remark is preserved in the Greek texts. In v. 11, the Hebrew story introduces us to Heber and explains why he is living near the scene of the battle. Both the Judges A and B text also have this verse. The Judges B text preserves its antecedent role in characterizing Jael by transliterating the name consistently here and in v. 17 with Χεβερ. The Judges A text transliterates in v. 17 but in v. 11 translates with ὁι πλησίον. Thus the intrusion of the verse in Judges A makes considerably less sense to the reader even in retrospect and makes the verse's connection to Jael more difficult. In v. 17 itself, both

Greek texts transliterate Heber's name and preserve the language of alliance and cooperation that leads the reader to expect what Sisera does from Jael, help and hospitality.

Jael spoke very little in the Hebrew account of this story. She speaks just as fleetingly in the Greek accounts. But when she does speak in v. 18, the inviting language of hospitality is preserved. The Greek reader and Sisera continue to assume that Jael is a friend.

The passages that deal with Jael's actions (vv. 18–19) experience inflation. We see that those actions which invite Sisera to expect her full cooperation are made just a bit more explicit. In both the Judges A and B texts, she invites Sisera into her tent, offers him milk and covers *his face* with *her (a) garment*. The italicized details exceed the Hebrew.[186] The addition of this personal touch in the Greek texts makes the reader even more certain of her cooperation and intentions.

Consequently, the Greek reader is just as amazed as the Hebrew reader and Sisera when Jael acts as she does in v. 21. Both Greek texts preserve each of Jael's actions as she assembles the tent-raising tools and kills Sisera with them. Here the Judges A text again becomes inflationary. It adds the following details to the scene. "And he convulsed between her knees." The Greek reader is not only allowed to linger a bit longer at the death-scene but is also given a more vivid picture of that scene. This draws even more attention to Jael's actions and character than the Hebrew.

Barak arrives on the scene at the same time in the Greek texts as he had in the Hebrew text. This invites the reader to compare the actions of Jael to those of Barak. In the Hebrew version of this story, we observed that Jael's actions stood in stark contrast to the wavering Barak (v. 8). That contrast helps characterize Jael in a more positive light. Within both Greek versions of the story we find a significant addition at v. 8 which changes the characterization of Barak. When Barak says he will not go without Deborah, both texts add, "because I do not know the day on which the Lord will prosper his angel with me." This softens the hesitation and so the characterization of Barak. He seems less faithless. This change makes the contrast with Jael less striking.

In sum, the additions to the Greek texts have altered the narrative in ways that affect the characterization of Jael. The changes in Barak's characterization diminish her luster slightly. But this is counterbalanced with the more detailed and vivid picture of her actions against Sisera.

Hence, she becomes even more powerful than she is in the Hebrew story.

The use of time in the Hebrew text was defined above. Here the translated story is identical with the Hebrew version. We find the same use of flashback in v. 11. And the strategic control of the duration of time replicates the Hebrew text.

In our analysis of the Hebrew text, we called attention to two instances of *Leitwort* and an instance of irony. The first instance of *Leitwort* was found in connection with the root הלך that was used 8 times in vv. 6, 8 and 9. Both the Judges A and B texts have deleted the imperative in v. 6. But in all other instances (including the preservation of an infinitive absolute), the word-play was preserved by repetition of the root πορεύομαι. The second example of *Leitwort* was found in the five-time repetition of the Hebrew בְּיָד. We had observed how the first four uses of that collocation were metaphorical and the last (v. 21) was literal as Jael took the camp tools in her hand. In each case, the Judges A and B text preserve the expression by translating with ἐν τῇ χειρί.

Finally, we had called attention to an instance of irony in v. 20 when Sisera told Jael to tell any "man" who inquired that there was no "man" in the tent. This irony is preserved in both the Judges A and B text. Thus the additions present in the Greek A and B texts did not affect the reading experience with regard to time and the patterning play of words. But the additions did play a role in reshaping the characters in the Greek narratives. The nature of those changes results in a moderate shift in the literary experience of the Greek reader.

1 Samuel 31 The Hebrew Story

At the close of First Samuel, the nation of Israel is involved in an important war with the Philistines. 1 Samuel 28 introduces the reader to that war and 1 Samuel 31 speaks of its final battle. But the Hebrew storyteller's focus in chapter 31 is not the battle itself, but Saul.[187] Not only does his name appear regularly in this discourse (11 times in 13 verses), we find him increasingly alone.[188] His men flee and fall (v. 1). And one by one, his sons die (v. 2). As Saul is left alone, the reader is left with an impression of him. We will examine the characterization of Saul by examining his speech, his actions and the contrasting actions of others.

The speech of Saul in v. 4 is important. Not only is it the only direct quote in the discourse, it is the last thing we hear Saul say before he dies. Saul asks his weapons bearer to kill him so as to avoid further indignities and suffering. The statement is clearly that of a *self-absorbed* person. This leader of Israel does not ask for divine assistance nor does he speak out of concern for his men. Saul is preeminently concerned about himself.

The only action of Saul in this discourse is related to what he has said. After the weapons' bearer refused to kill him, "Saul took his sword and fell on it." The description of his death is "wondrously understated."[189] Not only is it understated, it is out of character for a leader of God's people. Earlier in Saul's military career, the Philistine army also seemed to have the upper hand (1 Samuel 13:5–6), yet God used Saul to win a victory (1 Samuel 14). But Saul responds as if he is unaware of this precedent. He does not act in the interest of his army or his country. He acts with high self-interest. He died as he lived, "typically taking matters into his own hands (this time quite literally) killing himself."[190]

Several commentators view his suicide as an honorable act.[191] But the implications of this act for Israel cast it in a much more negative light. When the weapons' bearer sees what Saul has done, he takes his own life (v. 5). And when the men of Israel saw what Saul had done, they stopped fighting and fled, abandoning their cities to the Philistine army (v. 7). The very fact that the Philistines were now back to where they had been prior to the reign of Saul both serves to negate the legacy of his rule and any honor in his death.[192]

The single act of Saul mentioned in this chapter must also be seen in contrast to the action of two other characters in this story, the weapons' bearer and the men of Jabesh-Gilead. When Saul asked the weapons' bearer to take his life, he refused. The sensitive reader will recall that David was a weapons' bearer of Saul (1 Samuel 16:21) and that David declined to harm the Lord's anointed when he had the opportunity.[193] The figure of David casts an honorable shadow over this nameless weapons' bearer. And since this honorable man refuses to do what Saul does, it casts the action of Saul in a very negative light.

The reader is also invited to see the act of Saul in contrast to the actions taken by the men of Jabesh-Gilead. A new section of the discourse begins at v. 8 marked by וַיְהִי.[194] In the first section of the discourse (vv. 1–7), we see Saul responding to a national crisis,

Philistine aggression. In the second section of the discourse, we see the men of Jabesh-Gilead responding to a national crisis, royal desecration. Thus the reader is invited to contrast the two responses. The action of Jabesh Gilead's men is characterized by 8 *waw*-consecutive verbs. The men of Jabesh-Gilead get up and go on a dangerous mission, care for the remains of Saul and fast. The men of Jabesh-Gilead act unselfishly when confronted by national crisis. By contrast, Saul did not. The character of Saul stands out more negatively when viewed against the actions of those noble men.

The storyteller constructs the time of 1 Samuel 31 so that it constantly moves forward and never reverses. Furthermore, the story is told with a great economy that characterizes the Books of Samuel. The writer employs narrative summary with a "minimum expenditure of verbiage."[195] This gives the pace of the story a very regular rhythm. That flow is slowed down at only one point.[196] The action is slowed and focused on Saul's suicide (v. 4).

The "simple and matter-of-fact style"[197] with which this history is narrated makes it less rich in word play. The various commentators have called attention to only one item. That is the chiasm of verbal antonyms in v. 7.[198] At the close of verse 7, we read that the men of Israel "abandoned" (וַיַּעַזְבוּ) and "fled" (וַיָּנֻסוּ) while the Philistines "came" (וַיָּבֹאוּ) and "settled" (וַיֵּשְׁבוּ).

1 Samuel 31 The Greek Story

In the linguistic analysis of the previous chapter, we saw that the average literalness of the 1 Samuel 31 Greek text was slightly below the average at 88%. But an investigation of the literary experience in this text points to the Greek storyteller as a very literal translator. The self-absorbed and self-destructive character of Saul whom we met in the Hebrew text is the same Saul we meet in the Greek text. When the Greek version's Saul speaks, he too asks only for his own death and not for divine assistance or for the preservation of his men.

Saul's suicidal act is preserved in the Greek. And the implications of his act are not merely noted they are linked. The translator used the Greek perfect tense-form only twice in this narrative. It is found in v. 5 when the weapons' bearer of Saul saw ὁτι τέθνηκεν Σαουλ and in v. 7 when the Israelite soldiers saw ὁτι τέθνηκεν Σαουλ. Following the

first use of this collocation, the weapons' bearer takes his own life and in the second case the military abandon's the cities to the Philistines. Thus, as in the Hebrew, Saul's act of self-destruction is set in a very negative light.

The Greek translator also plays the extreme act of Saul against the refusal of the weapons' bearer to take Saul's life and the actions of the men of Jabesh Gilead. Two changes are made in the content of the text associated with the latter case but neither significantly impacts the characterization of their actions.[199] Thus the character of Saul is preserved in the translation process.

The forward movement of the plot in time characteristic of the Hebrew narrative is preserved in the Greek narrative. As in the Hebrew story, the sole interruption in the Greek story focuses the reader's attention on v. 4.[200]

The matter-of-fact way in which the Hebrew story is told is replicated in Greek resulting in very little patterning play of words. The one instance of chiasm using verbal antonyms is maintained in v. 7. The men of Israel "abandoned" (καταλείπουσιν) and "fled" (φεύγουσιν) while the Philistines "came" (ἔρχονται) and "settled" (κατοικοῦσιν).

2 Samuel 6 The Hebrew Story

2 Samuel 6 introduces us to a critical incident in the history of God's Old Testament people. David moves the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem. Since the Ark is the "taproot of Israel's religious vitality,"[201] the linking of David's new political capital with the Ark serves as a "ritual dedication of the City of David as both the political and religious capital of his kingdom."[202] We will begin by examining the storyteller's characterization of Michal.

Michal was the daughter of Saul who had been given to David in marriage. Our introduction to Michal takes place against the background of other's actions, in connection with her own actions, in her naming, in her speech and in connection with the narrator's closing comment about her (v. 23). Because the reader meets Michal later in this discourse, we will best appreciate the characterization of Michal against the background of the other participants in this chapter. The chapter itself may be divided into two stories: the initial attempt to

move the Ark (vv. 1–12b) and the successful attempt to move the Ark (vv. 13–23).[203] The initial attempt to move the Ark ended in tragedy when the Lord struck down Uzzah for touching this symbol of the Covenant (v. 7).[204] David was so upset over this that he abandoned any attempt to move the Ark for three months. When David initiated a second attempt to move the Ark, there was a great deal of fearful anticipation on the part of the people.[205] But that fearful anticipation turned into ecstatic celebration when the first six steps were followed by a seventh step.[206] The rest of the day was filled with "liturgical, social and royal extravagance."[207] The writer pays particular attention to the actions of David himself. He danced with all his might (v. 14), offered sacrifices (v. 18), gave gifts to everyone (v. 19)[208] and returned to bless his home (v. 20).

This was a perfect day in Israel for everyone but Michal. By contrast to the celebrating masses moving toward Jerusalem, Michal is remote and sullen. "But Michal, the daughter of Saul, looked down from the window and saw David leaping in dance and whirling about before the Lord. Then she despised him in her heart." (v. 16) This is not the Michal who had fallen in love with David (I Sam 18:20). This is an isolated person[209] "who had avoided mixing with the people preferring to remain aloof and inaccessible."[210]

> The reader observes Michal framed, enclosed, at the window observing David in a moment of physical abandon. From the window she can not touch him or participate in the joyous frenzy. She is above it all. Michal is a trenchant observer, but no longer one with a gaze of desire. Her no longer beloved David has been uncovering himself before concubines and wives for quite some time.[211]

Before Michal is allowed to speak she is named. She is named four times in the discourse, three of the four times as "daughter of Saul." This naming has two important undertones. First, it associates her with her father. Thus, the negative characterization of the former king clings to her. What is more, it betrays a separation between Michal and David.[212] That separation becomes clearer in what follows.

This Michal is not able to wait for David to come into their home. She is so filled with emotion that she charges outside to meet him.[213] And when she meets him, she can not wait to speak. "How the King of Israel has honored himself today, who today was revealing himself before the eyes of the servant girls of his servants like some worthless

fellow would reveal himself!" (v. 20) Her remarks are filled with sarcastic accusation and bitterness.[214] In her eyes, David is more of an exhibitionist than a king. "His skirts were flying high before the hungry eyes of slave girls."[215] There is no note of celebration in her voice and no comment about the successful move of the Ark. Her interests, like her father's, lay closer to home.

David's response to Michal's accusation is shared with the reader. He is given twice as many words as she is allowed.[216] His response not only refutes the criticism it attacks the character of Michal. David says that he was not dancing *before* the servant girls but *before the Lord* (mentioned twice in v. 21). So while Michal expresses concern about David's reputation (and in so doing her own), David is only concerned about the Lord's reputation.[217] Her views are also marginalized by the very fact that she is the daughter of a king whose dynasty the Lord cut short. David formally reminds her of that (v. 21). And David says that he is willing to humble himself even further because he knows that the slave girls whom Michal has mentioned will still honor him (v. 22), even if his wife will not. Thus their opinion counts for more than Michal's. David's language is sharp and pointed. It has marginalized Michal's response and her person. She is portrayed as isolated, bitter and self-absorbed. But Michal is not permitted to respond. This woman, "hardly a woman to swallow insults in silence,"[218] is silent. David's words are not only more numerous, they are the last word.

Or better, they are the last words of a character. The last word is offered by the narrator. "And Michal, the daughter of Saul, did not have a child before she died." (v. 23) The very setting of this declarative sentence at the close of the discourse gives it power. The childlessness of Michal may be regarded as a judgment of God or as an indication that marital relations ceased between David and Michal.[219] In either case, this contributes a final blow to the characterization of Michal. The daughter of the once great King Saul is not permitted to provide a child that might create a link between the two royal families. Thus she has failed in what could have been her greatest moment. She has not produced a son who could link the old dynasty with the new.

The summary form of presentation that characterizes the Books of Samuel is clearly evident in this discourse as well. The sequence of the action is always forward never reversing. This forward moving action has a regular rhythm which is only slowed at one point. In vv. 20–22, the narrated time comes much closer to the passage of real time as the

reading pace is slowed for the dialogic exchange between Michal and David.

The stylistically terse presentation in this discourse makes for the use of very few rhetorical devices.[220] We will briefly observe two, an example of metonymy and *inclusio*. In v. 5, Bullinger notes the use of metonymy. David and the entire assembly are described as rejoicing before the LORD "with all the wood of fir (or cypress) trees." The wood of which the musical instruments are composed is used in place of the instruments themselves.[221]

Of greater interest and importance for the discourse is the use of an *inclusio*. This device creates the expectation of an earlier and happier end to this story. The frame of that device is found in v. 11b and v. 20.[222] In v. 11b, the narrator tells us that when the Ark was left at the home of Obed-Edom, "the LORD blessed (וַיְבָרֶךְ) Obed-Edom and all his house." After the Ark was successfully moved to Jerusalem, David returned "to bless (לְבָרֵךְ) his house." (v. 20) This *inclusio* creates the expectation in the reader that the discourse is over and is ending on a happy note. But it is just at this moment when the reader sees Michal charging angrily out of her house to meet David.

2 Samuel 6 The Greek Story

The linguistic analysis of 2 Samuel 6 indicated that the average literalness of this chapter was 90% with a 7% increase in morphemes. Both those statistics suggest that the translation style found in this discourse would be of somewhat average literalness. But when we examined the content of this discourse in translation, we discovered that 16 of the 23 verses had a marked change in content either by way of addition, change or omission. The Greek storyteller was telling a very different story than the Hebrew storyteller.

As we noted in our reflection on the Hebrew discourse, Michal's speech and actions must be viewed in light of the actions of the Israelite masses and of her husband. And the ecstatic celebration that attended the second attempt to move the Ark must be viewed against the background of the failed attempt to move the Ark in vv. 1–9.

The Greek translation differs from the Hebrew in virtually every one of those initial verses. The most significant change may be seen in vv. 6–7. In v. 6, the Greek versions *twice* add the reason for Uzzah's

grasping the Ark. Uzzah grabbed the Ark in order to "hold it back" (κατασχεῖν αὐτήν). In v. 7, the Greek version omits the motivation for the Lord's action against Uzzah, עַל־הַשַּׁל. Since the motivation for Uzzah's actions is added and the motive for the Lord's response is gapped, the action of the Lord against Uzzah is less well understood. This increases the tension and makes the successful transportation of the Ark more worthy of celebration.[223]

The high celebration of the people is preserved in the Greek. David himself is again personally involved in the celebration. David offered sacrifices (v. 18), gave gifts to everyone (v. 19)[224] and returned to bless his home (v. 20). The one change in the description of David's activity that will play into the characterization of Michal is found in v. 14. The Hebrew has David dressed in a linen ephod (a shorter garment) whirling in dance before the Lord with all his might. The Greek has David dressed in a στολή (a longer garment)[225] and "playing harmonized instruments" (ἀνεκρούετο ἐν ὀργάνοις ἡρμοσμένοις). Thus as in the Hebrew, and to a slightly higher degree than the Hebrew, the community of Israel is full of festivity and joy.

By contrast, Michal is found in the window (v. 16) just as isolated from the festivity as she is in the Hebrew. She despises David and is the first one in the Greek narrative to call attention to David's dancing (ὀρχούμενον). As we will soon see, this becomes the object of her protests. The naming of Michal follows the pattern of her naming in the Hebrew. Thus Michal, "the daughter of Saul," is separated not only from the celebration but from her husband as well.

When Michal goes out to meet David, her first words in Hebrew are accusatory. This is not the case in Greek. Michal begins by "blessing (greeting) him" (εὐλόγησεν αὐτόν). But this kindly greeting quickly degenerates into the sharp criticism found in the Hebrew of v. 20. Her criticism is made emphatic by selection of the perfect tense-form (τί δεδόξασται σήμερον). And the point of her criticism is of a slightly different character. In Hebrew, Michal uses the verb for uncovering three times and compares David to "worthless ones" (הָרֵקִים) who expose themselves in public. In Greek, Michal does mention "uncovering" (ἀπεκαλύφθη) but only once. Here she focuses more on the "dancing."[226] And she compares her husband not to "worthless ones" (הָרֵקִים) but "dancers" (ὀρχουμένων). Thus the criticism of her husband is based on a less critical social miscue than public exposure.

As in the Hebrew, the Greek response of David is given twice as much space. He picks up on the criticism of his "dancing" by mentioning it twice in the Greek response where the Hebrew does not mention it at all. But apart from this difference, the Greek response of David does essentially the same thing as the Hebrew. It marginalizes Michal and her opinion. Michal is not allowed to respond and the narrator provides the last word on her childlessness as in the Hebrew. Overall, the character of Michal, plays somewhat worse in the Hebrew than in the Greek. Her lack of celebration is more striking. Her criticism of David is more petty and less convincing.

The summary form of narration that characterizes the Hebrew rendition of this discourse is at work in the Greek as well. Both the direction of time and the duration of time match those of the parent text.

The Greek story is just as void of rhetorical devices as the Hebrew. The metonymy that we noted in v. 5 is not evident in the Greek text. This is due to a dramatically different rendering in the Greek. Here the Hebrew reads, "with all the wood of fir (or cypress) trees." The Greek has "with instruments being harmonized with vigor." The inclusio (v. 11b and v. 20) that leads the reader to expect an early close to the story is preserved in the Greek. In v. 11, the LORD "blessed" (εὐλόγησεν) Obed-Edom's home. In v. 20 David went "to bless" (εὐλογῆσαι) his home.

In summary, the linguistic analysis indicated that this text was similar in literalness to the other texts we observed, but the narrative analysis indicates that the Greek reading experience differed frequently and significantly from the Hebrew reading experience.

Jonah The Hebrew Story

The story of Jonah has been subjected to more literary analysis than any of the other texts involved in this study. The Hebrew storyteller puts a remarkable variety of literary strategies to work in this narrative.[227] Our sample of the literary artistry will come from chapters 1, 3 and 4.

Jonah's character invites analysis.[228] We will examine the way the storyteller introduces us to Jonah through his speech and emotions, through his naming and comparison with the sailors. The reader

understands that Jonah is a prophet of God[229] and has come to expect that a prophet of God will *speak*. What is striking is that Jonah does not speak until we are nine verses into the first chapter! When he does speak (1:9), his words sound very orthodox. "I worship the LORD God of the heavens who made the sea and the dry land." But when these words are set in the context of his flight (1:3–6) and we realize that they are coerced from him following the fall of the lots (1:7), they ring with a different tone. "He confesses but he does not confess"[230] with a "well-worn liturgical phrase."[231] The first thing that Jonah says marks him as a man of orthodox form but a man lacking spiritual substance.

Jonah also speaks in 3:4. He may have said more to the residents of Nineveh than what is recorded here. But what is recorded here leaves an impression of whom Jonah was. He says, "Yet 40 days and Nineveh will be overturned." This sermon summary marks his exhortation as "petulant,"[232] "banal"[233] and "vague, containing no indictment or specific means of destruction."[234] What is more, it is missing the characteristic prophetic introduction, "This is what the LORD says."[235] Thus for a second time, the speech of Jonah is unimpressive.

The longest speech of Jonah is found in 4:2. This "prayer" of Jonah looks much more like a rebuke[236] designed to teach God a thing or two.[237] "Wasn't this my position when I was in my country? Therefore I began to flee to Tarshish because I knew that you are a God of mercy, slow to get angry, abounding in loving-kindness and turning back from (promised) destruction." He correctly summarizes the most wonderful qualities about God, but views them negatively. These very qualities had made him look foolish since *his* prophecy had apparently failed. "The lesson of his own merciful deliverance is insufficiently absorbed for him to transfer it to the Ninevites."[238] Jonah was a hypocrite. "And it was not simply the case that Jonah could not bring himself to appreciate Nineveh. Rather, to a shocking extent, he could not stand God!"[239]

Finally, the most frequent thing the reader hears from the mouth of Jonah is his desire to die. We hear it in 1:12, 4:3 and 4:8.[240] The refrain that is clearly articulated in all of Jonah's actions and words is escape. Death is his hope for ultimate escape. Thus the lingering confession of Jonah is that death is preferable to life.[241]

We also come to understand Jonah through his emotions. On two occasions, the narrator allows us to see Jonah's emotional state (4:1 and 4:6). Jonah's inexplicable, emotional shifts from angry to happy to

angry betray an instability in this man.[242] In 4:1, Jonah is very angry when we might expect this prophet to be happy. His message had brought Nineveh to repentance. This had been what God wanted, but not what Jonah wanted. When "the time fuse on the prophetic bomb does not work,"[243] Jonah becomes very angry. The only time that Jonah is truly happy in the story is in 4:6. The LORD God had appointed a plant to provide shade for Jonah. The structure of the Hebrew literally surrounds Jonah with happiness.[244] "*Happy* was Jonah over the plant with a great *happiness*." Jonah is angry when God is happy. Jonah is happy when he is being served. The Jonah whom the reader meets in this story is not a missionary worthy of emulation. He is a missionary in training. Jonah the disobedient man of empty words and unstable emotions is portrayed against the background of the sailors. They are the teachers of true piety.

The sailors in this story are mere agents. They are not given names. But they do display a character and sense of uprightness that is totally lacking in Jonah. When God hurls a storm on the sea, "the sailors' frantic activity highlights Jonah's inactivity."[245] We see them crying out to their gods (1:5), jettisoning cargo (1:5), interrogating Jonah (1:8), digging in to turn the ship (1:13),[246] praying to the LORD[247] (1:14) and offering sacrifices and vows to the LORD (1:16). "These sailors are nothing less than exemplary human beings; they never take the easy way; they do not shirk responsibility."[248] What a contrast this is to Jonah.

What is more they are people moving toward recognition and acceptance of the LORD. This becomes clear when we see their "fear" as it grows in intensity and focus.[249] Magonet's literary study has observed what he calls the "growing phrase." In 1:5, the sailors feared. In 1:10, the sailors feared with a great fear. In 1:16, the sailors feared with a great fear the LORD. This marks development in their character while Jonah devolves.[250] Jonah does and says enough on his own to project a negative image of himself. The contrast of his characterization with the very positive characterization of the sailors erodes the reader's view of him to an even greater extent.

The final dimension of Jonah's characterization is his naming. Jonah is referred to by his personal name fourteen times in these verses. The Hebrew word, יוֹנָה, means "dove." Hauser has noted that the concept of dove in the Hebrew Bible is most often associated with the following qualities: flight, passivity and beauty. He observes that

the first two certainly characterize Jonah.[251] While this analogy is interesting, it seems unlikely to be an intentional part of Jonah's characterization since the writer never formally plays on the etymology of Jonah's name.[252]

While a number of commentators are intrigued by the naming just mentioned, another regularly escapes their attention. It is the name given to Jonah by the captain in 1:6, "sleeper." The Hebrew lexeme (רדם) is rather rare and speaks not just of a casual sleep, but a deep sleep.[253] This is an appropriate picture of both the inactivity and the dullness of this prophet in training. He is a "deep sleeper."

The use of time in Jonah is a more complex matter than we have encountered so far. The narrative generally follows chronologically with two proposed exceptions. Bar-Efrat points to a brief flashback in 1:10b.[254] There the narrator tells us that the sailors knew "that he was fleeing from the LORD because he had told them." This statement of Jonah is not recorded for us in the preceding verses but helps us understand that Jonah has spoken at greater length with the sailors than we had known. A second flashback is proposed to exist in 4:5.[255] Again, the narrator tells us that "Jonah went out of the city and sat to the east of the city and made a shelter. He sat under it in the shade until he would see what might happen to the city." Craig assumes that this event would have occurred earlier (following 3:4). It is placed out of order to illustrate Jonah's clinging hope that the city would be destroyed.[256]

The narrated pace of the story changes substantially in the course of its telling. Chapter one is related at an erratic and frantic pace. It is a mixture of dialogue and narration. No one person's action or speech is allowed to take much of the reader's time. Consider the first five verses. Following an eight-word exposition, the Lord commissions, Jonah acts, the Lord acts, the ship acts, the sailors act and Jonah sleeps. The reader's eyes are first swept one direction then another in an effort to take in the full extent of the emergency.

