A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THREE VERSIONS OF 2 SAMUEL 21:1-14

by

Daniel Lee McNaughton

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emmanuel College of Victoria University and the
Biblical Department of the Toronto School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Theology
awarded by the University of St. Michael's College

Toronto 2000

Canada

A Comparative Analysis of Three Versions of 2 Samuel 21:1-14

by Daniel Lee McNaughton

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emmanuel College of Victoria University
and the Biblical Department of the Toronto School of Theology
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Theology
awarded by the University of St. Michael's College

Toronto 2000

ABSTRACT

This thesis is a comparative analysis of three versions of the biblical story found in 2 Samuel 21:1-14. In spite of evidence for diverse versions of Samuel, commentators and modern translations have assumed that the Hebrew and Greek versions are genetically related and that textual problems can be solved by reconstructing earlier stages of the copying process. While some textual difficulties have been solved using the reconstructive method, other textual divergencies resist being explained as errors in the transmissional process and appear instead to represent alternate versions. This dissertation argues that Codex Coislinianus (M), Codex Vaticanus (B), and the Masoretic text (ℳ) are three discrete versions of 2Sam. 21:1-14 which reflect different theological and political interests.

The dissertation begins with a summary of the awareness of differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions from the first century A.D. to the present and gives a rationale for interpreting manuscripts independently and comparatively. Manuscripts M, ℳ, and B of 2Sam. 21:1-14 are translated, analyzed, and interpreted independently and then compared.

The research shows that the three versions agree in their words and word order throughout most of the story. Where the versions differ, some of the differences are the result of transmissional errors, conflations, and stylistic improvements, while others point to different Hebrew texts. The differences, far from haphazard, cluster around political and theological issues: Saul's kingship, David's role in wiping out Saul's descendants, God's

role, the role of outsiders in Israelite community. Each version addresses these theological and political issues from different perspectives. The dissertation then explores ideological contexts within which each version of the story is at home.

In the conclusion, the dissertation gives a brief analysis of the value and results of the comparative method along with some implications of this study for textual criticism and the literary approach to the Bible. The dissertation concludes that scholars should interpret the actual versions and be careful about reconstructing a hypothetical oldest version where the data does not support it.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

DEDICATION

To Amy

PREFACE

This study is a comparative analysis of three versions of 2 Samuel 21:1-14 as presented in manuscripts M, ᴫ, and B. Although I will employ text-critical methods, my primary focus is neither historical reconstructive nor the establishment of sequence of the forms of this narrative in historical order. I have hermeneutic concerns that go beyond textual and historical interests. The primary focus of this work is the interpretation of actual texts and not the reconstruction of a hypothetical earliest text. This thesis seeks to identify, interpret and compare the three versions of 2 Sam. 21:1-14. I hope to show that some of the differences between these versions cannot be resolved as errors in the transmissional process but rather as differences in ideology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

α´ Aquila

B Codex Vaticanus

BDB Brown Driver Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament

Chr Chrysostom

D dlpqtz

E efmsw

GK Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar

KR Kaige Recension

L boc₂e₂

ʟ Old Latin

LSJ Liddell & Scott, Greek-English Lexicon

LXX Septuagint

M Codex Coislinianus

ɱ Masoretic Text

O Acx

OG Old Greek

σ´ Symmachus

θ´ Theodotion

Thdt Theodoret of Cyrrhus

TJ Targum Jonathan

ʋ Vulgate

All abbreviations of academic journals are the standard forms adopted by the Journal for Biblical Literature and the Religious Periodical Index.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Awareness of Differences Between the Greek and Hebrew Texts in the First Five Centuries A.D.

It is well known that there are many points in the Greek manuscript tradition of the

Old Testament that offer readings differing from the 𝔐. Such differences were probably

noticed very early, but two events of the first century A.D. brought them to the forefront:

the birth of the Christian Church, and the destruction of Jerusalem. These disagreements

were noted by the second-century Christian apologist Justin Martyr,[1] who describes

contemporary Jews questioning the veracity of the story about the origin of the Septuagint[2]

because the LXX had been preserved and transmitted primarily by Christians.[3] Although

dated to a later time, the Talmud captures the negative attitude of late first and second

century rabbis: "It happened that five elders translated the Pentateuch into Greek for King

Ptolemy. That day was as hard for Israel as the day the calf was made, because the

Pentateuch could not be translated properly."[4] Justin Martyr and other early church fathers

argued that the Jews deliberately removed a number of passages which were favorable

---

[1]Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, in Ante-Nicene Fathers, vol. I , Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson, eds. (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994), 232-235, 241; H. B. Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1989), 30.