The pace of the story increases in 3:5–10 where narrated summary is used to describe the repentance of the Ninevites. And the pace slows at 4:2–3 when Jonah has his longest sustained speech of the narrative. Summary moves the story quickly again until 4:9–10 when we have the closing dialogue between Jonah and the LORD.

The story of Jonah is presented with significant use of the patterning play of words. Below we will discuss three of those:

personification, *Leitwort* and the final rhetorical question. In 1:4, the reader meets an example of personification.[257] "The ship *thought about* breaking apart." Ackerman notes that this is the only time in which the verb חָשַׁב is collocated with an inanimate object.[258] Trible further notes that the subject + verb word order used in 1:4 is also used in verse 5 with Jonah as the subject, "Jonah went down."[259] The personification of the ship and the word order raises the ship to the level of a character that stands in contrast to Jonah. In antithesis to Jonah, even the inanimate ship knew enough to respond to God's storm.

Literary analysis has called attention to a number of examples of *Leitwort* in this story. The most interesting example of repetition that impacts the characterization of Jonah is the repetition of קוּם and ירד. These two words emphasize the disobedience of Jonah.[260] In 1:1, God tells Jonah to "rise (קוּם) and go!" Jonah did get up (וַיָּקָם) but fled. That flight is characterized by a series of descents. In 1:3, Jonah went down (וַיֵּרֶד) to Joppa. And he went down (וַיֵּרֶד) into the ship. In 1:5, he went down (יָרַד) into the ship's hold. And he fell into a deep sleep (וַיֵּרָדַם).[261] Following a series of descents which have concluded in a deep sleep, the very next word Jonah hears recalls the word of God in 1:1. The ship's captain comes to Jonah and says קוּם! "Jonah must have thought he was having a nightmare. For these were the very words with which God had disturbed his pleasant life a few days before."[262] This carefully composed section uses *Leitwort* in order to characterize both the "physical and spiritual decent" of this prophet.[263]

The final example of the patterning play of words involves the final question of the LORD directed to Jonah. It is a rhetorical question[264] that contains a significant amount of irony. Should I not have the same sort of compassion for this city that you, Jonah, had for the plant? Apart from the irony[265] in the question, the question itself ends the story without closure. We don't know how Jonah responded. But how Jonah responds is perhaps less critical than the way the reader responds. For the closing question is strategically designed to invite a response not only from Jonah but also from the reader.[266]

Jonah the Greek Story

The Hebrew storyteller fills the story of Jonah with literary artistry. In the linguistic analysis of the previous chapter, we discovered that the

overall literalness of the translation was above average at 92%. This may suggest that the literary experience of the Greek reader would be similar to that of the Hebrew reader. But Larry Perkins suggests just the opposite is true. In his literary study of the Greek Jonah, he has observed that "although the Greek translator follows a fairly literal translation strategy, he reveals a different understanding of certain aspects of the plot and characterization."[267] The cumulative effect of the changes "upon the literary perspective of the story is significant."[268] Let's visit the Greek storyteller at work.

The characterization of the Greek Jonah is shaped in his speech, emotions, comparison with the sailors and naming. The speech patterns and content of Jonah in the Greek text parallel the Hebrew with one exception. In 3:4, Jonah announces that Nineveh will be destroyed in 3 days versus the 40 days in Hebrew. This change heightens the tension in the story. It also makes the immediate action of the Ninevites more understandable and the breadth of their action more miraculous.[269] How could Jonah not be impressed? One thing is for sure, the reader is certainly not impressed when Jonah is not.

When the Greek narrator allows us to see Jonah's emotional state following the miracle, another marked change is noted. In the Hebrew, Jonah is extremely displeased and angry (וַיֵּרַע וַיִּחַר). "Jonah's displeasure and anger are converted into painful distress, or perhaps vexation and confusion (ἐλυπήθη καὶ συνεχύθη)."[270] The anger of Jonah is not only lost in this verse but also in 4:4 and 4:9. God no longer asks if Jonah is morally correct (הַהֵיטֵב) in his anger, but instead he asks this missionary in training if, in fact, he is deeply upset by the circumstances (Εἰ σφόδρα λελύπησαι σύ;). This makes Jonah look less spiteful and less small.

The sailors whom we meet in the Greek are just as upright and wholesome as those we meet in the Hebrew. All their activities contrast with Jonah's inactivity. This is particularly noted in 1:5. The translator goes out of his way to link and contrast the response to the storm offered by the seamen and Jonah. He uses the imperfect tense-form to translate three verbs that are *waw*-consecutive imperfects in Hebrew. This both emphasizes and links these three activities. The first form points to the sailors' activity. They were doing what we would expect a prophet to be doing, "crying out to their gods (ἀνεβόων)." By contrast, Jonah the prophet is below deck "sleeping and snoring (ἐκάθευδε καὶ ἔρρεγχε)."

In the naming of Jonah, two significant changes affect his characterization. In 1:9, Jonah is responding to the questions asked of him by the sailors. In the Hebrew, Jonah begins by identifying himself as a Hebrew (עִבְרִי אָנֹכִי). Thus Jonah has skipped over the first question about his occupation and moved to the last questions about his national origins. In the Greek text, Jonah answers the first question. He says, "I am a servant of the Lord (δοῦλος κυρίου ἐγώ)." By contrast to the Hebrew, this more clearly identifies Jonah as a prophet and thereby throws his actions into even greater contrast with those of the sailors.[27] Further, we had noted that in 1:6 Jonah is called "sleeper" (נִרְדָּם). This pejorative "title" is lost in the Greek for the participle is translated by a present indicative. "Why are you sleeping (ῥέγχεις)?"

The strategic use of time related to sequence and duration are duplicated in the Greek text. The two instances of flashback are preserved. And the shifting pace of the narration is matched to that of the Hebrew.

The first two examples of the pattering play of words that we examined in the Hebrew also participated in the characterization of Jonah. In 1:4, we noted how the *personification* of the ship and its appropriate response to the storm stood in contrast to the response of Jonah. That personification is lost in the Greek. The ship which "thought about breaking apart" becomes the ship which "is running the risk (ἐκινδύνευε) of breaking apart." In Jonah 1, we also observed the *Leitwort* using the roots for "rising" and "going down." The root קום is consistently represented by a form of ἀνιστήμι. But the descent of Jonah that is evident in the Hebrew narrative from the time he head for the seaport is translated by three different roots: καταβαίνω, ἐνβαίνω, ἐρρέγχω. Again an important tool in the characterization of the Hebrew Jonah is lost.

The considerable number of changes in the narrative artistry of the Greek Jonah shifts the nature of the story at many points. Thus the literary experience inherent in the Greek story is changed significantly from that inherent in the Hebrew story.

Job 1–2 The Hebrew Story

The first two chapters in the book of Job are called the Prologue. In the Prologue, the reader is introduced to Job and to the dreadful losses he faced. Job the wealthy man of notable character experiences the loss

of his possessions, his children, his health and his wife's support. These losses were instigated by Satan who questioned whether Job's fine character would exist without the divine indulgence that had permeated his life. The Hebrew storyteller carefully unveils these challenges in the process of Job's characterization.

We get to know Job primarily in three ways: through his actions, his speech and what is said about him. The first action of Job is found in 1:4–5. The narrator tells us about a habit of Job that emphasizes his cautious piety. Following the feasts of his sons and daughters, Job would customarily offer *precautionary* sacrifices. Such sacrifices were designed to mediate sins that his children had *potentially* committed.[272] This establishes Job as a man of cautious piety who had a real love for his family.[273]

The next actions of Job are designed to portrait his pitiful state and solicit the reader's empathy for him. In 1:20, we see him mourning the loss of his possessions and family. "Job rose, ripped his garment, shaved his head and fell to the ground." While the actions are customary indications of grief,[274] they are heart wrenching in context. And in 2:8, the reader sees Job scraping his dry, plagued skin with a potsherd. As readers, we are given a close-up view of his pain and invited to sympathize with him in his losses.

Secondly, we come to know Job through what he says. He speaks only twice in these chapters and with considerably fewer words than are allowed other speakers. He does not speak until the twenty-first verse of the Prologue. But when he speaks, he speaks in a profound and memorable way. Following the loss of his property and children, Job says, "Naked I left my mother's womb and naked I will return. The LORD gave and the LORD has taken away. Let the name of the LORD be praised." (1:21) The response is so saintly that even Satan must have been taken back.[275] This language characterizes Job as one not only willing to place his fate in the hands of the LORD[276] but also as one willing to worship him at a time when others would not.[277]

The second time Job speaks, it is after he has been struck with a terrible skin disorder. His wife, whose introduction has been saved to this moment, encourages him to curse God and die (2:9). It is certainly no accident that she picks up language that is reminiscent of Satan's challenge. Her character stands in strong contrast to Job and her speech serves as the final temptation.[278] Job distances himself from her language by calling her language the kind that belongs to godless

fools.[279] He then asks the rhetorical question, "Shall we accept good from God and not disaster?" The cumulative effect of these tests would have placed a tremendous strain on Job. But Job meets the challenge. His reaction characterizes him as a remarkably pious thinker.[280]

Through Job's actions and speech, we have met a member of God's family like no other. What is said about Job both by the narrator and by God will sustain that observation. In the exposition of this story, the narrator tells us that Job is a man of unequaled devotion who has the ideal family and significant wealth. Job is described with a four-fold complement in 1:1. "He was blameless (תָּם), upright (יָשָׁר), feared God (וירא אֱלֹהִים) and turned away from evil (וְסָר מֵרָע)." Commentators have frequently looked at each of these expressions in isolation from one another. This approach misses the cumulative impact[281] of the four-fold description when the individual elements are used in concert. This four-fold complement not only creates "emphasis,"[282] it distinguishes Job from all other Old Testament figures. Job is the only Old Testament figure characterized with this combination of words.[283]

Following this profound description of Job's piety, we have a description of his family and wealth. Job is a family man with seven sons and three daughters. Since seven appears to be the ideal number of sons to have (Ruth 4:15, 1 Samuel 2:5), Job would again appear to have an ideal life.[284] Not only the numbers of his family but even the numbers of his animals "typify abundance."[285] He had literally thousands of animals and workers, more than any one else in the region (1:3). Gros Louis observes that this description of wealth that might characterize Job negatively actually works in his favor. "Job's wealth suggests that he was not a hermit, cut off from society. This makes his goodness even more remarkable."[286]

When the Lord speaks of Jonah, he also speaks with language that is unique and positively glowing. In 1:8, the Lord notes that Job is singular among mortals and reiterates the four-fold description used by the narrator in 1:1. Job is blameless, upright, God fearing and turning from evil. This reiteration also contains an expansion.[287] God calls Job, "my servant." The reiteration with expansion formula puts the spotlight on the expansion. The title, "my servant" is one of great honor, one that is "not indiscriminately applied."[288]

Such high praise from the mouth of the Lord is followed by the narrator's summary following the first set of disasters. In 1:22, the reader is told that "In all this, Job did not sin." In fact, he did not even

besmirch God in the most moderate of ways.[289] When Satan returns to the Lord's presence in 2:3, the Lord again speaks using repetition with expansion.[290] The four-fold repetition we met in 1:1 and 1:8 is once again placed before the reader's eyes. Then the Lord adds, "He is still holding on to his integrity even though you have incited me to swallow him up without cause." The expanded part of this formula again receives emphasis. Satan has suggested that Job's piety was merely a response to divine indulgence. The Lord makes it clear that this is not the case.

Finally, the narrator offers us one more glowing report on Jonah. That is found in 2:10c. Following the loss of his health and his wife's support, Job has remained constant. The narrator reports, "In all this, Job did not sin with his mouth."[291] The reader is overwhelmed by the storyteller's description of Job.[292] His actions, his words and the Lord's glowing report make him the model of Old Testament piety.

The artful use of time is also apparent in this narrative. The story of these two chapters is told with multiple scenes. Some of these scenes appear to overlap in time. But while there may be instances of simultaneity, there are no clear examples of time reversal. The narrated pace of the story tends to be very slow. We experience much of this narrative in real time. Following the exposition in 1:1–5 (where the reader is not aware of the passage of any time), two out of three verses are direct speech.[293] Thus the majority of the reading time is spent in real time listening to characters speak.

The poetic sections of the Book of Jonah are noted for their masterful use of metaphor.[294] By contrast, the patterning play of language in the narrative is notably absent. Clines observes that the style is as plain as anything in the Hebrew Bible, repetition being the most prominent literary device.[295] We will examine two instances of repetition. The first is connected with the messenger reports and then two instances of *Leitwort*.

The messenger reports are found in 1:14–19. A series of four messengers bring word of the four-fold disaster that has struck this man of God. Their arrival and reports follow a similar formula. The A element is a statement about their arrival. Following the arrival of the first messenger, each subsequent messenger is introduced with the phrase, עוֹד זֶה מְדַבֵּר וְזֶה בָּא. The B element is present only with the arrival of the first and fourth messenger. It speaks of a tranquil situation about to be disrupted. (In 1:14, the scene involves animals

working and grazing. In 1:18, Job's children are enjoying a feast together in the eldest brother's home.) The C element is the messenger's report of the disaster that has befallen Job's possessions and people.[296] The D element is the repetition of the phrase וְאִמְלְטָה רַק־אֲנִי לְבַדִּי לְהַגִּיד לָךְ. This repetition unifies the disasters and adds to the cumulative weight of the reports. Their impact overlaps and builds.[297]

We also note two examples of *Leitwort*. The first involves the root בָּרַךְ.[298] It is used six times in these two chapters. It is used in the sense of "bless" two times (1:10 and 1:21). It serves as a euphemism[299] for "curse" or "blaspheme" four times (1:5, 1:11, 2:5 and 2:9). This *Leitwort* serves to emphasize the tension that exists in this story. God has "blessed" with wealth, family and health. When God removes those "blessings" one at a time, Job will be tempted to "curse" God. But instead of "cursing" God, he "blesses" God. Another *Leitwort* phrase is used to mark three of four scene changes. The expression וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם is used at 1:6, 1:13 and 2:1. The one scene change that is not marked by the use of this formula is found at 2:7. The absence of this marker at 2:7 marks this scene of dramatic physical suffering for emphasis.[300]

Job 1–2 The Greek Story

In our earlier study of the Greek edition, Job 1–2 received the lowest overall rating of literalness. We had suspected that the Greek storyteller would shift the literary experience of the reader in a unique direction and we were correct.[301] The Job we meet in the Greek text is made even more pious than the Job we met in the Hebrew text.[302] The actions of Job contain two significant additions. In 1:4–5, the precautionary sacrifice of Job is mentioned. Then the Greek storyteller adds one more line to his story. "...and one ox as a sin-offering for their lives (καὶ μόσχον ἕνα περὶ ἁμαρτίας περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν)." This addition enhances Job's character by placing his worship in the context of Old Testament worship rites.[303]

Another addition is found in 2:8. There we are told that Job scraped away "pus" (ἰχῶμα) and sat "on the dungheap outside the city." (ἐπὶ τῆς κοπρίας ἔξω τῆς πόλεως). Both of these additions make the picture of Job's suffering more graphic. This enhances the sympathy the reader feels for Job and deepens the quality of his

subsequent confession. Job is further characterized by his speech. In 1:21, the Greek again adds a line that enhances his humble submission to the will of God. Just before Job blesses the Lord, the storyteller reports Job saying, "As it seemed best to the Lord, so it has come to be (ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ ἔδοξεν, οὕτως ἐγένετο).

The speech of Job in 2:10 is changed not in its content but in its co-text. For the speech and character of Job's wife are dramatically changed by a significant addition in 2:9. In the Hebrew edition, Job's wife suddenly breaks in and says, "Are you still holding on to your integrity, curse God and die." Then she leaves without explaining this outburst to the reader. The Greek adds that her speech follows a significant period of time (χρόνου δὲ πολλοῦ), time for the anguish of this situation to build up. The nature of her anguish is then detailed in the lengthy addition that follows.

> How long will you endure, saying, "Look, I am going to wait a little longer, expecting the hope of my salvation"? Look, your memory is already blotted out from the earth, sons and daughters, the birth pains and labor of my womb, whom I reared with exertion for nothing. And you sit in decayed matter caused by worms spending the entire night in the open air. And I am a wanderer and servant, going from place to place and house to house, looking for the sun to set so that I might rest from my painful exertions which now press hard on me. But say some word against the Lord and die.

Not only is the entrance of Job's wife softened[304] her outburst seems more logical.[305] She recapitulates and expands upon Job's situation. The storyteller allows us to see her side of the story giving credibility to her assessment. If Job is not justified in lashing out at God, who is? This expanded verse heightens the drama and piety of Job's response in 2:10.[306]

The actions and speech of Job enhance his character. What is said about him also contributes toward this augmented characterization. In the Hebrew, we saw that the narrator and God traded off singing the praises of Job. In doing so, they used a formula that repeated and expanded. The first time we met the formula was in 1:1. The Greek expands the four-fold formula in two ways. It adds the adjective ἀληθινός, "truthful" to the four-fold formula of the Hebrew. Furthermore, Job turns not just from evil but from "every evil deed (ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος)."

In 1:8, the Lord speaks of Job with only four of the five terms used

in 1:1. The term δίκαιος is eliminated from the list. But the greatest, potential loss is found in the translation of the Hebrew "my servant." This honorific title is translated παιδός μου. This choice of vocabulary not only falls outside the standard, Septuagint translation in the Old Testament for עֶבֶד (δοῦλος), but it also falls outside the standard pattern in Job which uses θεράπων. (This, in fact, is the translation of the lemma in 2:3.) A new picture is crafted in the Greek. Job is not formally associated with the other "servants of the Lord" but he is called a "child of God." The latter has a direction and a power all its own. But it is direction distinct from that of the Hebrew. When the narrator cites the list again in 2:3, five expressions are used again and one of the five is new. Neither the narrator nor God has used the term ἄκακος, "innocent" before.

The Job whom we meet in the Greek of Job 1–2 is definitely an enhanced version of the Job we meet in the Hebrew. Through various additions to the text, the storyteller enhances the piety of Job at any number of places. It is true that the translator seemed less concerned about the symmetry of repeated formula. Nevertheless, the Greek generates new patterns all its own, patterns that embellish Job's godliness.

By contrast to the changes noted above, we can safely say that the use of time within the Greek and Hebrew narratives is nearly identical. Both maintain chronological sequence in their reporting. Both contain the same dialogue-driven form of narration. Given the significant lengthening of 2:9, this is even more true of the Greek than the Hebrew story.

The report on the patterning play of words in this section is somewhat mixed. We begin with the pattern of the messenger reports in 1:14–19. The A element, stating the arrival of the messenger is repeated, ἔτι τούτου λαλοῦντος ἦλθεν ἕτερος ἄγγελος. The one significant shift that occurs in this portion of the formula is in 1:18 where ἔρχεται is used instead of ἦλθεν. (Earlier we had noted that this change to the present tense-form places the final report in the foreground from a discourse grammar perspective.) The tranquil situation is noted in the B element (1:14 and 1:18) as in the Hebrew. The C element contains the report of the disasters. This is changed slightly in several of the reports[307] but the symmetry is retained. The final element reports that the messenger alone has escape and come to report (καὶ σωθείς ἐγὼ μόνος ἦλθον τοῦ ἀπαγγεῖλαί σοι). We

conclude that the translator did not maintain symmetry in all possible dimensions of the A-D pattern. But enough repetition is present so that the Greek reader feels the overlap and building of the report.

The *Leitwort* repetition of ברך was noted throughout these two chapters. Of the six instances where this root was used, four were translated by εὐλογέω. The sense was maintained in 1:5 and 2:9, but an alternate expression was used which destroyed the linkage with the others. In 1:5, the Greek storyteller exploys this language. Μήποτε οἱ υἱοί μου ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτῶν κακὰ ἐνενόησαν. In 2:9, we read ἀλλὰ εἶπόν τι ῥῆμα εἰς κύριου.

The final example of word-play involved the practical matter of marking scene changes with the Hebrew expression וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם. While there is a similarity in appearance between each of the uses in 1:6, 1:13 and 2:1, the Greek does not construct them with exactly the same formula. Thus they fail to adequately perform the function of the Hebrew expression.

Overall, the literary experience of the Greek reader and Hebrew reader diverges in some significant ways. While the use of time is nearly identical the characterization and patterning play of words create a very unique reading experience.

Ruth 1–2 The Hebrew Story

Naomi, her husband and her sons left Bethlehem in order to settle in Moab. The move was not casual but coerced by a famine in their homeland. While in Moab, the family experienced both joy and tragedy. Elimelech, Naomi's husband, died. The two boys married Moabite women, but they also died leaving behind three widows. Uncertain about her future, Naomi decides to return to Bethlehem. Ruth, one of her daughters-in-law, accompanies her and begins the family that will give birth to King David. We will examine the Hebrew storyteller at work in the first two chapters of Ruth.

While much of this story is told from the perceptual viewpoint of Naomi, Ruth is clearly the focus of the reader's interest.[308] She is presented to the reader in her actions, her speech, her naming and in Boaz's comments. The first time we see Ruth act is in response to the speech of Naomi and in contrast to the actions of Orpah, her sister-in-law. Naomi strongly discouraged her widowed daughters-in-law from

traveling with her to Judah (1:8–13). The moment of truth comes in 1:14. Orpah weeps and leaves. She is following the expected sociological norm.[309] But her expected action calls even more attention to the unexpected action of Ruth.[310] She weeps and clings.[311]

The other activities of Ruth all involve her in work. In 2:3a, the narrator tells us that Ruth took on the responsibility of providing for her family by gleaning.[312] After she had gleaned all day, she threshed what she had gleaned in the evening (2:17) ending up with a considerable amount of food.[313] Thus the actions of Ruth portrait her as emotionally sensitive and hardworking.

Ruth is also characterized by her speech. The reader must wait until 1:16 to hear her speak, but what a speech it is!

> Do not press me to leave you and to turn back. Because wherever you go, I will go; and wherever you spend the night, I will spend the night; your people will be my people; and your God will be my God. Wherever you die, I will die and there I will be buried. May the LORD strike me down, if anything but death separates us.

"Ruth responds in kind, in a brilliant piece of rhetoric which matches Naomi's concerns point by point."[314] Her commitment had no weak point.[315] Ruth would stick with her mother-in-law no matter what was to come. That promise is all the more striking given the social order. "One female had chosen another female in a world where life depended upon men."[316] But it is not only the content that makes Ruth's commitment so striking, it is also the context of that commitment. First of all, Naomi had laid out a "blunt and pragmatic"[317] rationale that favored separation (1:8–13). Separation just made sense. "Her argument was carefully crafted to be irrefutable and was stated with brutal emotional force."[318]

Ruth not only had to overcome Naomi's logic she also had to see past her bitterness.[319] There is a bite to the rhetorical question Naomi asks in 1:11, "Why are you going with me?"[320] There is a sting to her comment in 1:15. "Look, your sister-in-law has turned back to her people and to her gods, return with your sister-in-law." And there is a sharpness to her silence. Gunn and Fewell point to five significant moments of silence in this story. Two of them occur in this chapter which betray Naomi's emotional state. In 1:15, the trip back to Jerusalem is characterized as one of silence. In 1:18, Naomi speaks to the women of Bethlehem. She describes herself as "empty." And in

doing so, she speaks "as if Ruth is invisible."[321] Thus the dedication of Ruth exemplified in her speech is even more dramatic when we consider the fact that it overcomes both the logic and bitterness of Naomi. It is powerful both in its content and in its context.

The boldness of Ruth becomes apparent when she speaks in 2:2 and 2:7. In 2:2, she tells her mother-in-law that she is going to glean *among the ears of grain* (בַּשִּׁבֳּלִים). In 2:7, the overseer reports that Ruth asked to glean *among the sheaves* (בָּעֳמָרִים). The latter request is striking. For the request to gather among the sheaves is limited to members of the clan and forbidden to gleaners.[322] But this *bold* request (one which is granted by Boaz in 2:15) does not become a *brazen* request given the circumstances. Gleaning by its very nature resulted in meager returns. The gleaning of Ruth had to satisfy the needs of two adults.[323] Thus the speech of Ruth characterizes her as a resourceful and bold woman.

Ruth is also characterized by naming. Her humble and vulnerable position in Bethlehem is regularly paraded before the reader. In these two chapters, her Moabite origin is noted five times (1:4, 22; 2:2, 6, 21). While other more personal names are used of Ruth, the title, "Ruth the Moabitess," creates tension between her foreignness and familiarity.[324] Is this Moabitess really helpful to Naomi or is she a cause of her misfortune and an "albatross around her neck?"[325] When Ruth refers to herself, she also reflects a humble sense of her differentness. In 2:10, she calls herself a "foreigner" (נָכְרִיָּה).[326] And in 2:13, she calls herself a "female servant" (שִׁפְחָתֶךָ). Thus Ruth's naming characterizes her as a humble woman of foreign origins.

Finally, Ruth is characterized by the comments of Boaz. In 2:11–12, Boaz reports earlier conversations he had had about Ruth. He was told about her dedication to her family and her willingness to leave behind all that was familiar to her in the process. This confirms what the reader has already been thinking about her loyalty.[327]

In sum, the storyteller introduces us to a Ruth who is unassuming, modest, hardworking, bold, emotional and dedicated. "Neither a warrior nor a scarlet woman using her sexual powers, Ruth is one of those modest, hardworking women usually loved and forgotten."[328]

The writer's use of time in these two chapters includes two flashbacks contained within indirect speech.[329] In 2:6–7, the overseer reports an earlier conversation that he had with Ruth. In 2:11, Boaz reports an earlier conversation that he had about Ruth. The pace of the storytelling in all of Ruth proceeds slowly. In the book, 55 of 85 (65%)

verses are dialogic. Within the first two chapters, 29 of 45 (64%) verses are dialogic. "The story-teller manages the pace so that the scenes of encounter are protracted by repetition and long solemn speeches."[330] This style of presentation adds "increased intimacy"[331] to the telling of the story.

Commentators call attention to a number of examples of the patterning play of words in these two chapters. We will concentrate on two of those: the repetition in 1:15–17 and the etymological word-play in 20. As Ruth meets the objections of Naomi in 1:16–17, she uses word-repetition five times. She says, "Wherever you will go, I will go (תֵּלְכִי אֵלֵךְ); wherever you spend the night, I will spend the night (תָּלִינִי אָלִין); your people will be my people (עַמֵּךְ עַמִּי); your God will be my God (ואלֹהַיִךְ אֱלֹהָי); and were you die, I will die (תָּמוּתִי אָמוּת)." This style of speaking adds intensification and force to the argument.[332]

The second illustration is found in Ruth's conversation with the women of Bethlehem who had come out to welcome her home (1:20). As the group inquires if this is really Naomi, Naomi responds by calling attention to the etymology of her name. Naomi says, "Do not call me Naomi (נָעֳמִי), call me Marah (מָרָא) because the Almighty has made me very bitter (הֵמַר)." Naomi declares that her name, which means "sweetness," is no longer appropriate for her. She should rather be called Marah, "bitterness."[333]

Ruth 1–2 The Greek Story

The Greek translation of the Book of Ruth is quite literal. It placed slightly above average in our linguistic study at 92%. The translator telling the story demonstrates a sensitivity to Greek idiom often using subjunctive or optative forms to represent the deep grammar of the Hebrew. Yet at the same time the translator can be very literalistic such as in representing the Hebrew תְּמוֹל שִׁלְשׁוֹם of 2:11 with ἐχθὲς καὶ τρίτης. This translating style resulted in a narrative reading experience that is nearly identical in the Greek and Hebrew story.

The Ruth whom we meet in Hebrew has the same qualities as the Ruth we meet in Greek. Her actions are all preserved in the Hebrew with one exception. That is found in 1:14. Orpah leaves as she does in the Hebrew but instead of "clinging" to Naomi, Ruth "follows"

Naomi.[331] This action is obviously less emotive than the one in Hebrew. The speech of Ruth is preserved both in quantity and content. The dramatic pledge (1:16–17) and its context are preserved. And the bold request to glean among the sheaves present in 2:9 and permitted by Boaz in 2:15 is intact.

Ruth is further characterized in her naming. The fact that Ruth is a Moabitess is clearly noted although one of the five references to her in the Greek (2:21) drops the allusion to her national origins. Ruth refers to herself as both foreigner and servant (ξένη and δούλης). In addition, the laudatory comments of Boaz also appear in the Greek (2:11–12). In sum, the Greek Ruth is unassuming, modest, hardworking, bold, emotional and dedicated. This is the same Ruth we meet in the Hebrew edition of this story.

The use of time by the Hebrew writer is replicated by the Greek translator. The Hebrew contains two flashbacks in indirect speech (2:6–7 and 2:11). Both are found in the Greek. And as in the Hebrew narrative, the story is primarily told through dialogue. Long solemn speeches are also a characteristic of the Greek narrative.

We had noted two examples of the patterning play of words. The first was contained in Ruth's powerful speech (1:16–17). The same replication of roots we saw in the Hebrew is present in the Greek. There Ruth assures Naomi, "Wherever you will go, I will go (ὅπου ἐὰν πορευθῇς, πορεύσομαι); wherever you spend the night, I will spend the night (οὗ ἐὰν αὐλισθῇς, αὐλισθήσομαι); your people will be my people (ὁ λαός σου, λαός μου); your God will by my God (ὁ θεός σου, θεός μου); and where you die I will die (οὗ ἐὰν ἀποθάνῃς, ἀποθανοῦμαι)."

We also noted the word-play in Naomi's speech in 1:20. She asks the women of Bethlehem to stop calling her "sweetness" and start calling her "bitterness" because God had made her life "bitter." The Greek translator transliterates the proper name Νωεμιν as has been the case throughout. But instead of transliterating "*Marah*," the translator translates with the Greek word for "bitterness" using Πικράν and following with the cognate verb ἐπικράνθη. Even a reader unfamiliar with Hebrew would likely be able to decode the message through context.

Thus the translation of Ruth both in its characterization, its use of time and its patterning play of words closely resembles the parent text. Both the Hebrew and Greek reader engage in a similar story.

1 Chronicles 10 The Hebrew Story

1 Chronicles 10 bring us back to the death of Saul. This retelling of Saul's final moments is not merely a repetition of Saul's death but a "slightly paraphrased edition"[335] of that story which is designed to meet a specific rhetorical need in Israel.[336] The reader is invited to review our earlier treatment in 1 Samuel 31. Here, we will focus our attention on the unique elements in the Chronicles' narrative that affect Saul's characterization, the use of time and the patterning play of words.

The Saul who dies in 1 Chronicles 10 is a more negative character than the Saul who dies in 1 Samuel 31. Both speak only once and with the same words. Saul asks that his weapons' bearer kill him. But Saul's request takes on a more negative connotation in 1 Chronicles 10 because of the context in which the storyteller sets the quote. Saul was seriously wounded by the archers. The language which 1 Samuel 31:3 uses to describe the wound is וַיָּחֶל מְאֹד. The storyteller removes the adverb in the 1 Chronicles edition. Since Chronicles diminishes the seriousness of his wounding, Saul's request becomes even less honorable.

What is more, this story from Saul's life is the only story about Saul in 1 Chronicles. This quotation of Saul is the first and last thing the reader hears Saul say. "Since this story appears in literary isolation from the antecedent history, Saul's actions and words are more stark and unexplainable."[337] Thus what Saul says appears as less noble and more self-absorbed than it did in 1 Samuel.

Saul proceeds to take his own life in Chronicles as in Samuel. And as in 1 Samuel, the reader must evaluate the nobility of that act based upon the consequences that follow. After Saul takes his own life, the weapons' bearer takes his life and the soldiers of Israel fall leaving the cities for the Philistines to inhabit. Two changes in the telling of this act result in Saul's greater isolation. In 1 Samuel 31:5, it is explicitly said that the weapons' bearer dies "with him" (עִמּוֹ). This is eliminated in 1 Chronicles 10:5. And in 1 Samuel 31:6, the list of dead includes the weapons' bearer. This reference is omitted in 1 Chronicles 10:6. Thus the reader's attention is not distracted from Saul. He dies more alone and isolated.[338]

Saul is also characterized in contrast to the weapons' bearer and the men of Jabesh-Gilead. The positive view of the weapons' bearer particularly with regard to his David-like refusal to kill Saul is present

in the Chronicles account. The characterization of the men of Jabesh-Gilead is slightly adjusted. For example, their all-night march is not related in Chronicles and what is related lacks punch.

> The courageous act of the people of Jabesh-Gilead is greatly elaborated in 1 Samuel. In a series of verbs, without one word wasted on emotions, the author depicts in full their decisiveness, valor and devotion. The version of Chronicles is much paler.[339]

This adjustment works slightly in Saul's favor. But what completely sways the reader's assessment of Saul is the significant addition at the conclusion of the Chronicles' account. The narrator offers the following, unique assessment.

> So Saul died because of his unfaithfulness to the LORD since he did not keep the word of the LORD with regard to inquiring through a medium. He did not inquire of the LORD. And so he put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David, the son of Jesse.

This characterizes the life of Saul as one of total unfaithfulness[340] and virtually eliminates the ability of the reader to view Saul in a positive light.[341] Thus the Saul we meet in 1 Chronicles 10 is a more negative character than we meet in 1 Samuel 31. This portrayal sets him up as a more dramatic foil to David so that the contrasts between the two may be more sharply drawn.[342]

The use of time in 1 Chronicles 10 follows exactly the same pattern that we saw in 1 Samuel 31. And the scarcity in the patterning play of words is also evident in Greek. The chiasm of antonyms which we observed in 1 Samuel 31:7 is also present in 1 Chronicles 10:7.

One additional word play is present in the additions to the Chronicles narrative. This patterning play of words is associated with the name of Saul. In Hebrew, Saul is cognate with the verb which means "to ask" (שָׁאַל). This word and a word from within its semantic domain, דרשׁ, are played off against one another here.[343]

> So Saul (שָׁאוּל) died because of his unfaithfulness to the LORD since he did not keep the word of the LORD with regard to inquiring (לִדְרוֹשׁ) through a medium. He did not inquire (דָּרַשׁ) of the LORD. And so he put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David, the son of Jesse.

Saul, the one asked for, was particularly ineffective at inquiring.[344]

1 Chronicles 10 The Greek Story

The Greek text of 1 Chronicles 10 ranked highest in overall percentage of literalness in our linguistic study. The only lingering question associated with this high percentage of literalness was the 12% increase in morpheme count. While a few of the increases were minor points of clarification, the Greek storyteller did adjust the telling of the story in significant ways.[345] We observed that the Chronicler characterized the Saul of his narrative more negatively than the writer of 1 Samuel.

The translator of 1 Chronicles followed the lead of the Hebrew in all matters of Saul's characterization. But the additions to the Greek in 10:11 and in 10:13 detract even more from Saul's persona. In 10:11, the narrator tells us what the residents of Jabesh-Gilead heard which summoned them to action. They heard about everything that the Philistines did to Saul *and to Israel* (τῷ Ισραηλ). The addition "to Israel" emphasizes the negative ramifications of Saul's self-inflicted death. His act may have been personal but it resulted in a national crisis.

The Chroniclers' additions in vv. 13–14 push the Hebrew reader deeply into a negative perception of Saul. Further additions here by the translator expand upon this trend. First, the translator represents the Hebrew singular "his unfaithfulness" with a plural, ἀνομίαις. The plural invites the reader to think of multiple instances in which this quality of Saul became apparent during his life. Furthermore, the translator expands with the details of the most recent act of unfaithfulness. "Because Saul asked a medium *in order to inquire, and Samuel, the Prophet, answered him.*" The addition, noted in italic, recalls the specific sin at En Dor. Not only is the Greek reader left to reflect on multiple instances of Saul's sin, a specific sin is to linger in the memory of the reader. Thus the Saul we meet in 1 Chronicles 10 is the most negatively characterized of the four Sauls we have met.

The sequence of time matches that which we saw in the Hebrew. But additional reading time spent on the narrator's negative comments about Saul, noted above, means that the reader lingered slightly longer over the unsavory side of Saul.

The two examples of the patterning play of words found in the Hebrew are also present in the Greek. The first is found in 10:7 where we noted the chiastic play of verbal antonyms. This play on words is preserved in the Greek. "They [Israel] abandoned (κατέλιπον) the cities and fled (ἔφυγον). Then the Philistines came (ἦλθον) and settled (κατῴκησαν) in them."

The second example plays about Saul's name. Recall that that in Hebrew Saul means "asked for." The Greek text not only duplicates this play on words it expands it. This expansion involves both the additions to the text noted above and the use of an antonym in the semantic domain.

> So Saul (Σαουλ) died in connection with his sinful acts by which he sinned against the Lord.... Because Saul (Σαουλ) asked a medium in order to inquire (ζητῆσαι). And Samuel, the Prophet, answered (ἀπεκρίνατο) him. And he did not inquire (ἐζήτησεν) of the Lord.

Thus the Greek storyteller translates with sensitivity to the Hebrew text in most dimensions. But a moderate shift in the storytelling is apparent. Where the translation expands, it expands in a direction charted by the Hebrew narrative. Nevertheless, the Greek reader is treated to a moderately adjusted version of the story.

1 Chronicles 13 The Hebrew Story

The second synoptic text that we have included in our study is 1 Chronicles 13. As 2 Samuel 6, this text relates David's attempt to move the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem following his coronation. Our earlier look at this event focused on the second attempt to move the ark. This literary analysis will focus on David's initial attempt.

The characterization of David in this chapter is primarily accomplished through the use of the narrator's comments on David's emotional state and through a significant monologue. Within 5 verses of this chapter (8–12), we hear of David's shifting emotions three times. These dramatic changes characterize David as a very complex but real person. In 13:8, David is pictured rejoicing before God with all (his) strength. David is ecstatic over the opportunity to bring the Ark of the Covenant to his new capital. After Uzzah is struck down for

touching the Ark, David is deeply upset (13:11).[346] And just one verse later David is "afraid." These dramatic shifts in emotion resonate perfectly with the circumstances in the story. Anyone reading this story would have reacted in this way. And that is just the point. By sharing these shifting emotions with us, the writer portraits David as a very real person.

The second means of characterizing David in this chapter is through a two-verse speech (13:2–3). This speech represents the biggest distinction between this narrative and the parallel story in 2 Samuel 6.[347] Here, the Chronicler accomplishes two things. David is portrayed as a consensus builder and David is portrayed as distinct from Saul.

David says to the *entire assembly* of Israel, "If it seems good to you and to the LORD our God, let us send in every direction to our brothers, those who are left in all the land of Israel, and with them the priests and Levites in their cities and pasturelands and let them gather with us. We will bring back the Ark of our God to us...." The reader is met by the regular use of "us," "our" "every" and "all" throughout his speech. "(It) expresses concern for communal consensus and for as wide a participation as possible."[348] This large and growing circle of participants is invited not only to observe but to be full partners in this important national enterprise.[349] Thus David is characterized as a consensus builder.

But does this consensus building mean that David is willing to become more like Saul to appease his adherents? The answer is a resounding "No!" David is characterized in opposition to Saul. David concludes his speech, "...because they did not seek it in the days of Saul." The problem was not that the Ark was unavailable in Saul's day. It was at Kiriath-Jearim. But it had not played its assigned role in the worship life of God's people.[350] "David will do what Saul did not, or more to the point, Israel under David will do what it did not do under Saul."[351] Thus the writer has characterized David as a real person with changing emotions, a consensus builder and a worshiper who is distinguished from Saul.

The writer's use of time complements the characterization noted above. The sequence of narration in this chapter always moves forward. There is only one point when the reader is asked to reflect back in time. That is found in 13:3b which we have just discussed. The story is told almost exclusively in summary fashion. The one exception

to this pace is the time taken to listen to David's speech (13:2–3). In both these instances, the change in pace from the norm places emphasis on sections that characterize David.

Finally, we give attention to two examples of the patterning play of words in this chapter. The first is an example of *Leitwort* found in 13:11 that emphasizes the Lord's "breaking out" (פרץ) against Uzzah.[352] "David was deeply upset because the LORD broke out (פָּרַץ) a breaking out (פֶּרֶץ) against Uzzah. And that place is called Perez (פֶּרֶץ) Uzzah to this day."

The second literary device is a merism that employs geographical references. In 13:5, David assembled all Israel from the Shihor of Egypt (שִׁיחוֹר מִצְרַיִם) to Lebo-Hamath (לְבוֹא חֲמָת). Aharoni explains that this designation for Israel is much larger than is defined by the typical reference "from Dan to Beersheba."[353] He sees Lebo-Hamath as an important city (Lebo) on the border of Hamath.[354] Since the Shihor is most frequently understood to be the Nile River, this description entails the broadest possible conceptualization of Israel's boundaries.[355] By mentioning the point that is furthest north and the point which is furthest to the south, the writer has constructed a geographical merism. It functions here to show the sincerity of David's willingness to form a *broad* consensus. Everyone in Israel from its northern to its southern border is to be included in establishing the Ark in Jerusalem.

1 Chronicles 13 The Greek Story

Our linguistic study of the Greek text of 1 Chronicles 13 indicated that it was second highest in overall literalness at 92%. But in one respect it was the most literal of all. It had a morpheme increase of just over 1%. This leads us to expect a literary experience that is virtually identical with the Hebrew. And that was what we found.

The Hebrew text characterized David as a very real person with shifting emotions. He was also characterized by his speech that showed him as a consensus builder who was distinguished in his worship from Saul. Each element of the Hebrew used to characterize David was present in the Greek without change or addition.

The Greek storyteller uses time to complement the characterization of David in the same way as the Hebrew storyteller. The standard presentation of sequence and duration are interrupted in exactly the

same places. Thus the literary impact is identical.

Both the *Leitwort* and merism we examined in the Hebrew were present in the Greek. The *Leitwort* found in 13:11 was replicated with the Greek lexeme, διακόπτω. The geographical merism was also replicated but with slight shift in the toponyms.[356] Despite the shift, the extended boundaries are evident in the translation so the power of the merism expresses itself in the Greek text as well. Thus the Greek reader's experience is virtually identical to the literary experience of the Hebrew reader in all facets of this text.

Conclusion

Since the linguistic method of translation technique analysis failed to fully portrait the Septuagint translators as storytellers, we have experimented with a new approach. By applying a matrix developed from narrative criticism, we evaluated the replication of characterization, the use of time and the patterning play of words. The application of this method has given a much clearer picture of the translators as storytellers. We observed replication, additions and even elimination of literary ingredients. In the end, we were able to categorize the literary adjustments with the terms: slight, moderate and significant. As their names suggest, slight adjustment implies that the literary experience of the Hebrew and Greek reader was largely the same. Significant adjustment implies that both the quantity and nature of the literary adjustments led to a dramatic shift in the reader's experience. Moderate adjustment implies that the literary shifts lay between the other two categories.

As a result of our investigation, it is clear that six of the texts experienced only slight literary adjustment. They are Gen 34, Exod 13–14, Num 13, 1 Sam 31, Ruth 1–2 and 1 Chr 13. Four texts experienced moderate adjustment. They are: Gen 22, Judg 4a, Judg 4b, and 1 Chr 10. And three texts experienced significant literary adjustment in translation. They are 2 Sam 6, Jonah 1, 3–4 and Job 1–2.

NOTES

1 Leland Ryken, "The Bible as Literature: A Brief History," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 50.

2 Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981), 12.

3 Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature* (New York: Basic Books, 1992), 43.

4 Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 20.

5 Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III, "Introduction," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 17.

6 Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univeristy Press, 1987), 482.

7 Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature*, 63–64.

8 Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III, "Introduction," 23–29.

9 Leland Ryken, "Literary Criticism of the Bible: Some Fallacies," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), 31–32.

10 John Barton, *Reading the Old Testament, Method in Biblical Study* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1984), 29.

11 Carl F. H. Henry, "Narrative Theology: An Evangelical Appraisal," *Trinity Journal* 8 (1987): 19.

12 Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 70 (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1992), 10.

13 Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 30.

14 V. Philips Long, *The Art of Biblical History*, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 5, ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994), 167. Several years earlier, Sternberg defined the narrative discourse as

regulated by three similar principles: ideological, historiographic and aesthetic. Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 41.

[15] V. Philips Long, *The Art of Biblical History*, 70.

[16] Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 3, ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), 58.

[17] We will not be discussing the historical development of narrative criticism within biblical studies. For an overview of that topic, the reader is directed to David M. Gunn, "Narrative Criticism," in *To Each Its Own Meaning, An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and their Application*, ed. Stephen R. Haynes and Steven L. McKenzie (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993), 171–95.

[18] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 101.

[19] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 93.

[20] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 102.

[21] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 111.

[22] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 102.

[23] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 235.

[24] Ibid., 247.

[25] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 121.

[26] Ibid., 129.

[27] Ibid., 93.

[28] Ibid., 13–16.

[29] Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature*, 76–77. Sternberg identifies 14 varieties of the narrator's own discourse. They are: expositional antecedents, character sketches, descriptions of objects, interscenic summary, retrospects, prospects, genealogies and catalogues, identifications, value judgments, telescoped inside views, notes and stage directions in dialogue, intrusions into direct

discourse, bibliographical references and temporal or cultural bridging. Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 120–21.

[30] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 34.

[31] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 46.

[32] Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches*, 87.

[33] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 44.

[34] Ibid., 23.

[35] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 51.

[36] Ibid., 47.

[37] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 326.

[38] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 116–17.

[39] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 63.

[40] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 66–67.

[41] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 72–73.

[42] Ibid., 74.

[43] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 67.

[44] Ibid., 62.

[45] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 68–69.

[46] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 54.

[47] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 476.

[48] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 53.

[49] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 53.

[50] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 60.

[51] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 37–38.

[52] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 77.

[53] Ibid., 78–79.

[54] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 80.

[55] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 80.

[56] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 476–77.

[57] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 40–41.

[58] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 83–84.

[59] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 34.

[60] Ibid., 36.

[61] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 48.

[62] Adele Reinhartz "Anonymity and Character in the Books of Samuel." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 137.

[63] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 330.

[64] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 60.

[65] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 142.

[66] Ibid., 143–44.

[67] Ibid., 151.

[68] Ibid., 152.

[69] Ibid., 146–47. Bar-Efrat notes that time stops only long enough for the narrator to provide: depiction, interpretation, explanation or summary conclusion.

[70] Ibid., 166.

[71] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 479.

[72] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 3.

[73] Ibid., 147.

[74] Ibid., 148.

[75] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 201.

[76] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 366.

[77] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 95.

[78] Ibid.

[79] Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature*, 111–113. Bar-Efrat calls attention to the allusion made between God's instructions to Samuel that he should not pay attention to the external appearance of the next king he annointed (1 Samuel 16:17) and the reference to Saul's distinctive height (1 Samuel 9:2). See Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 49.

[80] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 95–96.

[81] Ibid., 93.

[82] Ibid., 95. See also the discussion of "key words" in Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 212–215 and Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 480.

[83] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 97–98.

[84] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 391–92.

[85] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 74.

[86] E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968).

[87] For example, Bar-Efrat discusses: metonomy, synecdoche, metaphor and simile. Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 207–210.

[88] David M. Gunn, "Narrative Criticism," 178. For a similar view see Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III, ed., "Preface," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 10.

[89] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 218.

[90] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 2–3.

[91] Karel A. Deurloo, "Because You Have Hearkened to My Voice (Gen 22)," in *Voices from Amsterdam: A Modern Tradition of Reading Biblical Narrative*, ed. Martin Kessler (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 116.

[92] Francis Landy, "Narrative Techniques and Symbolic Transactions in the Akedah," in *Signs and Wonders: Biblical Texts in Literary Focus*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989), 4.

[93] Lewis M. Barth, "Textual Transformations: Rabbinic Exegesis of Gn. 22:14," in *Bits of Honey: Essays for Samson H. Levey*, ed. Stanley F Chyet and David Ellenson (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 9.

[94] Yair Mazor, "Genesis 22: The Ideological, Rhetorical and the Psychological Composition," *Biblica* 67 (1986): 87.

[95] Alter calls this an "ironic divergence." Robert Alter, *Genesis, Translation and Commentary* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1996), 104.

[96] W. Dow Edgerton, "The Exegesis of Echoes," in *The Passion of Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1992), 79.

[97] Walter Brueggemann, *Genesis* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1992), 188. Reading this verse in the context of the narrative does not justify White's calling this purely deceptive language. Hugh White, "'Where is the Lamb for the Burnt Offering?' Genesis 22," in *Narration and Discourse in the Book of Genesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 192. Not only this discourse unit but its place in the larger discourse of Abraham would rather support the view of Gros Louis. "Abraham has seen enough of the Lord's hand in his life that he means it." Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, "Abraham II," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, ed. K. R. R. Gros Louis, vol. 2 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1982), 81.

[98] Doukhan observes that this dialogue occurs at the apex of a chiasm. A and A_1 are found in vv. 1–2 and 11–12 respectively where God is speaking. B and B_1 are found in vv. 3–6 and vv. 9–10 where Abraham is acting. That places C (vv. 7–8) at the heart of the narrative. Jacques Doukhan, "The Center of the Aqedah," *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 31 (1993), 17–28.

[99] W. Dow Edgerton, "The Exegesis of Echoes," 77.

[100] Francis Landy, "Narrative Techniques," 19.

[101] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 80.

[102] Erich Auerbach, "Odysseus' Scar," in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953), 8.

[103] Robert Alter, *Genesis*, 103. Rashi enhances this chain by describing a dialogue that took place between Abraham and the Lord. "Your son—Abraham said to God, 'I have two sons.' He answered him, 'Your only son.' Abraham said,' This one is the only son of his mother and the other is the only son of his mother.' God then said, 'the one whom you love.' Abraham replied, 'I love both of them.' Where upon God said, 'even Isaac.'" A. M. Silbermann, *Genesis, Chumash with Rashi's Commentary* (Jerusalem: The Silbermann Family, 1934), 93.

[104] Francis Landy, "Narrative Techniques," 21 and 23.

[105] Claus Westermann, "Abraham's Sacrifice," in *Genesis 12–36, A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), 358.

[106] Yair Mazor, "Genesis 22," 85.

[107] Robert Alter, *Genesis*, 105.

[108] James L. Crenshaw, "Journey into Oblivion," 22–23. If Abraham's physical limitations had prevented him from carrying the wood, he could have taken the donkey along. Yair Mazor, "Genesis 22," 86.

[109] E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used In the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968), 650.

[110] Karel A. Deurloo, "Because You have Hearkened," 117; Robert Alter, *Genesis*, 104; and John Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch As Narrative* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992), 178.

[111] The repetition of this root points to a progressively clearer seeing. Terence E. Fretheim, "The Book of Genesis," in *The New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 1 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 495.

[112] Bechtel asks if this chain actually represents a forced rape. Lyn M. Bechtel, "What if Dinah Is Not Raped?" *Journal for the Study of Old Testament* 62 (1994): 19–20. But Caspi presents convincing evidence of the broadly accepted view that this three-verb chain clearly designates a forced sexual encounter. Mishael Maswari Caspi, "The Story of the Rape of Dinah: The Narrator and the Reader," *Hebrew Studies* 26 (1985): 25.

[113] Sharon Pace Jeansonne, "Dinah: the Fracturing of a Tenuous Peace in a Troubled Land," in *The Women of Genesis* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 92; Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 447; Claus Westermann, "Dinah and the Shechemites," in *Genesis 12-36, A Commentary*, trans. John J. Scullion (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985), 538; Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis, A Commentary*, trans. John H. Marks (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1972), 327; and Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis, Chapters 18-50* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995), 356.

[114] Westermann points out that the only other use of this verb form is found in Gen 6:6 which speaks of God's distress over the pre-flood world. Claus Westermann, "Dinah and the Shechemites," 538.

[115] Targum Onkelos softens the act when it translates this word with "wisdom" (חוכמא). Moses Aberbach and Bernard Grossfeld, ed. *Targum Onkelos to Genesis* (Denver: Ktab Publishing House, Inc., 1982), 203. Hamilton observes that the strategic repetition of a verb root portrays the actions of the brothers in a positive light. The deceit is justified since it is clearly connected to the rape. The ענה of v. 2 in the rape scene is met with the brother's ענה of v. 13. Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis*, 362.

[116] Gunn and Fewell condemn this action of the brothers as extreme and self-serving. Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "Tipping the Balance: Sternberg's Reader and the Rape of Dinah," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 211. But this is clearly the minority view. Literary analysis by Jeansonne, Sternberg and Berlin all indicate that this action is to be viewed in a positive light given the rape and holding of Dinah. Sharon Pace Jeansonne, "Dinah," 93; Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 468; and Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 78.