[2]I will use the terms Septuagint (LXX) and Old Greek (OG) to refer generally to the translation of all of the books of the Hebrew Bible into Greek and to the oldest reconstructed version of the Greek Bible respectively.

[3]Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint," in Mikra, eds. Martin Jan Mülder and Harry Sysling (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 163.

[4]Tov, "The Septuagint," 163.

towards Christianity.[5] Thus, though they differed in their explanations, Jews and

Christians in the second century A.D. agreed that there were differences between the Greek

manuscripts and 𝔐.

Jews and Christians used different approaches to try to resolve the differences.

Since the extant Greek texts during the second and third centuries A.D. were considered

corrupt by certain Jews, several attempts were made at revising the LXX based on the

received Hebrew Scripture. Three names are associated with these early improvements:

Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus.[6] Aquila, a Jewish proselyte from Pontus and

student of Rabbi Akiba, completed a slavishly literal translation of the received Hebrew text

in *ca.* A.D. 125.[7] There were mixed reactions to α' by Jews and Christians. Jews, on the

one hand, praised and trusted α' using it widely until it was forbidden for use in the

Synagogue by the Code of Justinian (A.D. 555).[8] Early Church Fathers Irenaeus and

Epiphanius, on the other hand, reacted negatively to Aquila's anti-Christian bias.[9]

Symmachus, probably an Ebionite, provided a good Greek rendering of the received

Hebrew text (σ') probably in the latter part of the second century A.D.[10] Theodotion,

probably a proselyte to Judaism from Ephesus, completed a free revision of the Greek

---

[5]Swete, Intro., 479.

[6]I will refer to the works of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion as α', σ', θ' respectively.

[7]Tov, "The Septuagint," 183-84; Swete, Intro., 31-32.

[8]Harry M. Orlinsky, "Current Progress and Problems in Septuagint Research," in The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, ed. H. R. Willoughby (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1947; reprinted in Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations, ed. Harry M. Orlinsky (New York: KTAV, 1974), 11.

[9]Sidney Jellicoe, The Septuagint and Modern Study (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 77.

[10]Tov, "The Septuagint," 184.

Bible during the latter part of the second century A.D.[11] Faithful to the standard Hebrew, Theodotion's revision was better Greek style than Aquila.[12]

Origen attempted to solve the problem of differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions in a different way. In order to provide "a basis for discussions between Jews and Christians who needed to know the exact differences between each other's Bibles,"[13] Origen created his Hexapla, six texts in parallel columns: Hebrew; a Greek transliteration; α'; σ'; Origen's revised Greek text; and θ'. Using θ' as his primary text, he restored Hebrew word order and corrected supposed corruptions. Where θ' had additions he marked them with an *obelus*. He supplied omissions from α', σ', and θ' which he marked by an *asterisk*. Where the LXX and the Hebrew seemed hopelessly at odds, he included both versions which he marked appropriately. Origen's revisions brought the Greek text into conformity with the Hebrew text available to him, and also preserved the variant Greek texts rather than destroying them. Contemporaries Eusebius and Pamphilus published the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla *ca*. A.D. 309 assuming he had restored the Old Greek. Origen's revision, however, did not resolve the problem of differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions for Christians. Jerome wrote about the different Greek texts in the latter part of the fourth century A.D.:

> Alexandria and Egypt attribute the authorship of their Old Testament to Hesychius. From Constantinople as far as Antioch the rendering of Lucian the Martyr holds the field; while the Palestinian provinces in between these adopt those codices which, themselves the production of Origen, were promulgated by Eusebius and Pamphilus. And so the whole world is in conflict with itself over this threefold variety of text.[14]

---

[11]Swete, Intro., 43.

[12]Ibid.

[13]Tov, "The Septuagint," 185.