[117] Mishael Maswari Caspi, "The Story of the Rape of Dinah," 29-30. See also Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 451.

[118] Sharon Pace Jeansonne, "Dinah," 91.

[119] Ibid., 92.

[120] Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "Tipping the Balance," 198. This follows the sense of Targum Onkelos which translates verse 5, "Jacob kept silent until they (brothers) came (home)." Moses Aberbach and Bernard Grossfeld, ed. *Targum Onkelos to Genesis*, 200.

[121] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 448.

[122] Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis*, 363.

[123] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 474.

[124] Gerhard Von Rad, *Genesis, A Commentary*, 30–31.

[125] Mishael Maswari Caspi, "The Story of the Rape of Dinah," 42.

[126] Robert Alter, *Genesis*, 194.

[127] Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis*, 372–73.

[128] Lyn M. Bechtel, "What if Dinah Is Not Raped?", 36.

[129] Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 469.

[130] Sternberg calls it "poetic justice that Shechem's punishment started exactly where his sexual crime did." Ibid., 466.

[131] Robert Alter, *Genesis*, 192.

[132] The use of עָנָה in vv. 2 and 13 allows the deceit to be seen in view of the rape. Because no one Greek word duplicates the semantic range of עָנָה, the Greek translator was not able to duplicate this concordance. In addition, the holding of Dinah hostage that seems to be implied in v. 16 is lost in the Greek. The Greek translates with "daughters." In the Greek, the brothers will take the daughters whom they have offered in the bargain and leave.

[133] The offer of Hamor and Shechem (vv. 8–12) is presented in 93 words. The response of Jacob's sons (vv. 14–17) is presented in 84 words. The dialogue at the city gate (vv. 21–23) is presented in 81 words. And the actions of the brothers (vv. 25–29) are presented in 132 words.

[134] This section of text is regularly regarded and defended as a literary unit despite the fact that it crosses chapter lines. J. P. Fokkelman, "Exodus," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. R. Alter and F. Kermode (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 58.

[135] Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus*, The JPS Torah Commentary (New York: The Jewish Publication Society, 1991), 68.

[136] David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, ed., *Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987), vol. 3, *Exodus*, by John I. Durham, 186.

[137] The event was important enough for a midrash to be associated with it. "Others say that he was buried, like a king, in a royal mausoleum, and the Egyptians had constructed dogs made of gold which, by means of magic, barked whenever a man approached the sarcophagus. The sound of their barking filled the whole land of Egypt...but Moses silenced them. Moses began to cry, 'Joseph, Joseph, the hour has come for which you did say: God will surely remember you and you shall carry up my bones from hence.' Straightway the coffin moved to the surface and Moses took it, as it says: And Moses took the bones of Joseph." H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, *Midrash Rabbah, Exodus* (New York: The Soncino Press, 1983), 258.

[138] John Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch As Narrative*, 186.

[139] Ronald E. Clements, *Exodus*, The Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge: The University Press, 1972), 85.

[140] Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus*, 71.

[141] Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1974), 226. See also Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, trans. Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1967), 164.

[142] Walter Brueggemann, "The Book of Exodus," in *The New Interpreters Bible*, vol. 1 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), 793.

[143] Ibid., 793–94.

[144] John Sailhamer, *The Pentateuch As Narrative*, 270. Gunn also observes the importance of this dialogue. "If the Sea marks the birth of Israel, this marks the re-birth of Moses as one who can control the people in a masterly fashion." David M. Gunn, "The 'Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart;' Plot, Character and Theology in Ex. 1–14," in *Art, Meaning, and Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*, ed. David J. A. Clines, David M. Gunn and Alan J. Hauser (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982), 86.

[145] John I. Durham, *Exodus*, 197.

[146] Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus*, 75.

[147] Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, 156.

[148] Nahum M. Sarna, *Exodus*, 71.

[149] David M. Gunn, "The 'Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart,' 79.

[150] John I. Durham, *Exodus*, 192; Brevard S. Childs, *The Book of Exodus*, 226; and Umberto Cassuto, *A Commentary on the Book of Exodus*, 164.

[151] The complaint of the Children of Israel itself is set in a less positive light in the Greek translation. In the preceding verse (14:10), the Hebrew prefaces the people's quote with the words הִנֵּה and the sight of an approaching force (participle). The Greek eliminates the marker of surprise, uses an aorist tense-form and has the army encamped rather than breaking camp.

[152] The Greek translator distinguishes between the three imperatives by placing two in a more prominent tense-form. Both the command to take courage (θαρσεῖτε) and to see (ὁρᾶτε) use the present tense-form.

[153] Within Jewish tradition, even the designation אֲנָשִׁים suggests that these were men of honor. This is given the use of that designation in Exod 17:9, 1 Sam 17:12 and 1 Sam 1:11. A. M. Silbermann, *Numbers, Chumash with Rashi's Commentary* (Jerusalem: The Silbermann Family, 1934), 62; and H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, *Midrash Rabbah, Numbers*, vol. 2 (New York: The Soncino Press, 1983), 676.

[154] Frank E. Gaebelein, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1990), vol. 1, *Genesis-Numbers*, by John H. Sailhamer, 804.

[155] R. K. Harrison, ed., *The New International Commentary on the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1993), *The Book of Numbers*, by Timothy R. Ashley, 232.

[156] Alter has noted that such lists are often ignored within literary analysis. In reality, they may be effectively employed as literary devices. "The coldest catalogue and the driest etiology may be an effective subsidiary instrument of literary expression." Robert Alter, "Introduction to the Old Testament," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. R. Alter and F. Kermode (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 16.

[157] John H. Sailhamer, *Genesis-Numbers*, 805.

[158] Rashi criticizes the selection of "large fruit" as part of the spies strategy to discourage the people. The "large fruit" is to support their claim of "large people." A. M. Silbermann, *Numbers, Chumash with Rashi's Commentary*, 64. A more natural reading seems to set this in context of Moses' instructions in v. 20 to bring back some of the fruit of the land.

[159] John H. Sailhamer, *Genesis-Numbers*, 811.

[160] Ibid., 812.

[161] The notion of "devour" has been interpreted as "causing death by disease," M. Silbermann, *Numbers, Chumash with Rashi's Commentary*, 65. It has been understood as a comment about the "infertility of the land." David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, ed. *Word Biblical Commentary*, (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1984), vol. 5, *Numbers*, by Philip J. Budd, 145. And finally, it has been understood as a reference to the military vulnerability of the land, Nahum M. Sarna, *Numbers*, The JPS Torah Commentary (New York: The Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 167.

[162] James Luther Mays, ed. *Interpretation* (Louisville: John Knox, 1996), *Numbers*, by Dennis T. Olson, 79.

[163] Timothy R. Ashley, *The Book of Numbers*, 243; and Philip J. Budd, *Numbers*, 120.

[164] E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 155.

[165] J. Cheryl Exum, "'Mother in Israel': A Familiar Figure Reconsidered," in *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Letty M. Russell (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1985), 84.

[166] Since no other female is in view at this point, the reader is trapped into assuming this heroine will be Deborah. Meir Sternberg, "Darkness in Light, or Zizagging toward Sisera's End," in *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1985), 278.

[167] Kenites were nomads associated with Judah. Arthur E. Cundall, *Judges, An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, Il.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968), 86. Gray assumes that they were itinerant metal smiths who found work around the Canaanite sites. Ronald E. Clements, ed., *New Century Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1986), *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, by John Gray, 259.

[168] Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1-5* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1995), 191.

[169] D. F. Murray, *Narrative Structure and Technique in the Deborah-Barak Story*, Vetus Testamentum Supplements 30 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), 182.

[170] Soggin calls this the language of "alliance and cooperation." J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1981), 75. While Heber is associated with Moses, and thus a presumed ally of Israel, it is clear that this sheik has sold out to the Canaanites. Margalit makes the convincing argument that the

powerful Hazor may have used this family to secure the trade route. He further suggests that Jael restores honor to the family with her actions. Baruch Margalit, "Observations on the Jael-Sisera Story," in *Pomegranates and Golden Bells, Studies in Biblical, Jewish and Near Eastern Ritual, Law and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman and Avi Hurvitz (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 640.

[171] Sisera lives in a world dominated by patriarchy. He feared the entrance of a man into the tent where he was hiding but had no fear of a woman, particularly this woman. Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "Controlling Perspectives: Women, Men and the Authority of Violence in Judges 4 and 5," *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 58 (1990): 392.

[172] Both Pseudo-Philo and the Talmud add sexual overtones to this invitation. Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1-5*, 169.

[173] It was a violation of the social norm for Sisera to enter the tent of a woman. Thus it was a place unlikely to be searched. Victor H. Matthews, "Hospitality and Hostility in Judges 4," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 21 (1991), 16.

[174] Clements identifies this as butter-milk, the refreshment a guest would receive upon entering a bedouin camp. John Gray, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, 19.

[175] Alter calls attention to the maternal overtones to each of these actions. Thus characterizing Jael as the mom offering her child security. Robert Alter, "From Line to Story," *Poetics Today* 4 (1984): 635.

[176] Susan Niditch, "Eroticism and Death in the Tale of Jael," in *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*, ed. Peggy L. Day (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 45.

[177] In v. 18, וַתֵּצֵא יָעֵל לִקְרַאת סִיסְרָא. In v. 22, וַתֵּצֵא לִקְרָאתוֹ.

[178] Meir Sternberg, "Darkness in Light," 273.

[179] Cohen and Lindars both view this statement of Barak in a more positive light. They see a man recognizing the need for divine guidance rather than a man expressing his cowardice. A. Cohen, *Joshua and Judges* (London: The Soncino Press, 1959), 188; and Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1-5*, 189. But when Deborah concedes to go with him (v. 9), she states that there will be a penalty for his hesitation. Thus we regard Barak's statement as a lack of faith. See Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, "The Book of Judges," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, vol. 1., ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), 148; James D. Martin, *The*

Book of Judges (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 57; and Barry G. Webb, *The Book of Judges: An Integrated Reading* (Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1987), 137.

[180] J. Alberto Soggin, *Judges*, 75.

[181] The speech patterns of the last section differ from the dialogue of the first. The speeches in the last section are given in "quick short bursts" which adds to the tension of that scene and allows for particular focus on the scene shared by Sisera and Jael. D. F. Murray, "Narrative Structure," 164–65.

[182] Robert Alter cites this as a classic example of *Leitwort*. "Barak, in a paroxysm of hesitation, releases a stammering chain of *go's*." Robert Alter, *The World of Biblical Literature*, 42.

[183] Ibid.

[184] John H. Stek, "The Bee and the Mountain Goat: a Literary Reading of Judges 4," in *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, ed. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. and Ronald F. Youngblood (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 72; and Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "Controlling Perspectives," 393.

[185] The Judges A text increased by 13%. The Judges B text increased by 10%.

[186] The Judges A text of v. 18 adds ἐν δέρρει αὐτῆς and the text of v. 19 adds τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ. Judges B in v. 18 adds ἐπιβολαίῳ. Both references in v. 18 seem to be some reference to clothing. The Judges A addition in v. 19 helps the reader view the covering as concealing his presence.

[187] Peter D. Miscall, *1 Samuel, a Literary Reading* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1986), 182

[188] David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, *Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1983), vol. 10, *1 Samuel*, by Ralph W. Klein, 287.

[189] James Luther Mays, *Interpretation, A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), *First and Second Samuel*, by Walter Brueggemann, 206.

[190] David M. Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul, An Interpretation of a Biblical Story* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980), 111.

[191] Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, 207; S. Goldman, *Samuel* (London: The Soncino Press, 1951), 185; and P. R. Ackroyd, A. R. C. Leaney

and J. W. Packer, ed. *The Cambridge Bible Commentary* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1971), *The First Book of Samuel*, by Peter R. Ackroyd, 227–28.

[192] Diana V. Edelman, *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 288.

[193] Ibid., 284; and J. P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*, vol. 2, *The Crossing Fates* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1986), 625.

[194] Ibid., 622.

[195] V. Philips Long, "First and Second Samuel," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 165.

[196] J. P. Fokkelman, *The Crossing Fates*, 623.

[197] David M. Gunn, *The Fate of King Saul*, 111.

[198] J. P. Fokkelman, *The Crossing Fates*, 627.

[199] In the second half of this narrative, the Greek translation differs from the Hebrew. In v. 9, the Hebrew says that the Philistines *cut off Saul's head* before stripping off his gear. The Greek says that *they turned him over* (ἀποστρέφουσιν αὐτόν) and stripped off his gear. In v. 12, the men of Jabesh Gilead are said to have removed the bodies of Saul and his sons from the wall of Beth-shan. The Greek says that they removed the bodies of Saul and Jonathan.

[200] During our linguistic study, we had noted that the majority of the translated text contained a mixture of Greek aorists and historical presents. The exception to this pattern was found in vv. 4–6 where all aorists are used. This distinctive selection of tense-form also adds to the focusing of the reader's attention in this section of the narrative.

[201] Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, 249.

[202] P. K. McCarter, Jr., "The Ritual Dedication of the City of David in 2 Samuel 6," in *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983), 276.

[203] Fokkelman observes that there are 72 words in procession 1 (vv. 1–5), 107 words in conflict 1 (vv. 6–12b), a transition in v. 12c, 107 words in procession 2 (vv. 13–19) and 72 words in conflict 2 (vv. 20–23). J. P. Fokkelman, *Narrative Art and*

Poetry in the Books of Samuel, vol. 3, *Throne and City* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1990), 177.

[204] Kleven asserts that the failure was due to three Torah infractions: Uzzah was not a Kohathite, the ark was not carried on the Levites' shoulders and the Ark was touched. Terence Kleven, "Hebrew Style in 2 Samuel 6," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35 (1992): 305.

[205] J. P. Fokkelman, *Throne and City*, 194.

[206] Fokkelman notes that since 7 is the number of God, any objection of God to this effort would become clear on the seventh step. This accounts for the sacrifices following the sixth step (v. 13). Ibid., 195.

[207] Walter Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, 250.

[208] Anderson notes that the gifts of food are not the normal fare and thus highly prized. David. A. Hubbard, ed., *Word Bible Commentary* (Dallas: Word Books, 1982), vol. 11, *2 Samuel*, by A. A. Anderson, 107.

[209] J. P. Fokkelman, *Throne and City*, 196.

[210] Joyce G. Baldwin, *1 and 2 Samuel*, Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries, ed. D. J. Wiseman (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), 209.

[211] Alice Bach, "Signs of the Flesh: Observations on Characterization in the Bible," *Semeia* 63 (1993), 73.

[212] Ibid., 123; and J. P. Fokkelman, *Throne and City*, 196.

[213] J. P. Fokkelman, *Throne and City*, 198.

[214] The use of the combination infinitive construct and infinitive absolute is unique in the Hebrew Bible thus strengthening the emotion and passion of her accusation. Terence Kleven, "Hebrew Style," 20.

[215] Robert Alter, "Character in the Bible," *Commentary* 66 (October 1978): 63.

[216] Fokkelman notes that while Michal is permitted 15 words, David is given 31 words to respond. The number of words allowed in the refutation helps negate what Michal has said. J. P. Fokkelman, *Throne and City*, 200.

[217] Joyce G. Baldwin, *1 and 2 Samuel*, 211.

[218] Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 125.

[219] J. P. Fokkelman, *Throne and City*, 205.

[220] Terence Kleven, "Hebrew Style," 310–311.

[221] E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 557.

[222] David M. Gunn, *The Story of King David, Genre and Interpretation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1978), 73.

[223] The tension which is increased in the Greek is diminished somewhat over the Hebrew by a change in v. 13. This verse eliminates the six steps and sacrifices found in the Hebrew.

[224] This is made even more emphatic in the Greek story with an addition. The people given a gift are "from Dan to Beersheba."

[225] The standard translation of אֵפוֹד within 1–4 Kingdoms is ἐφούδ. The representation of this root by στολή is found only here and in the parallel presentation of this story in 1 Chronicles 15:29.

[226] Recall that in v. 14, David is dressed in the longer στολή rather than the linen ephod (Hebrew).

[227] Woodard characterizes it as a text that contains "powerful interplay of terse, vivid commentary and lively, penetrating dialogue." Branson K. Woodard, Jr., "Jonah," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 348.

[228] While there are many interesting characters in this story, the story focuses on Jonah. God is educating him in the art of being a prophet. Meir Sternberg, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*, 320.

[229] When contrasted with other calls to service, the very brief exposition found in 1:1 clearly has the ring of a prophet's call. David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 129.

[230] John C. Holbert, "'Deliverance Belongs to Yahweh!', Satire in the Book of Jonah," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 21 (1981): 67.

[231] David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 131.

[232] Ibid., 136.

[233] John A. Miles, "Laughing at the Bible: Jonah as Parody," *Jewish Quarterly Review* 65 (Jan. 1975): 175.

[234] Raymond F. Person, Jr., *In Conversation with Jonah, Conversation Analysis, Literary Criticism and the Book of Jonah* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 75.

[235] This "feeds doubt about the authority of the utterance." Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism, Context, Method and the Book of Jonah* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 180.

[236] Ibid., 199.

[237] Raymond F. Person, Jr., *In Conversation with Jonah*, 44.

[238] Thayer S. Warshaw, "The Book of Jonah," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw, vol. 2 (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), 192.

[239] David A. Hubbard, ed., *Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, Tx.: Word Books, 1987), vol. 31, *Hosea-Jonah*, by Douglas Stuart, 503.

[240] The statement in 1:12 might be read as a statement of noble self-sacrifice. See Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Obadiah, Jonah and Micah* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1983), 211. But in its context, the statement has the ring of a "deliberate challenge." David M. Gunn and Danna Nolan Fewell, *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*, 132.

[241] James S. Ackerman, "Jonah," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Robert Alter and Frank Kermode (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 236.

[242] Kenneth M. Craig, Jr., *A Poetics of Jonah, Art in the Service of Ideology* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1993), 61.

[243] Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, 227.

[244] Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 211.

[245] James S. Ackerman, "Jonah," 236.

[246] Bar-Efrat views this particular action as most instructive with regards to their high morality. Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 82.

[247] Craig has observed that the outline of their prayer (address, petition and motivation) is the standard form of an *Israelite* prayer. Kenneth M. Craig, Jr., *A Poetics of Jonah*, 90–92.

[248] John C. Holbert, "'Deliverance Belongs to Yahweh!,'" 68.

[249] Jon Alan Hauser, "Jonah: In Pursuit of the Dove," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 27–28.

[250] Jonathan Magonet, *Form and Meaning: Studies in Literary Techniques in the Book of Jonah*, 2d ed., Bible and Literature Series (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983), 32.

[251] Jon Alan Hauser, "Jonah," 22.

[252] Douglas Stuart, *Hosea–Jonah*, 503.

[253] *Tief schlafen*. Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, ed. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros*, vol. 2 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953), 875.

[254] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 177.

[255] Since 1885, some have proposed that this verse has fallen out of its proper place and needs to be restored to its rightful position following 3:4. For a discussion of the history of this issue see. J. Day, "Problems in the Interpretation of the Book of Jonah," in *The Quest of the Past, Studies on Israelite Religion, Literature and Prophetism*, ed. Adam S. van der Woude (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990), 42–43.

[256] Kenneth M. Craig, Jr., *A Poetics of Jonah*, 54.

[257] E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 866.

[258] James S. Ackerman, "Jonah," 236.

[259] Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 135.

[260] Raymond F. Person, Jr., *In Conversation with Jonah*, 70.

[261] This form actually is from the root דמה, but the verb form used has the appearance of continuing the *Leitwort*.

[262] Leslie C. Allen, *The Books of Obadiah, Jonah and Micah*, 207–208.

[263] Jonathan Magonet, *Form and Meaning*, 17.

[264] E. W. Bullinger, *Figures of Speech*, 866.

[265] "The plant meant nothing to Jonah." Edwin M. Good, "Jonah, The Absurdity of God," in *Irony in the Old Testament* (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1981), 53.

[266] Walter B. Crouch, "To Question an End, To End a Question: Opening the Closure of Jonah," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994): 111.

[267] Larry Perkins, "The Septuagint of Jonah: Aspects of Literary Analysis Applied to Biblical Translation," *Bulletin for the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 20 (1987): 43.

[268] Ibid., 52.

[269] Ibid., 44.

[270] Ibid., 45.

[271] Ibid., 47.

[272] Berlin notes that these were beyond the call of duty both because his children were grown adults, responsible for themselves, and secondly because they were merely precautionary. Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 42.

[273] Janzen observes that this distinguishes Job from the typical wealthy person for whom the reader feels less appreciation. Gerald J. Janzen, *Job*, Interpretation: A Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 36.

[274] Ibid., 43.

[275] The Targum makes that point explicit by adding words that recall Satan's challenge in 1:11. Targum adds, "Job did not utter a rebellious word before the Lord." Martin McNamara, ed., *The Aramaic Bible, The Targums* (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1991), vol. 15 *The Targum of Job*, by Celine Mangan, 27.

[276] David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, ed. *Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), vol. 17 *Job 1-20*, by David J. A. Clines, 38.

[277] Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, "The Book of Job," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, vol. 1, ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), 230.

[278] David J. A. Clines, *Job 1-20*, 51.

[279] Ibid., 53–54.

[280] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 42.

[281] Norman C. Habel, "The Narrative Art of Job: Applying the Principles of Robert Alter," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (1983): 106.

[282] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 88.

[283] Athalya Brenner, "Job the Pious? The Characterization of Job in the Narrative Framework of the Book," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 43 (1989): 40–41.

[284] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 41.

[285] Moshe Greenberg, "Job," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Robert Alter and Frank Kermode (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987), 284.

[286] Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, "The Book of Job," 228.

[287] Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger and Georg Steins, "Zur Entstehung, Gestalt and Bedeutung der Ijob-Erzählung," *Biblische Zeitschrift* 33 (1989): 8.

[288] David J. A. Clines, *Job 1–20*, 24. It is used of Abraham, Isaac and Moses.

[289] The meaning of תִּפְלָה is somewhat uncertain but seems to suggest the most moderate form of cursing. Ibid., 40.

[290] Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger and Georg Steins, "Zur Entstehung," 8.

[291] Following the lead of the Targum addition ("but in his mind he thought on words"), some commentators have viewed "with his mouth" as an indication that Job did sin in his heart. Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 109; and Gerald J. Janzen, *Job*, 51. But the point of the contrast is with the language of Satan in 1:11. There Satan predicts that Job will curse God with his mouth. Thus the verse does not diminish Job's integrity but increases it in contrast to the expectations of Satan. David J. A. Clines, *Job 1–20*, 55.

[292] Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, "The Book of Job," 230.

[293] The reader meets: seven verses of dialogue between God and Satan (1:7–13), six verses of messenger reports (1:14–19), one verse containing Job's response (1:21), five verses of dialogue between God and Satan (2:2–6) and two verses of dialogue between Job and his wife (2:9–10).

[294] Jerry A. Gladson, "Job," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 240.

[295] David J. A. Clines, "False Naivety in the Prologue to Job," *Hebrew Annual Review* 9 (1985): 127.

[296] Hartley has observed that the disasters fall upon the wealth of Job in exactly the opposite order in which they were introduced in 1:2-3. In the exposition, we meet: sons and daughters, flocks and camels, herds and donkeys. In the reports, we meet: herds and donkeys, flocks and camels, sons and daughters. The latter builds towards the most significant loss. John E. Hartley, *The Book of Job*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 76 note 13.

[297] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *Narrative Art in the Bible*, 109.

[298] Ellen Van Wolde, "A Text-Semantic Study of the Hebrew Bible, Illustrated with Noah and Job," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 321-33.

[299] John E. Hartley, *The Book of Job*, 65.

[300] David J. A. Clines, *Job 1-20*, 47.

[301] Heater has cataloged all of the changes which occur in these chapters and assessed them from a theological perspective. Homer Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job*, Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series (Washington D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1982), 1-38. We will take up only those matters related to the narrative analysis done on the Hebrew text.

[302] Gard's study that focused on the dialogic sections of Job came to the same conclusion there. Donald H. Gard, "The Concept of Job's Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953), 182-86.

[303] See Lev 16:3 and Num 15:28. Cox notes that "by small additions and by his choice of renderings, the translator ensures that Job is seen to be a careful adherent of the Law." Claude E. Cox, "Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX Job," in *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 81.

[304] Homer Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique*, 32.

[305] Heater notes that the details of her speech are taken from various places in the following chapters of Job. Ibid., 35.

[306] Claude E. Cox, "Methodological Issues," 81.

[307] For a discussion of those changes see Homer Heater, *A Septuagint Translation Technique*, 18–21.

[308] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 84.

[309] Jon L. Berquist, "Role Dedifferentiation in the Book of Ruth," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 57 (1993): 26.

[310] The Hebrew word order formalizes the contrast. It is *waw* + subject + verb.

[311] Berquist observes that outside the Book of Ruth this word is never used of a woman, only males דבק. This makes the statement all the more striking.

[312] The Law provided for the impoverished members of the community through this social service requirement imposed on all farmers. See Lev 19:9–10 and Deut 24:19–22.

[313] Hubbard calculates that "20 ephah" was at minimum 29 US pounds. Given the fact that the daily ration for the workers at Mari was 1–2 pounds, this was at least a two-week supply for the family. Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *The Book of Ruth*, The New International Commentary on the Old Testament, ed. R. K. Harrison (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 179.

[314] Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "'A Son is Born to Naomi!' Literary Allusions and Interpretation In the Book of Ruth," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 40 (1988): 96.

[315] Hubbard describes the breadth of Ruth's commitment. "In geography, it covered all future locations; in chronology, it extended from the present to eternity; in theology, it exclusively embraced Yahweh; in genealogy, it merged the young Moabitess with Naomi's family." Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *The Book of Ruth*, 119–120.

[316] Phyllis Trible, "A Human Comedy: The Book of Ruth," in *Literary Interpretation of Biblical Narratives*, vol. 2, ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1974), 168.

[317] Nancy M. Tischler, "Ruth," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 161.

[318] Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *The Book of Ruth*, 108.

[319] Nancy M. Tischler, "Ruth," 154.

[320] Hyman argues that this question is biting and critical based on his discourse analysis of questions in this section. Ronald T. Hyman, "Questions and the Book of Ruth." *Hebrew Studies* 24 (1983): 19.

[321] Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "'A Son is Born to Naomi!'" 100.

[322] Jack M. Sasson, *Ruth, A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation*, 2d ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 48. Hubbard notes that gleaning in the field before the sheaves were moved to the threshing floor created the opportunity for gleaners to secretly glean in the harvested piles. Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., *The Book of Ruth*, 176.

[323] Ibid., 150.

[324] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 88.

[325] Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, *Compromising Redemption: Relating Characters in the Book of Ruth*, Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1990), 72–73.

[326] The Targum plays up this distinction. Ruth says, "I am from a foreign people, from the daughters of Moab, and from a people who are not permitted to enter the congregation of the Lord." Martin McNamara, ed., *The Aramaic Bible* (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1994), vol. 19, *The Targum of Ruth* by D. R. G. Beattie, 23.

[327] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 105.

[328] Nancy M. Tischler, "Ruth," 158.

[329] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 96.

[330] Edward F. Campbell, Jr., *Ruth* (Garden City: N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1975), 17.

[331] Jack M. Sasson, *Ruth*, 320.

[332] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation*, 105.

[333] Jack M. Sasson, *Ruth*, 32.

[334] This is the only place in the Septuagint in which the Hebrew דבק is translated by ἀκολουθέω. The lexeme, κολλάω, is regularly used to translate this verb as it is in Ruth 2:8,21,23.

[335] Shemaryahu Talmon, "1 and 2 Chronicles," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. R. Alter and F. Kermode (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 369.

[336] 1 Chronicles was written to encourage the people of God who returned from the Babylonian Exile. Thus its focus is on Judah. Richard L. Pratt, Jr., "First and Second Chronicles," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 194 & 200.

[337] Sara Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles, A Commentary*, The Old Testament Library (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, John Knox Press, 1993), 223-24.

[338] Saul Zalewski, "The Purpose of the Story of the Death of Saul in 1 Chronicles 10," *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 461-62.

[339] Sara Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 228.

[340] Glenn W. Barker, ed., *Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, Tex.: Word Books, 1986), vol. 14, *1 Chronicles* by Roddy Braun, 151.

[341] Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Chronicler as Exegete," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 2 (1977): 8. The Targum explains the unfaithfulness of Saul in view of the Amalekite war and slaughter of the priests at Nob. Martin McNamara, *The Aramaic Bible* (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1994), vol. 19, *The Targum of Chronicles* by J. Stanley McIvor, 85.

[342] Rodney R. Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis*, JSOT Bible and Literature Series 25 (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1990), 57.

[343] Rodney R. Duke, *The Persuasive Appeal*, 97-98.

[344] Peter R. Ackroyd, "The Chronicler as Exegete," 8.

[345] At times, Septuagint translators have demonstrated a propensity towards harmonization. See Emanuel Tov, "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations

in Biblical Manuscripts," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985): 3–29. Only one brief phrase that diverged from the Hebrew of 1 Chronicles 10 agreed with the Greek text of 1 Samuel 31. That was found in the addition of ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (10:6). While this translation fits the definition of a harmonization, it is clearly not the style of this translator. There were a considerable number of places where such harmonization could have occurred on more critical matters where the translator follows the Hebrew of 1 Chronicles 10 exactly.

346 Japhet notes that while the same verb root, חרה, is used to describe both God's and David's reaction, the collocation is different. God's reaction is collocated with אַף while David's reaction with לְ. She argues that the latter is often used to communicate "upset" rather than anger. Sara Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 280.

347 Ibid., 273.

348 Tamara C. Eskanazi, "A Literary Approach to Chronicles' Ark narrative in 1 Chronicles 13–16," in *Fortunate the Eyes that See, Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Astrid B. Beck, Andrew H. Bartelt, Paul R. Raabe and Chris A. Franke (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995), 265.

349 Sara Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 274.

350 Ibid., 276.

351 Tamara C. Eskenazai, "A Literary Approach," 265.

352 Ibid., 266.

353 Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible, A Historical Geography*, trans. by A. F. Rainey (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967), 77.

354 Ibid., 72–73.

355 Sara Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, 277–78.

356 The reference to the Nile River by Shihor of Egypt is translated by the "boundaries of Egypt" (ἀπὸ ὁρίων Αἰγύπτου). The reference to Lebo in Hamath is translated by the "entrance to Hamath" (ἕως εἰσοδου Ημαθ).

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER FOUR

The Storyteller and Narrative Geography

By expanding the traditional form of translation technique analysis to include the traditional categories of narrative criticism, we were able to see the techniques of the Greek storyteller more clearly. We may refine our view of the translator's literary sensitivity even further when we inspect the handling of the more challenging dynamic we call narrative geography. This chapter will explore the artful use of geography within Hebrew narrative and search out its replication by the Greek storyteller.

First, we will build a firmer bridge between the study of geography and narrative analysis. Here we will see that geography has been incorporated into the analysis of secular fiction and make the case for expanding such analysis into the realm of biblical narrative criticism. We will define a method for such analysis and apply that method both to the parent and receptor texts of Numbers 13, Judges 4 and Ruth 1. In the end, our view of the translator as storyteller will be sharpened as we inspect the replication, elimination or changes imposed on the narrative geography.

Introduction to Narrative Geography

The association of geography[1] and biblical studies is not new in itself. Geography has long been used as a light with which to illuminate

biblical history. As early as 1896, George Adam Smith's monograph, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, observed the influence of geography on biblical events.[2] In this light, Aharoni has observed "geography and history are so deeply interwoven that neither can be really understood without the help of the other."[3] Barry Beitzel lifts this connection to a theological plain. In the introduction of his atlas, Beitzel argues for the uniqueness of the Promised Land by stating, "God prepared the Promised Land for his chosen people with the same degree of care that he prepared his chosen people for the Promised Land."[4] Geography plays a key role in the study of biblical history and its theology. We now propose that it is just as essential to the study of Hebrew narrative.[5] For some biblical storytellers exploit the geography of a location in order to achieve strategic, literary ends.

The Secular Storyteller

The connection between geography and storytelling is affirmed in the analysis of secular fiction. Here two premises stand out. Geography affects writers and writers make artful use of geography. First of all, geography affects writers. This point is aptly illustrated in an essay entitled, "Landscape and Literature,"[6] by Kenneth Mitchell. "Geography, or landscape, has a profound influence in shaping any society.... Literature, like art, is ultimately a reflection and illustration of the landscape that produced it."[7] Mitchell illustrates his point by contrasting the literature of Britain, the island, and Canada, the frozen north. With regard to Britain, he writes:

> Britain is an island, relatively small and crowded, with commonly known, clearly defined geographical limits. So there is not only the preoccupation with island as a metaphor that we find everywhere in the literature, but quite beyond that, insularity has impressed itself powerfully producing an insular quality that amounts to a hallmark (of their literature).[8]

By contrast, Mitchell writes the following about the literature that originates in Canada.

> Geographical forces can be seen even more clearly in Canadian literature.... I refer of course to the image of Canada as the frozen north, the huge blank on the TV weather map, full of cold weather and high winds, a land of bitterly

> hostile landscape and climate that simply refused to yield to the onslaught of the frontier. And it is in this literature that the depiction of nature as a terrifying, lethal force has produced a literature that is only now making its way to international attention.[9]

Thus, the geography of a location can influence the writers in that region so powerfully that their literature will be shaped by it. Geography affects writers.

It is not surprising then that writers also employ geography in order to affect their readers. Of course, some writers will do so more than others. Those writers have been associated with two stylistic schools, regionalism and local color.[10] The *Handbook to Literature* defines regionalism as

> fidelity to a particular geographical area; the representation of its habits, speech, manners, history, folklore or beliefs. A test of *regionalism* is that the action and personages of such a work cannot be moved, without major loss or distortion, to any other geographical setting.[11]

The writing of Willa Cather is frequently pointed to as an illustration of this style. In novels like *O Pioneers!* and *My Ántonia*,[12] she depicted life on the Nebraska plains at the turn of the century. In Cather's stories, the Nebraska geography is more than just the setting for her characters. She treats "the land as a character, with its own identity and integrity."[13] "The prairie takes the settlers as they are, slowly but inevitably destroys their older ways, destroys even some of the people themselves, and compels the survivors to adapt their ways to the land."[14] Thus regionalism is a style of writing which creates an intimate connection between the plot of the story and its environmental context or setting.[15]

A close partner to regionalism is local color writing. Local color is defined as writing that exploits the speech, dress, mannerisms, habits of thought and topography peculiar to a certain region, primarily for the portrayal of the life of a geographical setting.[16] Harry R. Warfel and G. Harrison Orians edited a monograph entitled *American Local Color Stories*. In the introduction, they describe these storytellers as "writers who with photographic accuracy are recording local topography, architecture, manners, customs, history, dialect and character types."[17] For such writers, geography is clearly playing a role that exceeds "establishing setting."

> Commonest among the fictional practices of the local colorist is the employment of an atmospheric setting which, although clearly related to the action and to the characterization, intensifies both, and becomes a positive force in the literature.[18]

From the foregoing, it is clear that geography may be employed as a stylistic device within secular narrative. Local color writing and regionalism have been cited as examples of this style of writing.[19] A writer may either steep his or her story in the local geography so that it becomes an integral part of the literary presentation or that writer may limit the geographical impact on the way the story is told. The consequences of this decision will certainly be felt in the reading experience.

The Biblical Storyteller

The standard introductions to biblical narrative criticism never mention local color or regionalism. This is not surprising. But even a discussion of setting is quite rare in this literature. Berlin is unique in this respect. In her discussion of "orientation" (exposition), she briefly notes the role of time and setting by the biblical storyteller.[20]

Tremper Longman III offers increasing attention to this topic and suggests the possibility that geography may function beyond the level of merely establishing location. He notes that the setting of a story can function in three ways. It may provide the physical location of the action. It may add atmosphere to the story. It may support the message of the story.[21] As an illustration of the third use of setting, Longman points to the Gospel of Matthew. In Matthew 5:1, the writer strategically mentions the location of Jesus' teaching. It happened on a mountain. "Who can miss it? Jesus' preaching law on the mount is related to Moses' receiving the law on Mount Sinai."[22]

Longman also illustrates the literary function of place using the Book of Jonah. Here strategic mention is made of Jonah's assigned destination, Nineveh, and his intended destination, Tarshish. Although Jonah is commanded to go northeast, he flees west. This illuminates the character of Jonah and sets the stage for divine action.[23] At the conclusion of this illustration, Longman offers the following comment.

> We must realize that in the historical narrative which dominates the narrative genre of the Bible, the author's choice of setting was usually restricted. Authors simply placed action where it occurred. Of course these authors controlled the *selectivity of detail in the description of settings*, requiring the reader to pay close attention to these textual signals.[24] (emphasis mine)

Longman allows that a writer may opt to strategically expose the reader to geography and that such exposure is designed to achieve rhetorical ends.

The most sustained treatment of geography within Hebrew narrative occurs in the monograph of Shimon Bar-Efrat. His initial observations about the use of geography are very traditional. In a section entitled, "The Shaping of Space," he notes that geography serves to "construct the arena in which the events occur" and to provide "spatial depth."[25] But Bar-Efrat takes the matter a step farther. He proposes that geography may have an extended literary function. He illustrates that function by entering into a seven-page discussion of the strategic use of geography within the narrative of David's journey from Jerusalem to Mahanaim (2 Samuel 15–16). Within that presenation, he observes that geography serves to create allusion to previous history. "Just as the crossing of the Jordan in Joshua's time marks the beginning of a new era in the history of the people so crossing the Kidron marks the last chapter in David's life."[26] He further observes that geography participates in the characterization of David. "The ascent of the Mount of Olives thus throws into relief the terrible descent in the king's position."[27]

Following this extended illustration, Bar-Efrat concludes with a statement that articulates the thesis of this chapter. "Thus, places in the narratives are not merely geographical facts, but are to be regarded as literary elements in which fundamental significance is embodied."[28] Although the artful use of geography within Hebrew narrative is not broadly broached in the introductions to Hebrew narrative nor widely applied in narrative analysis of Hebrew texts,[29] this literary phenomenon has been affirmed. Biblical writers are both affected by the geography that surrounds them and they employ that geography in order to achieve strategic literary ends in impacting their readers. What is lacking is a method for such analysis. And there is a clear need for the articulation of such a method.

A Method of Narrative-Geographical Analysis

The need for a method is clearly indicated in the reservation expressed by Bar-Efrat.

> It is often difficult to comprehend fully what part is played by the places cited in biblical narrative because the narrator was addressing an audience which was familiar with them. This audience was able to ascribe significance to those spots which we cannot do today because of the distance in time and our inadequate knowledge of the geographical realities of the biblical period.[30]

While it would be presumptuous to assume that we could equal the geographical sensitivity held by the initial readers of these texts, we will establish the more modest goal of approximating their geographical understanding.

Since no method for such analysis has been suggested in the literature, we will rely heavily upon the research methods associated with historical geography. While the connection between the disciplines of literary analysis and historical geography may seem like a stretch, no less a figure than the acclaimed geographer, George Adam Smith, observed such a union at work. In his classic work, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, Smith dedicates an early chapter to the use of scenery by biblical writers. That chapter is entitled, "The Scenery of the Land and Its Reflection in the Bible."[31] After quoting a series of Old Testament texts that deal with mountain settings, he salutes the vividness with which the scenery is shared.

> How vividly do these cries from Israel's mountains bring before us all that thirsty, broken land of crags and shelves, moors and gullies, with its mire and its rock, its few summer brooks, its winter spates and heavy snows; the rustling of its woods, its gusts of wind, and its brush fires; its startled birds, when the sudden storms from the sea sweep up the gorges, and its glimpses of deer, poised for a moment on the high sky-line of the hills.[32]

Following further quotations from the Old Testament, Smith describes the biblical writer's style in language that sounds exactly like a description of "local color" writing.

> You see those details which are so characteristic of every Eastern landscape, the chaff and rolling thorns blown before the wind, the dirt cast out on the

> streets: the broken vessel by the well; the forsaken house; the dusty grave. Let us pay attention to all these, and we shall surely feel ourselves in the atmosphere and scenery in which David fought, and Elisha went, and Malachi saw the Sun of Righteousness arise with healing in his wings.[33]

The method of analysis which we propose has three steps. The first is identification of geographical features in the narrative. The second is understanding of geographical features in the narrative. And the third is defining the artful use of geographical features in a narrative. Once these three steps have been accomplished in the parent text, a translated text may be measured for its sensitivity to narrative geography.

The first step in the process is to identify all geographical features in the narrative. Apart from the proper names of places, this would also mean any references to physical geography. A survey of the standard biblical atlases and historical geographies suggests that geographical study includes: topography, geology, hydrology, climate, forestation, land use, urbanization, roadways and transportation.[34] A careful reading and marking of the narrative for such features is the first step in the process.

Once the geographical entities have been identified, the next step is to better *understand* the realities that attend them. Whether the geography noted is the proper name of a city or the mention of rain, the first step towards understanding will be to develop a sense of its setting. The locating of a place or feature mentioned in the narrative is critical because the land of Israel is a fragmented land of significant topographic and climatic variation.[35] The hundreds of pages dedicated to regional geography in the standard atlases and historical geographies would seem to be out of place for a country that entails only about 10,330 square miles.[36] But the dramatic regional diversity of Israel makes this lengthy discussion necessary. And if we are to understand the literary contribution of a geographical element, we must note its location. A reference to rain can have radically different implications in one area versus another. The topography of one city may be dramatically distinct from that of another.

If we are dealing with the proper name of a city or geo-political setting, then we may profitably turn to the maps in the standard atlases and historical geographies for help in locating and understanding such sites.[37] Early maps may also be consulted, such as the Ptolemaeus Map and the Medeba Map.[38] Maps produced during the Middle Ages may be

consulted, although with greater caution.[39]

If we are dealing with a geographical feature (such as topography, hydrology or land use), a variety of resources will sharpen our understanding. First, we may consult the array of atlases, historical geographies and natural histories noted in our bibliography. Our perceptions may be enhanced by consulting the ancient sources. These include: the Apocrypha, the New Testament, Rabbinic literature, Josephus' writings and Eusebius' *Onomasticon*.[40] We may see the land through the eyes of the early Christian pilgrims[41] and through the research of 19th century explorers like, Edward Robinson and William Thomson.[42] Finally, archaeology plays a continuing role in our understanding of the sites and features of the biblical record. We may consult standard reference sets, monographs and journals for both a discussion of geography and of the cultural response to that geography.[43] At the conclusion of this process, we will have approximated the original reader's geographical sensitivity. With this enhanced understanding, we may define the storyteller's artful use of that geography in the narrative.

The literary function of such geographical entities takes in the full sweep of possibilities we raised in our introduction to literary criticism. Once the analyst has created a deepened sensitivity to geography, he or she must then inductively pursue the question of its literary function in that text. The storyteller may use the mention of a city to provide the setting for the plot. It may be that the mention of hydrology will add to the tension in the plot. The storyteller may use the formal mention of topography to play a role in characterization. Once we have defined narrative geography of the parent text, we will be free to solicit the replication, alteration or elimination of narrative geography by the Greek storyteller.

Measuring the Texts for Narrative Geography

Biblical writers clearly employ geography as they tell their stories. But not all writers will exploit geography in the same way or to the same degree in their narratives. Therefore, our illustration will be limited to three texts that exploit geography to a higher degree. We will revisit Numbers 13, Judges 4 and Ruth 1. In the process, we will seek out the artful use of geography by the Hebrew storyteller. Once that

literary use of geography is noted, we will seek out its replication, elimination or alteration in the Greek story.

Numbers 13 The Hebrew Story

In Numbers 13, we find Moses and the Children of Israel poised at the frontier of Canaan ready to march into the Promised Land. Moses selects and instructs twelve men who are to explore the new land and report back to him. The report that they bring back (exclusive of Joshua and Caleb) was negative. And this negative report inspired a rebellion that resulted in forty years of wandering in the wilderness.

As Moses tells this story in Numbers, he employs a considerable amount of geography. This is particularly evident when he gives instructions to the spies. For he defines the specific search area, the search season and the search parameters of their expedition. Given this definition, the geographically perceptive reader will be more sensitive to the details of the spies' report. And since this report plays a major role in characterizing the spies and their followers, a sharpened reading of their report will clarify this characterization.

The Search Definition. Since the report of the 10 spies will best be read in light of their assignment, we will examine the way Moses defined the search area, search season and search parameters of the expedition. The search area is defined both by direct quotation of Moses and by the narrator's description of the search itself. In v. 17b, the reader is allowed to listen in as Moses tells the spies where they are to go. They are to explore the Negeb (בַּנֶּגֶב) and the hill country (הָהָר).

Moses was interested in the Negeb. The modern Negeb is much larger than the definition of the ancient Negeb. As a regional-geographical term, it refers to a limited strip of land extending 10 miles north and 10 miles south of Beersheba and running east to west from the mountain ridge overlooking the Rift Valley to near the dunes along the Mediterranean Sea.[44] Moses was also interested in the hill country. The word, הַר, in the Book of Numbers is most often employed in the proper names of prominent mountains such as Mt. Sinai in 3:1 (הַר סִינָי). But here, in collocation with Negeb, it is clearly a regional designation. The hill country is set in contrast to the other two regions

west of the Jordan River, the coastal plain and the Jordan valley.[45] The hill country or central, mountain spine runs from the Negeb through Judea, Samaria and into the highlands of Galilee.

When the narrator defines the exploration, he defines it in a slightly different way. In v. 21, we are told of the trip's southern departure point and its northern terminating point. The spies explored the land from the Wilderness of Zin (מִמִּדְבַּר־צִן) to Lebo-Hamath (לְבֹא חֲמָת). The Wilderness of Zin is the northern portion of the Wilderness of Paran and is used to refer specifically to the area around Kadesh-Barnea.[46] Lebò is associated with the Lebweh on one of the sources of the Orontes in the Beqa' Valley.[47] Thus the exploration of the spies is said to follow the watershed of the central mountain spine.[48] Assuming that the spies would have used established transportation routes, they may have traveled the Central Ridge Road to Beth-shan, the Great Trunk Road to Hazor and the Beqa' Valley Road to Lebo.[49]

A close reading of the text observes that the narrator's language is different than the language Moses used to define the search area. Why didn't the narrator simply summarize the search with identical language? For Martin Noth it is the signal of multiple authorship.[50] But within this unified literary unit, we are challenged to find a different explanation. The more ambiguous language of the narrator allows for the possibility that the spies did not adhere closely to the instructions of Moses. The search Moses asks for may be different than the one he gets. Replication of Moses' language would certainly have signaled obedience. The shift in language adds tension to the plot urging the reader to look for further evidence that will either vindicate or implicate the spies.

One last difference between Moses' description and the narrator's summary bears mentioning. Moses did not identify any specific city he wanted the spies to visit, but the narrator tells us that they stopped in Hebron (vv. 22–23). There they cut grapes from the Wadi Eshcol just north of Hebron.[51] We will revisit the importance of this information shortly.

In addition to the search area, the reader is also informed about the search season. In the last phrase of v. 20, we are told that "the days were the days of the first-ripe grapes (יְמֵי בִכּוּרֵי עֲנָבִים)." While the grape harvest itself would occur over several summer months, the first ripe grapes are harvested in July.[52] Since the entire exploration took forty days (13:25), we know that the entire exploration occurred during

the early summer.

Moses also defines the parameters of the search itself. The reader is able to listen in as Moses establishes a set of questions that need answers (vv. 18–20). Since we know the search area and the search season, the geographically informed reader will begin to anticipate how Moses' questions could be answered.

The first question asks for a report on population density (v. 18).[53] The archaeological record for the pre-Israelite period can be very helpful here. The Late Bronze period (1550–1200 BC) testifies to a declining population in the hill country.[54] Aharoni offers this summary of the Canaanite period.

> The valleys were intensely settled, with strong and important kingdoms on the coastal plain and the Shephelah, in the Jezreel and Jordan valleys. Among the hill regions only the most northern enjoyed a dense settlement.... Most of the hill regions were only thinly settled, and appreciable areas were forested with thick scrub that was a formidable obstacle to settlement and agriculture. The southern and highest part of Upper Galilee and nearly all of Lower Galilee, except for the lateral valleys and the southern highlands, were not occupied.[55]

Given the search area noted above, the spies would have encountered land that was largely unoccupied.

The second question Moses asks is about the hydrology or climate of the land (v. 19). "Is the land good (טוֹבָה) or bad (רָעָה)." While this vocabulary is somewhat general, we distinguish it from the question about soil fertility[56] that seems to be in view at v. 20. We understand this verse to be discussing the hydrology and/or the climate of the region.[57] In the Negeb, the spies would have experienced a climate and hydrology that was nearly as austere as the wilderness of their wandering. While the northern Negeb is partially arable, the region is generally an "adverse environment to human activity or extensive settlement."[58] Rainfall provides the only water in the region and it is scant (8–12 inches per year).[59]

By contrast, the climate and hydrology of the hill country would allow for habitation. The central mountain range receives anywhere between twenty and forty inches of rainfall annually.[60] The geologic makeup of that region allowed for the preservation of that water for use by its population. The upper layers of limestone gather the winter rains. That water percolates through the upper layers until it reaches an impermeable layer where the water flows laterally to form springs

throughout the area.[61] This summer visit by the spies would mean temperatures reaching over 90° F. under cloudless, rainless skies.[62] They undoubtedly benefited from such springs. And given their experience in the Wilderness of Zin, we certainly would expect the spies to report favorably with regard to water resources.

A third question had to do with urban construction. "Do the inhabitants live in open camps or in fortified cities?" (v. 19) Another look at the archaeological record shapes the answer we expect them to give. Bright observes that the hill country was a "patchwork of petty states, none of any great size."[63] Mazar adds that the most amazing archaeological feature of the hill country during this period is "the almost total lack of fortifications."[64] The strongholds that exist are Egyptian military and administrative strongholds "along the northern Sinai, the northern Negev, the coastal plain and the Beth-Shan Valley."[65] Thus, we would expect the spies to report that, in general, the indigenous population lived in vulnerable, open settlements.

The agricultural quality of the region is the subject of Moses' fourth question. In v. 20, he inquires about the fertility of the soil, the forestation and the produce of the land. The soil that the spies would have seen in the Negeb is a fine, wind-blown soil called loess soil.[66] The hydrology of this region and the soil type did not create a strong agricultural environment. "When it rains, the surface of the loess soil becomes relatively impermeable, so that instead of seeping into the ground much of the water rapidly runs off into the wadis, creating miniature badland's formations."[67]

The farther north they moved the more green they saw. As Robinson moved north of Beersheba, he wrote.

> The hills, we could see, began to be covered with shrubs; and these increased as we advanced and were intermingled with evergreens and prickly oaks, arbutus and other dwarf trees and bushes.[68]

During the Canaanite Period, the hill country was covered with considerable forests.[69] But under those forests lay an increasing bed of rich, red, moisture-absorbing *terra rossa* soil.[70] The hill country was land with real agricultural potential.

Moses had asked the spies to bring back some of the produce of the land as an illustration of its agricultural potential. So the spies stopped at the Wadi Eshcol near Hebron and cut a cluster of grapes to take back

with them. Robinson, who visited this valley about the same time of year, proclaimed that the grapes of Hebron were the "finest in all of Palestine."[71] Nine centuries earlier Mukaddasi made a similar observation. "All the country around Hebron is filled with villages and vineyards and grounds bearing grapes and apples."[72]

In summary, the reader who is aware of the search area, search season and search parameters begins to expect that Moses' questions will be answered in a certain way. We do not expect significant enthusiasm about the Negeb. But we expect them to report favorably on the hill country. For the hill country had low population density, favorable climate and hydrology, a lack of indigenous fortification and significant agricultural potential.

The Search Report. After forty days, the spies returned and offered their report. When the reader hears that report, a discrepancy is evident between the search area defined by Moses and the search area noted in the report. Moses speaks of a search area that involves the Negeb and hill country. In v. 29, when the spies give their report, they speak about the Negeb, the hill country, the coastal plain (עַל־הַיָּם) and the Jordan Valley (וְעַל יַד הַיַּרְדֵּן).[73] This expanded search area will have a significant impact on the answers to Moses' questions.

The ten spies answer Moses' question about population density in v. 29. Here they not only mention the expanded search area, they also make it sound as if the land were full! "The Amalekites live in the Negeb. The Hittites, Jebusites and Amorites live in the hill country. The Canaanites live along the Sea and along the Jordan River." Thus the sparsely populated hill country becomes a land that is completely full, a place which has no room to receive newcomers.

The answer to the question about the hydrology or climate takes the stage in v. 27. Here the spies resort to standard language that speaks of the rainfall dependence of the land.[74] The spies report that it is a land "flowing with milk and honey." The brevity of their answer masks the abundant water resources available for them.

The third question of Moses involves the nature of the urbanization. In v. 28, the spies report that they encountered "very large, fortified cities" (וְהֶעָרִים בְּצֻרוֹת גְּדֹלֹת מְאֹד). Recall that the archaeological record of the hill country at this time indicated only small settlements with the almost total lack of fortification. The only

place where the archaeological record points to large fortified cities is in the northern Negeb, the coastal plain and Beth-Shan Valley. But the unfortified land becomes one that bristles with large, fortified cities.

Finally, Moses asked the questions which related to the agricultural potential of the land. This is addressed by the spies as they show the large cluster of grapes gathered from the Wadi Eshcol (v. 27). Even though it had been a long time since this group had seen fresh fruit, this evidence of the land's agricultural potential gets very little attention. Rather the conversation quickly shifts to the numerous and powerful people who live in the land (vv. 28–29). When the report turns back to the land, the land that flows (זָבַת) with milk and honey becomes the land that devours (אֹכֶלֶת) its inhabitants (v. 32).[75] Thus while there is physical evidence of the agricultural potential of the land, the spies play down that agricultural potential.

The writer of Numbers 13 has used geography in very careful and strategic ways. The geography reshapes our view of the spies. These men who begin the chapter as honorable leaders become distrusted manipulators of the truth. A careful reading of the geography indicates that neither they nor their report is what we thought it might be.

Numbers 13 The Greek Story

The Hebrew storyteller shaped our reading of this story through the use of narrative geography. This shaping influences our impressions of the spies and their report. Did the Greek storyteller use geography in the same way?[76]

In defining the search area, two translation areas invite comment. First of all, the Hebrew word נֶגֶב is translated inconsistently within this text. When Moses describes the search area, he uses ἐρημός v. 17); and when the spies report on their investigation, they use νότον (v. 29). The translation with ἐρημός may point the Greek reader to an unspecified wilderness area or to the Judean Wilderness rather than the Negeb.[77] In v. 29, the Hebrew "Negeb" becomes the more broad designation, "the land to the south." The geography of the Greek story is not only less precise than the Hebrew, it also diminishes the similarity between the area Moses identifies for the search and the area the spies' report that they had searched. The result is a more negative characterization of the spies.

The second shift in the report of the search area is associated with the narrator's description of the search. In v. 21, the Greek translates Lebo-Hamath with the phrase, "the entrance of Hamath (εἰσπορευομένων Εμάθ)."[78] This translation points to a different location than the Hebrew but still allows for the termination of the exploration in the Beqa' Valley. Thus the Greek and Hebrew reading experience largely remains the same.

The definition of the search season would have been problematic for the geographically sensitive reader. The Hebrew search is conducted in July. In Greek, the search is associated with the first ripe grapes, πρόδομοι σταθυλῆς, but is further designated as the "spring" (ἔαρος) in v. 20. Since the first grapes are harvested in July not the spring, this collocation is confusing at best.

While the Greek reading experience was shifted in regards to the search area and search season, the search parameters as defined by the questions of Moses are fully preserved. The subsequent report of the ten spies is also presented by the Greek storyteller. As we noted above, this report plays a major role in characterizing the spies. The implication that the land is full of people, the statement that the cities are strongly fortified and the mixed report on agricultural potential are all misleading statements designed to make a rhetorical point. The language of both the Hebrew and Greek report leads to only one conclusion. "We can't do it!"

In summary, the Greek storyteller uses geography in much the same way as the Hebrew storyteller. Our positive impressions of the spies erode as we hear their report. But certain geographical references are altered. Certain references could have been confusing for the Greek reader and changes in place name would result in a more negative characterization of the spies. Thus we observe a slight-to-moderate shift in storyteller's use of narrative geography.

Judges 4 The Hebrew Story

The second text we will examine for the artful use of geography is Judges 4. This is a text that is also rich in geographical detail. Our study will be limited to four geographical items that contribute to the literary reading of the text. We will speak about: Hazor, Mount Tabor, the Wadi Kishon and the hydrology associated with the victory.

In 4:2 the reader is told that the LORD has sold the children of Israel into the hands of Jabin who ruled in Hazor. The Canaanite Hazor is a large city located between the Sea of Galilee and Lake Hula in the territory of Naphtali. Hazor is mentioned only once in this text. But the mention of Hazor has particularly powerful, intertextual overtones. In Joshua 11:1–11, we find that a Jabin of Hazor leads a mighty alliance of Canaanite kings who are committed to neutralizing the forces of Joshua. Joshua 11:4 takes note of the fact that this alliance had significant numbers and that their forces included the dreaded battle chariot. Infantry on level ground was no match for this early form of tank warfare. But despite this strategic advantage, the author of Joshua tells us that the Canaanite coalition was soundly defeated. Thus the reader is aware of a precedent for the battle about to take place in Judges 4.[79]

The archaeological record is also helpful in understanding the ancient Hazor which Deborah and Barak faced. Hazor has been associated with Tel el-Qedah. In the Late Bronze period, this city boasted a size that was second to none in all of Canaan. As we exit the Late Bronze period, the site entails over 175 acres.[80] The city is not only populous, it is also strategically located in northern Palestine. The one who controlled Hazor controlled all arterial traffic through that region and so benefited from the wealth of the traders.[81]

The storyteller of Judges 4 could have left the name Hazor out of this narrative, but he did not. And its inclusion has important literary consequences. To take on Hazor was to take on the biggest and the best in the region. This city-state could afford the best in military manpower and technology. That means that they had chariots, 900 *iron* chariots (4:3). But even with this advantage, the reader of Judges 4 knows from Joshua 11 that Hazor had been defeated before.

But what would the Israelites do about those chariots? When the Lord selects the battleground, the chariots will become a hindrance rather than an advantage. Joshua engaged the chariots of Hazor at Merom. "The narrow defiles and rugged forests of Merom neutralized the strength and mobility of the Canaanites' chariots."[82] Thus the formal mention of Hazor not only raised the stakes of this confrontation, it also foreshadowed the divine deliverance by recalling Joshua's victory at Merom. This tension drives the reader forward and leads the sensitive reader to begin looking for a way in which God might chose to disable the chariot strength of the Canaanites in this battle. Would it again be

through battle in a forest?

Mt.Tabor is mentioned by the author of Judges 4 in three different verses (6, 12 and 14). It is on Mt. Tabor that the Israelites will gather to charge upon the Canaanite forces gathered in the plain. There is no doubt as to the location of Mt. Tabor. This isolated and prominent landmark towers 800 feet above the surrounding plain rising to an elevation of 1,748 feet ASL. The summit is about one to two miles in circumference and about one mile in diameter.[83] As we shall see, it was a logical place to meet the Canaanites, if your intentions were to prevent them from entering the hill country and if you were going to engage chariots with your infantry.[84]

Because Tabor has been associated with the ascension of Jesus Christ, it was frequently visited by early travelers. Their accounts help us to get a clearer picture of the physical characteristics of this mountain. The pilgrims make frequent reference to the forestation of the mountain. The 19th century traveler, Edward Robinson said, "The sides of the mountain are mostly covered with bushes and orchards of oak trees which present a beautiful appearance and fine shade."[85] More than a few of the pilgrims describe the commanding view one has from the summit.[86]

The Hebrew storyteller wanted to be certain that his readers knew that it was from this mountain that Barak and the Israelites made their charge. You see, Mt. Tabor was the perfect place to *stay*. It provided the advantage of being above the attackers. Its thick oak forests provided shade from the hot afternoon sun. The same woods would have prevented any sort of successful movement by Canaanite chariots, much less a frontal charge. And the commanding view from the summit would have allowed for the careful positioning of defensive units. Mount Tabor seemed to be the perfect place from which infantry might fight chariots. It also recalls Joshua's victory at Merom where trees played a role in defeating chariots. Thus the reader is not surprised that the troops gather at Mt. Tabor, but what is absolutely *shocking* is that they should leave.

It was exactly the geography associated with the divine instructions which accounts for the great hesitation which we see in Barak (Judges 4:8). Would he not have gladly fought from his fortress on Mount Tabor? But the Lord's plan to lure Sisera to the *plain* and charge the chariots with infantry seemed like poor military strategy. The geography of Mount Tabor shapes the challenge of the Lord's

instructions as well as Barak's character. Barak hesitates at the divine plan. God is in the habit of inviting his leaders to do the impossible. The great leaders get to it. Barak's hesitation removes him from the list of the elite.

The location for the battle would not be the wooded sides of Mt. Tabor but the Wadi Kishon (4:7). This stream, which runs the length of the Jezreel Valley, carries away the entire drainage from the surrounding hills. "In the process, two basins are created, one by the volcanic causeway and the other by the narrow defiles near the Bay of Acco. These basins are easily flooded during the rainy season"[87] but during the dry season would provide the chariots with a ready approach to the hill country. The best evidence places the battle between the Valley of Chesulloth and the Canaanite cites on the south side of the plain.[88]

The writer of Judges 4 has a clear intention of mentioning where this battle would occur. The reader has already been conditioned to expect a divine victory. But the victory in the woods, as at Merom, is now out of the question. The battle will occur in a place that puts the infantry at a distinct disadvantage. How ironic that the Lord should "draw" (משך Judges 4:7) the Canaanites to the very place they would have wanted to go. Since it is highly unlikely that Sisera would enter this region during the rainy season, the chariots would move easily and freely in the plain.[89] Thus the mention of the Wadi Kishon plays a role in shaping the plot's tension. The old paradigm of defeating the chariots of Hazor with forests is out of the picture. What would the Lord do now?

Throughout the earlier portions of this narrative, the reader was led to expect some form of divine strategy that would overcome the Canaanite chariots. At just the moment when the reader expects to hear the details of that intervention, the text merely tells us that the Lord "confused" (המם) Sisera and all the chariots (4:15). The writer offers us no details on how that victory was secured.[90] The method of gaining the victory is gapped. Perhaps the reader is to use the poetic rendition of this event to determine the specific way in which the Lord engineered a victory. The implication of the poetic account (Judges 5:4, 21) is that the Lord induced a significant thunderstorm with accompanying down pour. The addition of this water to the Wadi Kishon created a muddy mire in which the chariots and horses were unable to maneuver successfully. And while chariots on dry, flat

ground have an advantage over infantry, chariots sticking in the mud are at the mercy of charging infantry.[91]

The pilgrim texts make allusion to the consequences of such sudden rain storms. In the 17th century, Maundrell made this observation about the Kishon.

> In the condition we saw it, its waters were low and inconsiderable; but, in passing along the side of the plain, we discerned the tracks of many lesser torrents falling down into it from the mountains, which must needs make it swell exceedingly upon sudden rains, as doubtless it actually did at the destruction of Sisera's host.[92]

Robinson calls our attention to a battle in the 18th century that took place at the base of Mt. Tabor.

> During the battle of Mount Tabor, between the French and the Arabs, April 16th, 1799, many of the latter are expressly said to have been drowned in the stream coming from Debûrieh, which then inundated a part of the plain.[93]

Given the evidence, we can reconstruct the role of hydrology in the victory. But what was the rhetorical gain of gapping this information out of the narrative? It may be that the narrative edition of this historical event was merely meant to supplement the poetic version of the story (Judges 5). But if we assume that the narrative and poetic rendition of this story were not always companions, that answer becomes unsatisfying.

Stek may be on the right track when he asserts that "to say anything more would be distracting."[94] While the narrative gaps out the specific way in which the Lord made the victory possible, the narrative makes it clear that it was *the Lord who was the victor*. It is he, not Barak or the Israelites or the weather that routed Sisera and the chariots. Perhaps this is the point. The reader sees the Lord in the foreground of the victory and *not nature*. This argument becomes more compelling when we realize that the Canaanite deity, Baal, is associated with rain. If the writer were to place the rainstorm in the foreground, it could suggest that it was Baal's failure to support his own adherents which resulted in their defeat. The author's failure to mention the natural cause of this victory illustrates that a writer may not only include but also exclude geography to achieve strategic literary objectives.

In summary, the geography of Judges 4 serves several literary purposes. By creating expectations about the way the plot will go and defeating those expectations, geographical reference plays an integral role in shaping the tension of the plot. In addition, the early characterization of Barak, particularly his hesitation, is best seen in light of the geographical realities of God's plan. Finally, the gapping of the victory's hydrology, also has an important rhetorical affect of the reader of Judges 4. It places full credit for the victory with the Lord.

Judges 4 The Greek Story

The Greek storyteller also employs narrative geography in the storytelling process. Both the A and B text of Judges 4 formally mention Hazor (Ασωρ) in 4:2. The literary impact of this reference is largely dependent upon the reader's ability to recall the role of Hazor in Judges 11. That possibility exists since the Septuagint uses the same name in Judges 11 for Hazor. It raised the stakes of the battle and foreshadowed divine intervention. The interplay between Mount Tabor (θαβωρ) and the Wadi Kishon (χείμαρρος Κισων) is also preserved in the two versions of the Greek text. The Greek reader who was familiar with the topography of these references would feel the same tension and see the character shaping which the Hebrew reader experienced. And finally, the important gap in the Hebrew text that prevented the reader from knowing the natural cause of the victory is also present in the Greek text. Consequently, the rhetorical effect of that gap would affect both Hebrew and Greek reader alike.

Thus in respect to the geography noted in the Hebrew text, the Septuagint translator carefully preserved the narrative geography for the Greek reader. And while we can not be certain of the Greek reader's familiarity with the geographical realities we have studied, we can be certain that the opportunity to be affected by the literary use of geography was present.

Ruth 1 The Hebrew Story

The final text we will review for the artful use of geography is Ruth 1. Scholars have observed that the author of Ruth 1 employed a

geographic *inclusio* to mark the beginning and end of this chapter.[95] In 1:1, the reader is told that there was a famine (רָעָב) in the land. In 1:22, the reader is told that the barley harvest had begun (בִּתְחִלַּת קְצִיר שְׂעֹרִים). Thus the chapter which opens with famine closes with fullness. In addition, we note that between the polar ends of this *inclusio* there is a string of breadcrumbs strewn which leads the reader from one end to the other. That path is created by the repetition of the word "Bethlehem" five times in these twenty-two verses. Since the interaction between Naomi and Ruth takes place against the background of this *inclusio* and repetition, their characterization will be affected by it. We will discuss the *inclusio* and repetition and then discuss its affect on the characterization.

In 1:1, the reader is told that a famine has seized the land around Bethlehem where Naomi and her family live. The reader is not informed as to the cause of the famine, only that it exists. The situation is significant enough to cause Elimelech to move his family to Moab for a period of time. This famine forms the first portion of the *inclusio*; and within the canonical context, it may even portend something positive. In the biblical pattern and despite their tragic appearances, famines often advance God's plan for his people.[96]

The second portion of the *inclusio* is shaped by the mention of harvest in v. 22. The barley harvest has begun. Since barley is the first grain to be harvested, the reader may picture fields of swaying wheat also anticipating harvest. This is a real picture of plenty.[97] Since the harvest season was always accompanied by both a sense of relief and celebration,[98] Ruth and Naomi enter a Bethlehem which is the antithesis of the Bethlehem which Naomi had left. This fullness provides the conclusion to the *inclusio*, as Bethlehem lives up to its name.

Between the opening and closing of the *inclusio*, the reader finds "Bethlehem" repeated five times. As we shall see, this repetition is part of the overall strategy of this chapter. Bethlehem is located five miles south-southwest of Jerusalem in the Judean hill country. Its agricultural reputation exceeds that of all other locations in the hill country of Judah[99] and rivals the finest land in all of Israel.[100] While the cenomanian hills of Judah are usually separated by narrow-bottomed, v-shaped valleys producing a landscape which becomes harsher and more rugged as one moves south,[101] the valleys around Bethlehem widen and fill with the arable *terra rosa* soil. This soil provides the "best plough-land in the Judean hills."[102] The wide valleys and arable

soil also obtain plenty of moisture with which to grow grain. Due to the higher elevation of the Bethlehem-Hebron area, the average annual rainfall is 20–28 inches.[103] Thus the name Bethlehem carries with it the implication of fullness and plenty. This undoubtedly accounts for the etymology of the name of the village itself. "Bethlehem" is derived from the Hebrew word for "house" (בַּיִת) and the Hebrew word for "bread (לֶחֶם)." Bethlehem is the "house of bread."

The repetition of Bethlehem in this chapter is strategic. After the writer announces the famine to the reader, we are told twice that Elimelech's family left Bethlehem (vv. 1 and 2). Leaving the "house of bread" does not bode well for this family.[104] Disaster quickly overtakes them. A reversal of fortunes is signaled by the return to Bethlehem. In v. 19, the word, Bethlehem, is used twice to emphasize the destination of Naomi and Ruth when they elect to leave Moab. And in v. 22, the reader is informed that they have arrived in "Bethlehem." The formal repetition of their intended destination creates a hopefulness in the reader. They are headed for one of the richest agricultural areas in Israel. The geographically sensitive reader anticipates that things will get better for them. Thus within the *inclusio*, traveling to "Bethlehem" creates a sense of hopefulness and fullness which was absent when the family of Elimelech left Moab.

The use of geography noted above plays an important role in establishing the background against which we are to characterize the actants. The closer we get to Bethlehem the happier Ruth and Naomi should be. As we noted in the previous chapter, it is Ruth whose characterization is most in synch with the flow of the geography. Naomi's characterization is not. She is the dower one who wishes to be called "bitter" (v. 21). It is her attitude that stands at odds with the flow of the geography and in bold contrast to the spirit of celebration that existed in the harvesting community.[105] Given the geographic nuancing of the text, the reader will view Naomi's reaction more negatively.

Ruth 1 The Greek Story

The Greek reader experiences two changes in the presentation of the geography of Ruth 1 which will slightly adjust the literary experience of that reader. The *inclusio* is preserved in the Greek text. In vs. 1, there is a "famine" (λιμός); and in vs. 22, there is a barley

harvest (θερισμοῦ κριθῶν).

The change comes in the repetition of Bethlehem. While the word is repeated five times in the Hebrew text, it is repeated four times in the Greek edition of the story.[106] This mildly affects the flow towards fullness. A greater loss may come in the transliteration of the name "Bethlehem" as Βειθλεεμ . The Greek reader is less likely to see the etymological irony associated with the name of the village as it is repeated than if the translator had helped the Greek reader by offering a parenthetical translation. Despite the losses noted above, the geographically sensitive Greek reader would have seen the flow of the narrative from famine to fullness. And thus the Greek reader would have had the opportunity to measure the response of Naomi and Ruth against that background.

Conclusion

This chapter began by asserting a role for geography within Hebrew narrative analysis. We affirmed the propriety of such a role by summarizing the precedent found within secular and biblical narrative analysis. And we saw within the texts that geography clearly played a role in shaping the narrative experience. Since this shaping with narrative geography can be traced in the translated text, it is possible to use this challenging dynamic to refine our view of the translation technique. We observed that the translation of Numbers 13 showed slight-moderate shift in the literary experience, the Judges 4 text showed virtually no shift and the Ruth 1 text showed a slight shift. Thus it is possible to trace the literary role of geography both in the parent and receptor text as a measure of translation technique. And it is possible to use the translator's handling of narrative geography in order to refine our view of the translators as storytellers.

NOTES

[1] Geography is understood to include: physical topography, hydrology, geology, climate, urbanization, land use, roadways and transportation. See Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas of Bible Lands* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), 25-71.

[2] George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 7th ed. (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896), ix. The reader is invited to consult the bibliography for the many books that have been published since then which entail or include a section on historical geography of the Bible.

[3] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible, A Historical Geography*, trans. Anson F. Rainey (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1979), ix.

[4] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, xv.

[5] We reviewed the prefaces and introductions of the standard, biblical-geographical resources contained in the bibliography. While speaking of geography's value for historical and theological analysis, only one (Smith) discussed the use of geography in connection with literary analysis.

[6] Kenneth Mitchell, "Landscape and Literature," in *Geography and Literature, A Meeting of the Disciplines*, ed. William E. Mallory and Paul Simpson-Housley (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1987), 23–29.

[7] Ibid., 23.

[8] Ibid., 24.

[9] Ibid., 26.

[10] The distinction between the two is difficult and fluid. It challenges even the experts in this field. David M. Jordan, *New World Regionalism, Literature in the Americas* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 8–9.

[11] William Harmon and C. Hugh Holman, ed., *A Handbook to Literature*, 7th ed. (Upper Saddle River, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1996), 435–36.

[12] Willa Cather, *O Pioneers!* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1962); and Willa Cather, *My Ántonia*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961).

[13] Susan J. Rosowski, "Willa Cather and the Fatality of Place: *O Pioneers!*, *My Ántonia*, and *a Lost Lady*," in *Geography and Literature, A Meeting of the Disciplines*, ed. William E. Mallory and Paul Simpson-Housley (Syracuse, N. Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1987), 92.

[14] Floyd C. Watkins, "*My Ántonia*: 'Still, All Day Long, Nebraska," in *In Time and Place* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 1977), 73.

[15] Douglas C. D. Pocock, "Imaginative Literature and the Geographer," in *Humanistic Geography and Literature. Essays on the Experience of Place* (London: Croom Helm, 1981), 12.

[16] William Harmon and C. Hugh Holman, ed., *A Handbook to Literature*, 295.

[17] Harry R. Warfel and G. Harrison Orians, *American Local Color Stories* (Chicago: American Book Company, 1941), ix.

[18] Ibid., xi.

[19] Regionalism and local color, by definition, take in a broader sweep than the traditional discussion of geography. They include things such as speech patterns and local ideology which are not traditionally part of geographical study. Our purpose in citing this literature is not to suggest that the categories of regionalism or local color be assigned to biblical texts directly. They were described in order to demonstrate that secular narrative analysis includes sensitivity to the artful use of geography.

[20] Adele Berlin, *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 102–103.

[21] Tremper Longman III, *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*, Foundations of Contemporary Interpretation 3, ed. Moisés Silva (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1987), 94.

[22] Ibid., 94–95.

[23] Tremper Longman III, "Biblical Narrative," in *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Leland Ryken and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993), 74.

[24] Ibid., 75.

[25] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, JSOT Bible and Literature Series 17 (Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1984), 187.

[26] Ibid., 189.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Ibid., 194.

[29] We discovered only one article that exploited this thesis. Deurloo investigates the narrative character of the geographical notes in the Abraham cycle. K. Deurloo,

"Narrative Geography in the Abraham Cycle," in *In Quest for the Past, Studies on Israelite Religion, Literature and Prophetism*, ed. Adam S. van der Woude (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990), 48–62.

[30] Shimon Bar-Efrat, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, 187.

[31] George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 93–104.

[32] Ibid., 97.

[33] Ibid., 100–101.

[34] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*; Yohanan Aharoni, Michael Avi-Yonah, Anson F. Rainey and Ze'ev Safrai, *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*, 3d ed. (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1976); Dennis Baly, *The Geography of the Bible* (New York: Harper and Row, 1974); Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas of Bible Lands*; Richard Cleave, *The Holy Land Satellite Atlas* (Nicosia, Cyprus: Rohr Productions, 1994); Nelson Glueck, *The River Jordan* (New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1968); Ruth Kark, *The Land that Became Israel, Studies in Historical Geography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990); Charles Pfeiffer and Howard Vos, *The Wycliffe Historical Geography of Bible Lands* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1967); Carl Rasmussen, *The Zonderan Atlas of the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing Company, 1989); Carl Ritter, *The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, 4 vols. (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968); J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959); George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*; William M. Thompson, *The Land and the Book*, 3 vols. (London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1883); and George Turner, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973).

[35] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Archaeology of the Land of Israel* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978), 2–3.

[36] This makes it about the size of Lake Erie or the state of Maryland. Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 25.

[37] Aharoni notes that of the 475 places mentioned in the Bible, only about 262 (55%) have been identified with any degree of certainty. Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible, A Historical Geography*, 129. Such sites are identified: by consulting the ancient sources (including expedition, conquest and administration lists from Egypt, Mesopotamia and Palestine) for approximate location, by analyzing the development and preservation of the name in the area and by analyzing the archaeological evidence. Ibid., 124. Since this identification process is continuing, it will be necessary to consult the most recent discussions occurring in the journals on that location.

[38] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 200–201.

[39] Christian maps of the Bible lands can be more symbolic than realistic, more art than science. "The scholarly efforts and promising methodology of onsite survey developed by Eusebius became suffocated by 'established ecclesiastical tradition.' Identification for the sake of learning gave way to identification as a stimulus to religious sentiment and not until the time of Napoleon were scientific surveys of the Holy Land resumed." Barry J. Beitzel, "Exegesis, Dogmatics and Cartography: A Strange Alchemy in Earlier Church Traditions," *Archaeology in the Biblical World* 2 (Spring 1994): 10.

[40] Carl Rasmussen, *The Zonderan Atlas of the Bible*, 204.

[41] George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, xiv.

[42] Richard Cleave, *The Holy Land Satellite Atlas*, 7–8. See also Nathan Schur, *Twenty Centuries of Christian Pilgrimage to the Holy Land* (Tel Aviv: Dvir Publishing House, 1992).

[43] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 97–103 and 205–208.

[44] Carl Rasmussen, *The Zonderan Atlas of the Bible*, 49.

[45] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 27.

[46] J. Simons, *The Geographical and Topographical Texts*, 256.

[47] "Many scholars assumed that Lebo-Hamath should be translated as 'the entrance to Hamath.' However, there is really no doubt that Lebo was an important city on the border of the kingdom of Hamath and is to be identified with Lebweh." Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 72.

[48] Nelson Glueck, *The River Jordan*, 112.

[49] This route is defined by linking Maps 19 and 26 in the *Moody Bible Atlas*.

[50] Noth assumes that the different descriptions are associated with different authors. J and E limit the search to the Negeb and Judah while P allows the search to extend to the entire nation. Martin Noth, *Numbers, A Commentary* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1968), 101.

[51] Robinson argues for this location of Wadi Eshcol based on the name of one of the four kings from the Hebron area who accompanied Abraham (Gen 14:24). Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions 1838 and 1852*, vol. 1 (Jerusalem: Universitas Booksellers, 1970), 214. This 19th century

observation about the location of Eshcol is supported by a 4th century Christian pilgrim text. Jerome, "The Pilgrimage of Holy Paula," *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society*, vol. 1 (New York: AMS Press, 1971), 9.

[52] Carl Ritter, *The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, vol. 3 (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 297.

[53] Rashi sees the matter of population density at the heart of this verse. A. M. Silbermann, *Chumash with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary*, vol. 4, *Bamidbar* (Jerusalem: The Silbermann Family, 1934), 62.

[54] Amihai Mazar, *Archaeology and the Land of the Bible 10,000–586 B.C.E.* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 239.

[55] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Archaeology of the Land of Israel*, 158.

[56] Brown understands this use of טוב as a reference to fertility. Francis Brown, *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon* (LaFayette, Indiana: Associated Publishers and Authors Inc., 1980), #2296, 3b.

[57] Rashi understands this use of טוב to be associated with hydrology. A. M. Silbermann, *Chumash with Targum Onkelos, Haphtaroth and Rashi's Commentary*, vol. 4, *Bamidbar*, 62. Ibn Ezra understands it as a reference to climate. Jacob Milgrom, *Numbers*, The JPS Torah Commentary (New York: The Jewish Publication Society, 1990), 102.

[58] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 36.

[59] Carl Rasmussen, *The Zonderan Atlas of the Bible*, 50.

[60] Ibid., 18.

[61] Ibid., 19.

[62] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 51.

[63] John Bright, *A History of Israel*, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1981), 119.

[64] Amihai Mazar, *Archaeology and the Land of the Bible*, 243. In particular, this was true at Hebron where a Middle Bronze II fortified city was not in use in Late Bronze or during Iron I. Avi Ofer, "Hebron," *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Investigation*, 2:608–609.

[65] Ibid., 283.

[66] Carl Rasmussen, *The Zondervan Atlas of the Bible*, 49.

[67] Ibid.

[68] Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions 1838 and 1852*, vol. 1, 212.

[69] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 27. The significant deforestation and accompanying erosion of the hill country did not occur until after it had been cleared for agriculture by the influx of Israelites. Arie Issar, *Water Shall Flow from the Rock; Hydrology and Climate in the Lands of the Bible* (New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990), 132.

[70] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 44.

[71] Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions 1838 and 1852*, vol. 1, 213.

[72] Mukaddasi, "Description of Syria, Including Palestine," *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society*, vol. 3 (New York: AMS Press, 1971), 51.

[73] The last two collocations are unique in the Hebrew Bible but are clearly a reference to the topographical zones west of the Jordan river. Beitzel identifies these as: the coastal plain, the central mountain spine and the Jordan rift valley. Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 27. Aharoni views the last reference as the northern Jordan Valley. Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 68.

[74] This expression is used during Moses' call in Exod 3:8 to describe the uniqueness of the land which God had promised his people. For many moderns, the expression conjures the connotation of lush fertility and abundance. But Beitzel argues that it is first a description of the hydrology of the new land. Using the definition of the phrase in Deut 11:9–12, Beitzel sees this expression as addressing the rainfall dependence of Canaan which stands in contrast to the river-based hydrology of Egypt. This land will only provide goat's milk and bee's honey when the Lord provides the seasonal rains to make it so. Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 49. Beitzel's observation is supported by a Ugaritic text discussed by Stern. In that text the god, Il, is celebrating the fact that the rain god, Baal, is alive. Il sings, "The heavens rain oil/fat, The wadi's flow with honey." (*KTU* 1.6) Philip D. Stern, "The Origin and Signficance of 'The Land Flowing with Milk and Honey,'" *Vetus Testamentum* 42 (1992), 554–557.

[75] Based on the paralleling of the participles, Budd understands this participle as a reference to the lands infertility. David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Baker, ed., *Word Biblical Commentary* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1984), vol. 5, *Numbers*, by Philip J. Budd, 145.

[76] The numbering of the Greek and Hebrew text varies by one verse in this chapter. We will use the Hebrew verse numbering to aid comparison.

[77] This is the only place in the Book of Numbers where the Hebrew word עֲרָבָה is translated by ἐρημός. In virtually all other instances, it is used to translate the general word for wilderness (מִדְבָּר). The topographical region of the Negeb generally has its own designation in the Septuagint. In Deut 1:7 it is called Λίβα . In Josh 10:40 and 11:16 it is translated by Νάγβ . Furthermore in Joshua 12:8, Νάγβ is set in contrast to another region called the ἐρημός . That region may be the Judean Wilderness. In 1 and 2 Maccabees, ἐρημός is associated with the Judean Wilderness. Thus the Greek reader may have a different topographical zone in mind than the Hebrew suggests.

[78] For a discussion of this phrase, see Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 72.

[79] Due to the similarities between the Joshua and Judges account, some scholars (notably Eisfeldt) have assumed that both were generated from a single tradition. However, Lindars asserts that once you remove the difficulty of the repetition of Jabin, the other resemblances are too general and conventional to be regarded as variants of a single tradition. Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1-5, A New Translation and Commentary* (T. and T. Clark: Edinburgh, 1995), 166. Cundall proposes a credible solution to that repetition. He suggests that "Jabin" may have started as a proper name but become an heriditary title, like Caesar. Arthur E. Cundall, *Judges, An Introduction and Commentary* (Downers Grove, Il.: Inter-Varsity Press, 1968), 81.

[80] Yigael Yadin, "Hazor," *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Investigation*, 1976, 2:494.

[81] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 32.

[82] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Atlas*, 99.

[83] Carl Ritter, *The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula*, vol. 2 (New York: Greenwood Press, 1968), 311-317.

[84] John Gray, *Joshua, Judges, Ruth*, New Century Bible Commentary (Grand Rapids: William B., Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1986), 256.

[85] Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions 1838 and 1852*, vol. 2 (Jerusalem: Universitas Booksellers, 1970), 351. Bishop Arculf provided a similar description about 700 A.D. Arculf, "The Travels of Bishop Arculf in the Holy Land," in *Early Travels in Palestine*, ed. Thomas Wright (London: Bohn, 1848), 9.

[86] See Joannes Phocas, "The Pilgrimage of Joannes Phocas in the Holy Land (1185 AD)" *Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society* vol. 5, trans. by Aubrey Steward (London: Hanover Square, 1896), 15. "The Travels of Bishop Arculf in the Holy Land towards 700 AD," in *Early Travels in Palestine*, ed. Thomas Wright (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848), 298-99.

[87] Dennis Baly, *The Geography of the Bible*, 176.

[88] Yohanan Aharoni, *The Land of the Bible*, 225.

[89] Barnabas Lindars, *Judges 1-5*, 194.

[90] Lindars suggests that the choice of vocabulary may give the Hebrew reader a slight clue. He observes that המם is used 9 times in the Old Testament with Jahweh as its subject. In each of these instances, a natural phenomenon caused the confusion. Ibid., 195.

[91] Josephus describes the victory in this way. "So the battle began; and when they were come to close fight, there came down from heaven a great storm, with a vast quantity of rain and hail, and the wind blew the rain in the face of the Canaanites, and so darkened their eyes, that their arrows and slings were of no advantage to them, nor would the coldness of the air permit the soldiers to make use of their swords; while this storm did not so much incommode the Israelites, because it came in their backs." Flavius Josephus, *The Antiquities of the Jews*, in *Josephus Complete Works*, trans. William Whiston (Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 1978), Book 5 Chapter 5 Part 5.

[92] Henry Maundrell, "A Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem," in *Early Travels in Palestine*, ed. Thomas Wright (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1848), 430.

[93] Edward Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, 363.

[94] John H. Stek, "The Bee and the Mountain Goat: a Literary Reading of Judges 4," in *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, ed. Walter C. Kaiser, Jr. and Ronald F. Youngblood (Chicago: Moody Press, 1986), 67-68.

[95] D. F. Rauber, "The Book of Ruth," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narrative*, vol. 1, ed. K. R. R. Gros Louis (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), 31; Jack M. Sasson, "Ruth," in *The Literary Guide to the Bible*, ed. Robert Alter and Frank Kermode (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), 324; and Phyllis Trible, "A Human Comedy: The Book of Ruth," in *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, vol. 2, ed. K. R. R. Gros Louis (Nashville: Abingdon, 1974), 169.

[96] Since this story begins with the same collocation as two other patriarchal stories which involve famine (Gen 12 and 26), a thematic link is created. The author thus serves notice that the reader should be ready to see something positive come from this natural disaster. Robert L. Hubbard, *The Book of Ruth* New International Commentary on the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988), 85.

[97] Jack M. Sasson, *Ruth, A New Translation with a Philological Commentary and Formalist-Folklorist Interpretation*, 2nd ed. (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 38.

[98] David A. Hubbard and Glenn W. Barker, ed., *Word Biblical Commentary* (Dallas: Word Books, 1996), vol. 9, *Ruth, Esther*, by Frederic W. Bush, 95. Wheat and barley provided one third of the daily calories required for an adult. Amos Hadas, "Agriculture in Israel: Comparisons between Past and Present Concepts," (Bet - Dagan, Israel: Department of Environmental Physics, Institute of Soils and Water, 1997), 3.

[99] Dennis Baly, *The Geography of the Bible*, 183.

[100] George Adam Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 319.

[101] Barry J. Beitzel, *The Moody Bible Atlas*, 35.

[102] Lucian Turkowski, "Peasant Agriculture in the Judean Hills," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 101 (1969): 23.

[103] Carl Rasmussen, *The Zonderan Atlas of the Bible*, 42.

[104] The shadow of doom is intensified by the fact that the family is headed for Moab. This country carried with it the negative undertones associated with the sin of Baal-Peor (Num 25). Danna Nolan Fewell and David M. Gunn, "'A Son is Born to Naomi!'" Literary Allusions and Interpretation in the Book of Ruth," *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 40 (1988): 103.

[105] Frederic W. Bush, *Ruth, Esther*, 95.

[106] The Hebrew text uses Bethlehem twice in v. 19. The Greek text uses it only once.

CHAPTER FIVE
Conclusion

Not just anyone can write a great story. For great stories are more than mere words and grammar. Great stories are more than the reporting of events. Great stories are carefully crafted pieces of art that have a literary soul and life. They are produced by authors who carefully select content and manipulate form to maintain their reader's interest and to shape their reader's response. Narrative is art with a message. But what happens to that art and its message when it is translated into another language? What kind of storytellers are the translators?

In this century, translation technique analysis of the Septuagint has focused almost exclusively on the linguistic decisions of the translators. By contrast, we have regarded the translators more as storytellers sharing a story than as linguists replicating linguistic phenomena. We share the view of Barnstone. "Writing is translation and translation is writing. Because literary translation is a work of literature, its existence and formation can be studied only within a theory of literature."[1] Thus it becomes imperative that we measure translation technique not merely at the linguistic level but also at the literary level. "For language learning and the study of literature are two completely different things, and translation has be a part of the latter if it is to receive the breadth that is inherent to it."[2]

We have experimented with three different models for measuring the translators as storytellers. We examined the contribution of a

linguistic approach, of a narrative-critical approach and of a narrative-geographical approach. What remains is for us to compare and contrast the data obtained from those three approaches and critique the capability of the methods we have employed to measure the translators as storytellers.

Comparing the Data

In table 27, the data from the three methods is aligned for analysis.

Table 27. Data from Methods Summarized

Biblical Text	Adjustment Based on Narrative-Critical Assessment	% of Text Literalness Based on Linguistic Measurement	Adjustment Based on Narrative-Geographical Assessment
Gen 34	slight	92%	unmeasured
Exod 13–14	slight	91%	unmeasured
Nu 13	slight-moderate	88%	slight-moderate
1 Sam 31	slight	88%	unmeasured
Ruth 1–2	slight	92%	slight
1 Chr 13	slight	92%	unmeasured
Gen 22	moderate	85%	unmeasured
Judg 4a	moderate	93%	slight
Judg 4b	moderate	93%	slight
1 Chr 10	moderate	94%	unmeasured
2 Sam 6	significant	90%	unmeasured
Jonah 1, 3–4	significant	92%	unmeasured
Job 1–2	significant	81%	unmeasured

The biblical texts have been organized according to the narrative-critical assessment. Not surprisingly, we have concluded that this measure provided the most precise picture of the translator's literary sensitivity. We begin by comparing the data obtained from the more traditional linguistic approach in chapter two with the narrative-critical data obtained in chapter three.

First of all, it is strikingly clear that no consistent correlation exists between the narrative-critical column and the linguistic column. A text

that displays a slight adjustment in the literary experience based upon narrative-critical assessment, could range in linguistic literalness from 88%–92%. A text that has a significant adjustment in the literary experience could range in literalness from 81%–92%. Thus it becomes clear that the average percentage of literalness, as measured with our linguistic model, *could not* be used to predict the level of literary adjustment in the translated text.

If the average percentage of literalness was unsuccessful in this prediction, is it possible that one component of that linguistic analysis might be successful in such prediction? The answer is no. We attempted to trace a correlation between each measurement taken in our linguistic analysis from morpheme count to clause coordination. We found that none of these measurements could be used to successfully predict the level of literary adjustment in the translated text as suggested by our narrative-critical analysis.

Does that mean that such measures have no role to play in the literary analysis of the text? No, the handling of a particular linguistic feature can be very helpful in illuminating part of the literary picture. We found this to be true particularly when we measured the handling of the verbal system by the translator. Recall the way in which the translator used imperfect tense-forms in Jonah 1 in order to create association and contrast between characters. The literary insights we obtained from the linguistic analysis were intriguing but incomplete. They made a contribution to our understanding of the translator as storyteller but provided insufficient evidence with which to comment on the literary sensitivity of the translator. Thus we conclude that the traditional means of measuring translation technique using linguistic measures is insufficient both when it comes to measuring and predicting the literary sensitivity of the translator as storyteller.

The measurement of the texts for narrative-geographical sensitivity corresponded with the narrative-critical measurement in two of three instances. And in the third case, it differed by only one category. Although the measurement of narrative-geographical sensitivity measures only a small portion of the text and thus its conclusions must be extrapolated with care, it would be a helpful supporting measurement when drawing conclusions about the literary sensitivity of a discourse. This, of course, would only be a useful measure in those texts where the narrative use of geography is clearly evident. Thus we conclude that the illumination of the translator as storyteller is best

accomplished by employing narrative criticism as the lead method. And that it is helpful to support that narrative-critical analysis both with a linguistic analysis and with the measure of a more challenging literary dynamic like narrative geography.

Critiquing of the Methodology

The methods of analysis used for this study must also come under some scrutiny. For the contribution of each element in the analysis was considerably less than equal. The linguistic model for translation technique analysis was designed to serve the text critic who wished to understand the overall literalness of a discourse and the consistency with which a translator converted a particular linguistic feature. In this respect, the traditional method of translation technique analysis worked well. But as we noted above, the application of this method for measuring the translators as storytellers was inadequate. Of all the components of our linguistic analysis, we note that the analysis of the verbal system paid the greatest dividends in terms of revealing literary artistry. This is followed at some distance by noun number and clause coordination. In addition, we note that the observation of independent personal pronouns and clause coordination contributed very little and could have been dropped from the analysis without compromising the results.

We would not only edit the methodology used in chapter two but also the methodology we used in chapter three. The narrative-critical model offered us the best picture of the translator's literary sensitivity. And within that model, we found that the measure of characterization paid the highest dividends. Measuring the patterning play of words was helpful in supporting the conclusions provided by characterization but our attention given to the use of time contributed very little. Thus we would suggest that the study of characterization may have the most to offer in evaluating the translator as storyteller and that these observations might be supported by a study of the patterning play of words.

One other issue bears mentioning. That is the measurement of the literary adjustment. We employed a very basic matrix for measuring the data from chapter three: slight adjustment, moderate adjustment and significant adjustment. Those categories were adequate for our initial

foray into this arena. But subsequent work would invite greater precision that would allow for a more refined discrimination between texts and particularly of texts within the same general category.

Finally, we come to the method that involved the investigation of narrative geography. Chapter four defined this more unique literary category and presumed that it might refine our views of the translator as we observed the handling of this literary dynamic. The method we used for that analysis was largely based on methodology borrowed from historical geography. That tested method of analysis proved successful in analyzing our texts for the literary use of geography. We would not make any changes in the methodology we used to analyze the texts for narrative-geographical force. Perhaps it goes without saying that this form of analysis would only be useful on texts exploiting this style. And thus not all translations can be measured for its use. But we do see a role for this method in translation technique analysis as a tool with which to validate and refine one's view of the literary experience in texts where it is employed. For example, the slight change in the narrative-critical assessment of the translation of Ruth 1–2 corresponds with the narrative-geographical conclusions on that text. Both suggest that there is only slight adjustment in the literary experience. By contrast, the Judges 4 text displays a moderate literary adjustment as measured by the narrative-critical assessment but only slight adjustment when it comes to measuring the narrative-geographical dimension. It is distinctions like these which may allow for a more refined discrimination between the storytelling art in translated texts.

While the method of analysis will undoubtedly undergo refinement, it is clear that the Septuagint translators were storytellers whose art can be measured and compared. Translation is more than a science. Translation is more than the replication of linguistic features. Translation is an art. We have seen more precise replication of the art. And we have also seen artistic freelancing displayed by some of the Septuagint translators. This leads us to the inescapable conclusion that our understanding and our measurement of translation technique will be imperfect, at best, if we fail to measure the translated stories as stories. The translation of Hebrew narrative is storytelling. And the translators we meet in the Septuagint are storytellers.

NOTES

1 Willis Barnstone, *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory and Practice* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 7–8.

2 Gregory Rabassa, "If This Be Treason: Translation and Its Possibilities," in *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives*, ed. William Frawley (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984), 27.

Bibliography

Reference Editions

Brock, Sebastian P., Charles T Fritsch and Sidney Jellico. *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Cox, Claude ed. "Record of Works Published or in Progress (Septuagint Study)." *Bulletin of the International Organization For Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 24 (Fall 1991): 9–13.

Dogniez, Cecile. *Bibliography of the Septuagint (1970–93)*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 60. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *An Introductory Bibliography for the Study of Scripture*. 3d ed. Subsidia Biblica 3. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1990.

Gorman, G. E. and Lyn Gorman. *Theological and Religious Reference Materials*. Vol. 1. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1984.

Gottcent, John H. *The Bible as Literature: a Selective Bibliography*. Boston: Hall, 1979.

Powell, Mark Allan. *The Bible and Modern Literary Criticism, A Critical Assessment and Annotated Bibliography*. Bibliographies and Indexes in Religious Studies 22. New York: Greenwood Press, 1992.

Vogel, Eleanor K. *Bibliography of Holy Land Sites, Parts I and II*. Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, 1981–82.

Watson, Duane Frederick and Alan J. Hauser. *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comprehensive Bibliography with Notes on History and Method.* Biblical Interpretation Series 4, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and Rolf Rendtorff. New York: E. J. Brill, 1994.

Septuagint Translation Technique

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators.* Kampen, The Netherlands: KOK Pharos Publishing House, 1993.

———. "The Septuagint of 1 Samuel." In *Eighth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies.* ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Oliver Munnich, 110–129. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

———. "The Significance of Clause Connectors in Syntactical and Translation-Technique Study of the Septuagint." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies.* ed. Claude E. Cox, 361–80. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

———. "Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator." In *Seventh Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies.* ed. Claude E. Cox, 23–36. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

———. *Parataxis in the Septuagint, A Study of the Rendering of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch.* Annales Academiae Scientarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1982.

———. "*Participium Conjunctum* as a Criterion of Translation Technique." *Vetus Testamentum* 32 (1982): 385–93.

———. "What Can We Know About the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX?" *Zeitschrift Für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 99 (1987): 58–89.

Allen, Leslie C. *The Greek Chronicles. The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text, Part I the Translator's Craft.* Vetus Testamentum *Supplements* 25. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.

Archer, Gleason L. "The Relationship Between the Septuagint Translation and the Massoretic Text in Jeremiah." *Trinity Journal* 12 (Fall 1991): 139–50.

Barnstone, Willis. *The Poetics of Translation: History, Theory, Practice*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

Barr, James. "Seeing the Wood for the Trees? An Enigmatic Ancient Translation." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 13 (1968): 11-20.

———. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

———. "Translator's Handling of Verb Tenses in Semantically Ambiguous Contexts." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. ed. Claude E. Cox, 381-403. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

———. *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations*. Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens der Akademie der Wissenschaft in Göttingen, no. 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1979.

———. "The Use of Evidence From the Versions." Chap. in *Comparative Philology and the Text of the Old Testament: with Additions and Corrections*. London: Oxford University Press, 1968; reprint, Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987.

———. "Vocalization and the Analysis of Hebrew Among Ancient Translators." *Supplements to Vetus Testamentum* 16 (1967): 1-11.

Barrett, Michael Paul Vernon. "A Methodology for Investigating the Translation Philosophies and Techniques of the Septuagint." Ph.D. diss., Bob Jones University, 1977.

Beekman, John and John Callow. *Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.

Bickerman, Elias Joseph. "The Septuagint as a Translation." Chap. in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 9. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1976.

Brock, Sebastian P. "Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 20 (1979): 69-87.

———. "The Phenomenon of Biblical Translation in Antiquity." In *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions and Interpretations*, ed. Sidney Jellicoe, 541-71. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

———. "Translating the Old Testament." In *It Is Written*, ed. D. Carson and H. Williamson, 87-98. Cambridge: University Press, 1988.

Brockington, L. H. "Septuagint and Targum." *Zeitschrift Für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 66 (1954): 80-86.

Callow, Kathleen. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan Publishing House, 1974.

Cook, J. "The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 91-125. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Cox, Claude E. "Methodological Issues in the Exegesis of LXX Job." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 79-89. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Deissmann, Adolf. *The Philology of the Greek Bible, Its Present and Future*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908.

Deist, Ferdinand E. "Presuppositions and Contextual Bible Translation." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 19 (1993): 13-23.

Frawley, William, ed. *Translation: Literary, Linguistic and Philosophical Perspectives*. Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1984.

Gard, D. H. "The Concept of Job's Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953): 182-86.

———. *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job*. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952.

Gehman, Henry S. "Adventures in LXX Lexicography." *Textus* 5 (1966): 102-109.

———. "Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of 1 Samuel." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 70 (1950): 292-96.

———. "Hebraic Character of LXX Greek." *Vetus Testamentum* 1 (1951): 81-90.

Goshen-Gottstein, M. H. "The Book of Samuel—Hebrew and Greek. Hindsight of a Century." *Textus* 14 (1988): 149-61.

Greenstein, Edward L. *Essays on Biblical Method and Translation*. Brown Judaic Studies, no. 92. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Hanhart, Robert. "The Translation of the Septuagint in Light of Earlier Tradition." In *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings, Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, 339–79.* Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Series. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Heater, Homer. *A LXX Translation Technique in the Book of Job.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series. Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1982.

Jellicoe, Sidney. *The Septuagint and Modern Study.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1968.

Kedar-Kopfstein, B. "The Interpretive Element in Transliteration." *Textus* 8 (1973): 55–77.

Lee, J. "Equivocal and Stereotyped Renderings in the LXX." *Revue Biblique* 87 (January 1980): 104–17.

Lindars, B. "A Commentary on the Greek Judges?" In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 167–200. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Lust, Johan. "Translation Greek and the Lexicography of the Septuagint." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 59 (1993): 109–120.

Marquis, Galen. "Consistency of Lexical Equivalents as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique as Exemplified in the LXX of Ezekiel." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies.* ed. Claude E. Cox, 405–424. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

———. "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel." *Textus* 13 (1986): 59–69.

Metzger, Bruce M "Persistent Problems Confronting Bible Translators." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1993): 273–84.

———."Theories of the Translation Process." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1993): 140–50.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?" In *Proceedings of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies 1972*, ed. R. A. Kraft, 90–107. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

———. "Hebrew *Hapax Legomena* and Septuagint Lexicography." In *Seventh Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. ed. Claude E. Cox, 205–22. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

———. "Literary Device in the Septuagint." *Textus* 8 (1973): 20–30.

Nida, Eugene A. *Bible Translating*. New York: American Bible Society, 1947.

———. *Toward a Science of Translating*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1964.

Nida, Eugene A. and Charles R. Taber. *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969.

Nida, Eugene A. and Jan de Waard. *From One Language to Another*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1986.

Nysse, R. W. "A Study of Relationships between Greek and Hebrew Witnesses to the Text of 2 Sam 1–9." Ph. D. diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1984.

Olofsson, Staffan. "Consistency as a Translation Technique." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 6 (1992): 14–30.

———. *God is My Rock, A Study of the Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica Old Testament Series 31. Stockholm: Almquist and Wiksell International, 1990.

———. *The LXX Version: A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*. Coniectanea Biblica OT Series 30. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1990.

———. "Studying the Word Order of the Septuagint, Questions and Possibilities." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*. 10 (1996): 217–237.

Orlinsky, Harry Meyer. *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1974.

———. "The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 46 (1975): 89–114.

———. "Studies in the Book of Job, II. The Character of the Septuagint Translation." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29 (1958): 229–71.

Perkins, Larry. "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.

Phelan, Thomas Whittredge. "Translation Techniques of the Greek Minor Prophets." Ph.D. diss., Bob Jones University, 1982.

Pietersma, Albert. "A New English Translation of the Septuagint." In *Ninth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. ed. Bernard A. Taylor, 177–87. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 45. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

Putnam, Frederic Clarke. "Representation of the Hebrew Predicators of Existence in the Septuagint." PhD diss., Annenberg Research Institute, 1991.

———. "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint." *Textus* 6 (1968): 1–26.

Sailhamer, John H. *The Translation Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms 3–41*. Studies in Biblical Greek 2, ed. D.A. Carson. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

Scher, T. P. "The Perfect Indicative in Septuagint Genesis." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 24 (1991): 14–24.

Schmitt, A. "Interpretation der Genesis aus Hellenistischem Geist." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 137–63.

Schogt, Henry G. *Linguistics, Literary Analysis and Literary Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1988.

Silva, Moisés. "Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek." *Biblica* 61 (1980): 198–219.

Soisalon-Soininen, Ilmari. *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta*. Helsinki: Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, 1965.

———. "Die Konstruktion des Verbs bei einem Neutrum Plural im Grieschen Pentateuch." *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979): 189–99.

———. "Die Wiedergabe des Hebräischen, als Subjekt Stehenden Personal Pronomens im Grieschen Pentateuch." In *De Septuaginta*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox, 115–28. Mississauga, Ontario Canada: Benben Publications, 1984.

———. "Internal Evidence in the Text-Critical Use of the LXX." In *La Septuaginta En La Investigacion Contemporarnea*. ed. Fernandez Marcos, 151–67. Madrid: C. S. I. C., 1985.

———. "Syntax of Translation Technique." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 5 (1972): 9–11.

Sollamo, Raija. "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the Greek Pentateuch." In *Seventh Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 75–85. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 31. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.

———. "The Pleonastic Use of the Pronoun in Connection with the Relative Pronoun in the LXX of Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy." In *Eighth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Leonard Greenspoon and Oliver Munnich, 44–62. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

———. *Renderings of the Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint.* Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979.

Szpek, Heidi Melissa. *Translation Technique in the Peshitta to Job; A Model for Evaluating a Text with Documentation from the Peshitta to Job.* Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Talshir, Zipora. "Double Translations in the LXX." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 21–63. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

———. "Linguistic Development and the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the Septuagint." *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 31 (1986): 301–20.

Thackeray, Henry St. John. "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings." *Journal of Theological Studies* 8 (1907): 262–78.

Tov, Emanuel. "The Ancient Translations." In *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 121–54. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

———. "Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words." *Biblica* 58 (1977): 189–212.

———. "Computer-Assisted Study of the Criteria for Assessing the Literalness of Translation Units in the LXX." *Textus* 12 (1985): 149–87.

———. "Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand Their Hebrew Text?" In *De Septuaginta*, ed. Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox, 53–70. Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications, 1984.

———. "Loan-words, Homophony and Transliterations in the Septuagint." *Biblica* 60 (1979): 216–36.

———. "The Nature and Background of Harmonizations in Biblical Manuscripts." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 31 (1985): 3–29.

———. "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 337–359. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

———. "On 'Pseudo-variants' Reflected in the Septuagint." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975): 165–77.

———. "Renderings of the Infinitive Absolute in the LXX." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 9 (1980): 597–601.

———. "The Representation of the Causative Aspects of Hiphil in the LXX: A Study in Translation Technique." *Biblica* 63 (1982): 417–24.

———. "Some Reflections on the Hebrew Texts From Which the Septuagint Was Translated." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 19 (1993): 107–122.

———. "The Septuagint." In *Mikra*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder, 159–188. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, ed. Harry Sysling, no. 1. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

———. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.

———. "Three Dimensions of LXX Words." *Revue Biblique* 83 (October 1976): 529–44.

Troxel, Ronald L. "Exegesis and Theology in the LXX." *Vetus Testamentum* 43 (January 1993): 102–111.

Voitila, Anssi. "What the Translation of Tenses Tells About the Septuagint Translators." *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament* 10 (1996): 183–96.

de Ward, Jan. "Homophony in the Septuagint." *Biblica* 62 (1981): 551–61.

———. "Translation Technique Used by the Greek Translators of Ruth." *Biblica* 54 (1973): 499–515.

Weissert, D. "Alexandrian Analogical Word-Analysis and Septuagint Translation Techniques." *Textus* 8 (1973): 31–44.

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Will, Frederic. *Translation Theory and Practice*. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 1993.

Wright, Benjamin Givens. "The Quantitative Representation of Elements: Evaluating 'Literalism' in the LXX." In *Sixth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Claude E. Cox, 311–335. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Study, no. 23. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Narrative Criticism

Ackroyd, Peter R. "The Chronicler as Exegete." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 2 (1977): 2–32.

Alter, Robert. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books, 1981.

———. "From Line to Story." *Poetics Today* 4 (1984): 615–37.

———. *Genesis, Translation and Commentary*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1996.

———. *The World of Biblical Literature*. New York: Basic Books, 1992.

Alter, Robert and Frank Kermode, eds. *The Literary Guide to the Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987.

Amit, Yairah. "Judges 4: Its Contents and Form." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 39 (1987): 89–111.

Auerbach, Erich. "Odysseus' Scar." In *Mimesis: the Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, 1–20. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953.

Bal, Mieke. *Murder and Difference: Gender, Genre, and Scholarship on Sisera's Death*. Translated by Matthew Gumpert. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Bandstra, Barry L. "Word Order and Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Syntactic Observations on Gn. 22 from a Discourse Perspective." In *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Walter R. Bodine, 109–124. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

Bar-Efrat, Shimon. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 70, Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1992.

Barth, Lewis M. "Textual Transformations: Rabbinic Exegesis of Gn. 22:14." In *Bits of Honey: Essays for Samson H Levey*, ed. Stanley F. Chyet and David Ellenson, 3–24. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Bechtel, Lyn M. "What if Dinah is not Raped?" *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994): 19–36.

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*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

———. "Poetics in the Book of Ruth." In *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*, 83–110. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994.

Bernstein, Moshe. "Two Multivalent Readings in the Ruth Narrative." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 50 (1991): 15–26.

Berquist, Jon L. "Role Dedifferentiation in the Book of Ruth." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 57 (1993): 23–37.

Bland, K. P. "The Rabbinic Method and Literary Criticism." In *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*, ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw, 16–23. Vol. 1. Nashville: Abingdon, 1974.

Bolin, Thomas M. "'Should I Not Also Pity Nineveh?' Divine Freedom in the Book of Jonah." *Journal for the Study of Old Testament* 67 (1995): 109–120.

Brenner, Athalya. "Job the Pious? The Characterization of Job in the Narrative Framework of the Book." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 43 (1989): 37–52.

———. "A Triangle and a Rhombus in Narrative Structure: A Proposed Integrative Reading of Judges IV and V." *Vetus Testamentum* 40 (1990): 129–138.

Brueggemann, Walter. *First and Second Samuel*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. ed. James Luther Mays. Louisville: John Knox, 1990.

Bullinger, E. W. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible Explained and Illustrated*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1968.

Caspi, Mishael Maswari. "The Story of the Rape of Dinah: The Narrator and the Reader." *Hebrew Studies* 26 (1985): 25–45.

Clines, David J. A. "False Naivety in the Prologue to Job." *Hebrew Annual Review* 9 (1985): 127–36.

Craig, Kenneth M., Jr. *A Poetics of Jonah, Art in the Service of Ideology*. Columbia, S. C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1993.

Crenshaw, James L. "Journey into Oblivion: a Structural Analysis of Gen. 22:1-19." *Soundings* 58 (1975): 243-56.

———. "A Monstrous Test: Genesis 22." In *A Whirlpool of Torment: Israelite Traditions of God as an Oppressive Presence*, 9-29. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Crouch, Walter B. "To Question an End, To End a Question; Opening the Closure of Jonah." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 62 (1994): 101-112.

Davis, Ellen F. "Job and Jacob: the Integrity of Faith." In *Reading Between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible*, ed. Danna Nolan Fewell, 203-224. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Day, J. "Problems in the Interpretation of the Book of Jonah." In *In Quest of the Past: Studies on Israelite Religion, Literature and Prophetism*, ed. Adam S. van der Woude, 32-47. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990.

Deurloo, Karel A. "'Because You Have Hearkened to My Voice: Gn. 22.'" In *Voices from Amsterdam: A Modern Tradition of Reading Biblical Narrative*, ed. Martin Kessler, 113-130. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

Doukhan, Jacques. "The Center of the Aqedah: a Study of the Literary Structure of Gn. 22:1-19." *Andrews University Seminary Studies* 31 (1993): 17-28.

Duke, Rodney K. *The Persuasive Appeal of the Chronicler: A Rhetorical Analysis*. JSOT Bible and Literature Series 25. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1990.

Edelman, Diana Vikander. *King Saul in the Historiography of Judah*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Edgerton, W. Dow. "The Exegesis of Echoes." *In the Passion of Interpretation*, 66-93. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Eskenazai, Tamara C. "A Literary Approach to Chronicles' Ark Narrative in 1 Chronicles 13-16." In *Fortunate the Eyes that See, Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of His Seventieth Birthday*, Ed. Astrid B. Beck, Andrew H. Bartelt, Paul R. Raabe and Chris A. Franke, 258-74. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1995.

Exum, J. Cheryl and David J. A. Clines, ed. *The New Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 143. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Exum, J. Cheryl. "'Mother in Israel': A Familiar Figure Reconsidered." In *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. Letty M. Russel, 73–85. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1985.

Gunn, David M. and Danna Nolan Fewell. "Boaz, Pillar of Society: Measures of Worth in the Book of Ruth." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 45 (1989): 45–59.

———. "Controlling Perspectives: Women, Men and the Authority of Violence in Judges 4 and 5." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 58 (1990): 389–411.

———. *Compromising Redemption: Relating Characters in the Book of Ruth*. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1990.

———. "'A Son is Born to Naomi!': Literary Allusions and Interpretation in the Book of Ruth." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 40 (1988): 99–108.

———. "Tipping the Balance: Sternberg's Reader and the Rape of Dinah." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991) 193–211.

Flanagan, James W. "Social Transformation and Ritual in 2 Samuel 6." In *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*, ed. Carol Meyers and M. O'Connor, 361–72. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

Fokkelman, J. P. *Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel*. 3 vols. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1986.

Forrest, Robert W. E. "The Two Faces of Job, Imagery and Integrity in the Prologue." In *Ascribe to the Lord*, ed. Lyle Eslinger and Glenn Taylor, 385–98. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.

Gard, Donald H. "The Concept of Job's Character According to the Greek Translator of the Hebrew Text." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953): 182–86.

Geller, Stephen A. "The Sack of Shechem: The Use of Typology in Biblical Covenant Religion." *Prooftexts* 10 (1990): 1–15.

Gerhart, Mary. "A Theory of Narrative: The Restoration of Biblical Narrative." *Semeia* 46 (1989): 13–29.

Good, Edwin M. "Jonah: The Absurdity of God." In *Irony in the Old Testament*, 39–55. Bible and Literature Series. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1981.

———. "Saul: The Tragedy of Greatness." In *Irony in the Old Testament*, 56–80. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1965.

Goodhart, Sandor. "Prophecy, Sacrifice and Repentance in the Story of Jonah." *Semeia* 33 (1985): 43–63.

Gordon, Robert P. "Simplicity of the Highest Cunning: Narrative Art in the Old Testament." *Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology* 6 (1988): 69–80.

Green, Barbara. "The Plot of the Biblical Story of Ruth." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 23 (1982): 55–68.

Gros Louis, Kenneth. R. R., James S. Ackerman and Thayer S. Warshaw, ed. *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives*. 2 vols. Nashville: Abingdon, 1982.

Gunn, David M. "The 'Hardening of Pharaoh's Heart;' Plot, Character and Theology in Ex. 1–14." In *Art, Meaning and Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*, ed. David J. A. Clines and David M. Gunn and Alan J. Hauser, 72–97. Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplements 19. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1982.

———. "Narrative Criticism." In *To Each Its Own Meaning, An Introduction to Biblical Criticisms and their Application*, ed. Stephen R. Haynes and Steven L. McKenzie, 171–95. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993.

———. "In Security: The David of Biblical Narrative." In *Reasoning with the Foxes*. ed. J. Cheryl Exum and Johanna W. H. Bos, 133–51. Semeia 42 (1989).

———. *The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation*. JSOT Supplement Series 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1978.

Gunn, David M. *The Fate of King Saul: An Interpretation of a Biblical Story*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.

———. *Narrative in the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford Universtiy Press,1993.

Habel, Norman C. "The Narrative Art of Job: Applying the Principles of Robert Alter." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 27 (1983): 101–111.

Hauser, Alan Jon. "Jonah: In Pursuit of the Dove." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 21–37.

Henry, Carl F. H. "Narrative Theology: An Evangelical Appraisal." *Trinity Journal* 8 (1987): 3–19.

Hoffman, Yair. *A Blemished Perfection, The book of Job in Context*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Holbert, John C. "'Deliverance Belongs to Yahweh!' Satire in the Book of Jonah." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 21 (1981): 59–81.

Humphreys, W. Lee. "The Tragedy of King Saul: A Study of the Structure of 1 Samuel 9-31." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 6 (1978): 18-27.

Hyman, Ronald T. "Questions and the Book of Ruth." *Hebrew Studies* 24 (1983): 17-25.

Japhet, Sara. *1 and 2 Chronicles, A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster-John Knox Press, 1993.

Jeansonne, Sharon Pace. "Dinah: the Fracturing of a Tenuous Peace in a Troubled Land." In *The Women of Genesis*, 87-97. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Kleven, Terence. "Hebrew Style in 2 Samuel 6." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 35 (1992): 299-314.

Kunin, Seth Daniel. "The Death of Isaac: Structuralist Analysis of Genesis 22." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 64 (1994): 57-81.

Landy, Francis. "Narrative Techniques and Symbolic Transactions in the Akedah." In *Signs and Wonders: Biblical Texts in Literary Focus*, ed. J. Cheryl Exum, 1-40. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

Lillegard, David. "Narrative and Paradox in Jonah." *Kerux* 8 (1993): 19-30.

Long, V. Philips. *The Art of Biblical History*. Foundation of Contemporary Interpretation 5, ed. Moisés Silva. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1994.

Longacre, Robert E. and Shin Ja J. Hwang. "A Textlinguistic Approach to the Biblical Hebrew Narrative of Jonah." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, 336-58. Dallas: SIL, 1994.

Longman, Tremper III. *Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation*. Foundation of Contemporary Interpretation 3, ed. Moisés Silva. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987.

———. "The Literary Approach to the Study of the Old Testament: Promise and Pitfalls." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 28 (1984): 385-98.

Magonet, Jonathan. *Form and Meaning: Studies in Literary Techniques in the Book of Jonah*. 2d ed. Bible and Literature Series. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1983.

Malbon, Elizabeth S. and Adele Berlin, ed. *Characterization in Biblical Literature*. Semeia 63. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993.

Margalit, Baruch. "Observations on the Jael-Sisera Story." In *Pomegranates and Golden Bells, Studies in Biblical, Jewish and Near Eastern Ritual, Law and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom*, ed. David P. Wright, David Noel Freedman and Avi Hurvitz, 629–41. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995.

Matthews, Victor H. "Hospitality and Hostility in Judges 4." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 21 (1991): 13–21.

Mazor, Yair. "Genesis 22: the Ideological Rhetoric and the Psychological Composition." *Biblica* 67 (1986): 81–88.

McCarter, P. K., Jr. "The Ritual Dedication of the City of David in 2 Sam 6." In *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*, 273–78. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983.

McCarthy, Dennis J. "Plagues and Sea of Reeds, Ex. 5–14." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85 (1966): 137–58.

Miles, John A. "Laughing at the Bible: Jonah as Parody." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 65 (Jan. 75): 168–81.

Milgrom, Jacob. "The Structure of Numbers: Chapters 11–12 and 13–14 and Their Redaction." *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, ed. Jacob Neusner, Baruch A. Levine, Ernest S. Frerichs and Caroline McCracken-Flesher, 49–61. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Miscall, Peter D. *1 Samuel: A Literary Reading*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Murray, D. F. *Narrative Structure and Technique in the Deborah-Barak Story*. Vetus Testamentum Supplements 30. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.

Niditch, Susan. "Eroticism and Death in the Tale of Jael." In *Gender and Difference in Ancient Israel*, ed. Peggy L. Day, 43–57. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Noble, Paul R. "Synchronic and Diachronic Approaches to Biblical Interpretation." *Literature and Theology* 7 (1993): 131–48.

Person, Raymond F., Jr. *In Conversation with Jonah: Conversation Analysis, Literary Criticism and the Book of Jonah*. JSOT Supplement Series 220. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.

Polzin, Robert and David Robertson. *Studies in the Book of Job*. Semeia 7. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.

Pope, Marvin H. "The Timing of the Snagging of the Ram, Gn. 22:13." *Biblical Archaeologist* 49 (1986): 114–117.

Powell, Mark Allan. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Preminger, Alex and Edward L. Greenstein, ed. *The Hebrew Bible in Literary Criticism*. New York: Ungar Publishing Co., 1986.

Rauber, D. F. "The Book of Ruth." In *Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narrative*, ed. K. R. R. Gros Louis, 163-76. Vol. 1. Nashville: Abingdon, 1974.

de Regt, L. J., Jan de Waard and J. P. Fokkelman. *Literary Structures and Rhetorical Strategies in the Hebrew Bible*: Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1996.

Reinhartz, Adele. "Anonymity and Character in the Books of Samuel." *Semeia* 63 (1993): 117-141.

Rost, L. *The Succession to the Throne of David*. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1982.

Ryken, Leland. *Word of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1987.

Ryken, Leland and Tremper Longman III. *A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1993.

Sailhamer, John. *The Pentateuch As Narrative*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992.

Saldarini, Anthony J. "Interpretation of the Akedah in Rabbinic Literature." In *The Biblical Mosaic: The Changing Perspectives*. Robert Polzin and Eugene Rothman ed., 149-65. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1982.

Savran, George. *Telling and Retelling: Quotation in Biblical Narrative*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988.

Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger and Georg Steins. "Zur Entstehung, Gestalt und Bedeutung der Ijob-Erzählung." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 33 (1989): 1-24.

Stek, John H. "The Bee and the Mountain Goat: a Literary Reading of Judges 4." In *A Tribute to Gleason Archer*, ed. Walter C. Kaiser Jr. and Ronald F. Youngblood, 53-86. Chicago: Moody Press, 1986.

Sternberg, Meir. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.

Trible, Phyllis. "A Human Comedy: The Book of Ruth." In *Literary Interpretation of Biblical Narratives*. Vol. 2, ed. Kenneth R. R. Gros Louis, 161-90. Nashville: Abingdon, 1974.

———. *Rhetorical Criticism, Context, Method and the Book of Jonah*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

Webb, Barry G. *The Book of Judges: An Integrated Reading*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament 46. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1987.

West, Mona. "Irony in the Book of Jonah: Audience Identification with the Hero." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11 (1984): 233–42.

Westermann, Claus. "Abraham's Sacrifice." In *Genesis 12–36, A Commentary*, 351–68. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1985.

White, Hugh, "'Where is the Lamb for the Burnt Offering?' Genesis 22." In *Narration and Discourse in the Book of Genesis*, 187–203. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Wolde, Ellen Van. "A Text-Semantic Study of the Hebrew Bible, Illustrated with Noah and Job." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113 (1994): 19–35.

Yee, Gale A. "By the Hand of a Woman: The Metaphor of the Woman Warrior in Judges 4." *Semeia* 61 (1993): 99–132.

Zalewski, Saul. "The Purpose of the Story of the Death of Saul in 1 Chronicles 10." *Vetus Testamentum* 39 (1989): 449–67.

Biblical Geography and Archaeology

Aharoni, Yohanan, Michael Avi-Yonah, Anson F. Rainey and Ze'ev Safrai. *The Macmillan Bible Atlas*. 2d ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1993.

Aharoni, Yohanan. *The Archaeology of the Land of Israel*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1978.

———. *The Land of the Bible, A Historical Geography*. Translated by A. F. Rainey. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1967.

Alon, Azaria. *The Natural History of the Bible*. New York: Paul Hamlyn, 1969.

Atlas of Israel: Cartography, Physical Geography, Human and Economic Geography and History. 2d ed. Amsterdam: Elsevier Publishing Company, 1970.

Avi-Yonah, Michael, ed. *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Investigation*. 4 Vols. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1976.

———. *The Madaba Mosaic Map with Introduction and Commentary*. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society 1954.

Baly, Dennis. *The Geography of the Bible*. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Beitzel, Barry J. "Exegesis, Dogmatics and Cartography: A Strange Alchemy in Earlier Church Traditions." *Archaeology in the Biblical World* 2 (1994): 8–21.

———. "How to Draw Ancient Highways on Biblical Maps." *Bible Review* 4 (Oct 1988): 36–43.

———. *The Moody Bible Atlas*. Chicago: Moody Press, 1985.

Borowski, Oded. *Agriculture in Ancient Israel*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1987.

Bright, John. *A History of Israel*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1981.

Cleave, Richard. *The Holy Land Satellite Atlas*. Nicosia, Cyprus: Rohr Productions, 1994.

Egeria: Diary of a Pilgrimage. Translated and annotated by George E. Gringras. New York: Newman Press, 1970.

Flemming, James. "Putting the Bible on the Map." *Biblical Archaeology Review* 9 (1983): 32–39.

Free, Joseph P. and Howard F. Vos. *Archaeology and Bible History*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1992.

Frescobaldi, Gucci and Sigoli, *Visit to the Holy Places of Egypt, Sinai, Palestine and Syria in 1384 by Frescobaldi, Gucci and Sigoli*. Ed. B. Basggati. Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1948.

The Geography of Strabo. Loeb Classical Library Vol. 7. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. Cambridge: Mass: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Glueck, Nelson. *The River Jordan*. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1968.

———. *Rivers in the Desert, A History of the Negev*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1959.

Harff, Arnold Ritter von. *The Pilgrimage of Arnold von Harff in the Years 1496–1499*. Translated by Malcolm Letts. Nendeln, Liechtenstein: Kraus Reprint, 1967.

Issar, Arie. *Water Shall Flow from the Rock, Hydrology and Climate in the Lands of the Bible*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990.

Klostermann, Erich, ed. *Eusebius Werke Das Onomastikon der Biblischen Ortsnamen.* Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1904.

Laor, Eran. *Maps of the Holy Land, Cartobibliography of Printed Maps 1475–1900.* New York: Alan R. Liss, Inc., 1986.

Mazar, Amihai. *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible 10,000–586 B.C.E.* New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Meyers, Eric, M., ed. *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Nebenzahl, Kenneth. *Maps of the Holy Land, Images of Terra Sancta Through Two Millenia.* New York: Abbeville Press, 1986.

Negev, Abraham, ed. *The Archaeological Encyclopedia of the Holy Land.* New York: Prentice Hall Press, 1990.

Nicolo of Poggibonsi. *A Voyage Beyond the Seas.* Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1945.

Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society. 13 Vols. New York: AMS Press, 1971.

Pfeiffer, Charles and Howard Vos. *The Wycliffe Historical Geography of Bible Lands.* Chicago: Moody Press, 1967.

Pliny the Elder. *Natural History.* Translated by H. Rackham. The Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1942.

Prescott, Hilda Frances Margaret. *Friar Felix at Large; a Fifteenth-Century Pilgrimage to the Holy Land.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Randall, David Austin. *The Handwriting of God in Egypt, Sinai and the Holy Land.* Philadelphia: John E. Potter and Company, 1862.

Rasmussen, Carl. *The Zondervan Atlas of the Bible.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989.

Redpath, H. A. "The Geography of the Septuagint." *American Journal of Theology* 7 (1903): 289–307.

Ritter, Carl. *The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula.* 4 Vols. New York: Greenwood Press, 1968.

Robinson, Edward. *Biblical Researches in Palestine and the Adjacent Regions 1838 and 1852.* 3 Vols. Jerusalem: Universitas Booksellers, 1970.

Rubin, Rehav. "Historical Geography of Eretz Israel: Survey of the Ancient Period." In *The Land That Became Israel, Studies in Historical Geography*, ed. Ruth Kark, 23-36. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Schalit, Abraham. *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.

Schoville, Keith N. *Biblical Archaeology in Focus*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1978.

Schur, Nathan. *Twenty Centuries of Christian Pilgrimage to the Holy Land*. Tel Aviv: Dvir Publishing House, 1992.

Scott, R. B. Y. "Meteorological Phenomena and Terminology in the Old Testament." *Zeitschrift Für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 64 (1952): 11-25.

Simons J. *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Smith, George A. *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Stern, Ephraim, ed. *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Investigation of the Holy Land*. 4 Vols. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1993.

Suriano. *Treatise on the Holy Land*. Jerusalem: Franciscan Press, 1949.

Thompson, John Arthur. *The Bible and Archaeology*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1972.

Thompson, William M. *The Land and the Book*. 3 Vols. London: T. Nelson and Sons, 1883.

Tristram, Henry Baker. *The Natural History of the Bible*. New York: E. S. Gorham, 1911.

Turkowski, Lucian. "Peasant Agriculture in the Judean Hills." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 101 (1969): 21-33, 101-112.

Turner, George. *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1973.

Wilkinson, J. *Jerusalem Pilgrims before the Crusades*. Jerusalem: Ariel, 1977.

Wright, G. Ernest. *Biblical Archaeology*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

Wright, Thomas ed. *Early Travels in Palestine*. London: Bohn, 1848.

This page intentionally left blank

Index

I

L

M

N

P

Q

R

S

T

U

V

W

This page intentionally left blank

Studies in Biblical Literature

This series invites manuscripts from scholars in any area of biblical literature. Both established and innovative methodologies, covering general and particular areas in biblical study, are welcome. The series seeks to make available studies that will make a significant contribution to the ongoing biblical discourse. Scholars who have interests in gender and sociocultural hermeneutics are particularly encouraged to consider this series.

For further information about the series and for the submission of manuscripts, contact:

Hemchand Gossai
Department of Philosophy and Religion
Culver-Stockton College
Canton, MO 63435

To order other books in this series, please contact our Customer Service Department:

(800) 770-LANG (within the U.S.)
(212) 647-7706 (outside the U.S.)
(212) 647-7707 FAX

or browse online by series at:

WWW.PETERLANG.COM

This page intentionally left blank

In the third century B.C.E., translators began retelling the stories of the Hebrew Bible in Greek. The Septuagint was born but its analysis had just begun. To date, most Septuagint translation technique analysis has focused on the linguistic sensitivity of these translators, but there is more to storytelling than linguistics. *Translators as Storytellers* addresses the literary sensitivity of the translators, thus, expanding the tradition of translation technique analysis to include the translator's replication of characterization, time, the patterning play of words, and the artful use of geography.

"A knowledge of ancient translation technique has great value in deriving historical and theological insights from a text or in observing grammatical and lexical features that a text may exhibit. Beck's insightful volume helpfully measures in rather conventional methodology (i.e., linguistic and narrative-critical analysis) the literary sensitivity employed by the Septuagintal translators of certain portions of the Hebrew Bible, but it goes on to experiment with what the author calls a 'narrative-geography' methodology. The reader of this volume is likely to be surprised to learn that a narrative-geography model of analysis does demonstrate that geography can function far beyond the axiomatic level of mere setting in the shaping of the literary form of a Hebrew narrative and, in point of fact, can on frequent occasion provide enhanced refinement and support to measurements obtained when employing more conventional strategies. In other words, this book plows new ground and offers its readers refreshing methodological perspectives in translation technique analysis."

Barry J. Beitzel, Professor of Old Testament and Semitic Languages, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois

John A. Beck is Associate Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament at Concordia University Wisconsin. He received his Ph.D. in Theology (Old Testament concentration) from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School. In addition to being the author of various articles, he is also a field education instructor in Israel for Bible World Seminars.

PETER LANG PUBLISHING