[14]Jellicoe, The Septuagint, 134.

Because of differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions, Jerome (*ca.* A.D. 345-420) was commissioned to revise the Old Latin version (𝔏) since it had been translated from an old Greek version different from the received Hebrew text as early as the second century A.D.[15] Jerome's revised Latin version, the Vulgate (𝔙), was never able to completely replace the 𝔏;[16] sacred texts are not easily replaced.

Awareness of Differences Between the Hebrew and Greek Texts Since the Sixteenth Century

From Jerome until the sixteenth century, not too much was made of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts, probably because of the dependence on the Latin versions in the western Christian church and because very few Christians were able to read Hebrew. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, the creation of the polyglot texts highlighted once again the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts. The Complutensian Polyglot, the first printed text of the complete Greek Old Testament, begun in A.D. 1502 by the Spanish Cardinal Francisco Ximenes and printed in A.D. 1514-1517, contained the Hebrew in the first column, the Vulgate in the second column, and the Greek in the third column.[17] Like the works of Origen and Jerome, the differences that emerged in the Polyglots were frequently solved by correction toward the 𝔐 without explanation or interpretation of the Greek texts.[18]

---

[15]Swete, *Intro.*, 92.

[16]Ibid., 102-103.

[17]Ibid., 171; Eugene C. Ulrich, *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*, Harvard Semitic Monographs 19 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), 19.

[18]Ulrich, *Qumran*, 19.

Divergent Readings in the Greek and Hebrew Texts of Samuel

Although Ludovicus Cappellus observed problems with the Hebrew text of Samuel as early as A.D. 1634,[19] the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Samuel were first emphasized by Otto Thenius.[20] In his commentary on Samuel (A.D. 1842), he attempted to systematically revise the ɯ based on the LXX. Since Thenius's conclusions were sometimes arbitrary and subjective,[21] Julius Wellhausen (A.D. 1871) was the first to successfully establish the text of Samuel in a way that would withstand subsequent research and discovery.[22] Thenius and Wellhausen both worked from the assumption that the Hebrew and Greek versions were genetically related and that one could solve textual problems by reconstructing earlier stages of the copying process.

While some transmissional problems were solved by the reconstructive approach, at least two difficulties arose for those attempting to reconstruct the Hebrew of Samuel based on the Greek manuscripts. First, the Greek witnesses are diverse. Second, the extant Greek texts show evidence of early revisions.

Thackeray's study is a good example of an attempt to explain the diversity of texts and possible revisions found in the LXX texts of Samuel-Kings. He proposed that there are three main text-types of the Greek versions of Samuel-Kings: those represented by Codex Vaticanus (B), those represented by Codex Alexandrinus (A), and those represented by the Lucianic recension (L).[23] He argued that B is the best witness to the OG in 1Sam. 1:1-

---

[19]P. Kyle McCarter, I Samuel, AB 8 (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1980), 5.

[20]Otto Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament 4 (Leipzig: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1842).

[21]McCarter, I Samuel, 5.

[22]Julius Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1871).

[23]H. St. J. Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, a Study in Origins. Schweich

2Sam. 11:1, although L seems to reflect a more logical conclusion to Samuel.[24] He

described sections 1Sam. 1:1ff, 2Sam. 1:1-11:1 and 1Kgs. 2:12-21:43, designated α, ββ,

and γγ, as "homogeneous wholes, that is to say, they are the work of three different

translators."[25] In contrast, sections 2Sam. 11:2 - 1Kgs. 2:11 and 1Kgs. 22-2Kgs., which

he designated βγ and γδ, have a distinctly literal translation style.[26] Noticing characteristic

similarities between βγ and γδ and Theodotion, Thackeray concluded, ". . . the final

portions of the Greek books of Kingdoms were probably appended some time in the first

century B.C., and that the translator's style has much in common with that afterwards

adopted by Theodotion."[27] The diversity and apparent revisions of the LXX texts of

Samuel-Kings resisted a simple explanation of their origin. Furthermore, it was uncertain

whether the various LXX texts represented alternate Hebrew texts or different Greek

translations of the *Vorlage* of 𝔐 until the discovery of ancient manuscripts in the Judean

Desert.

In 1953, Frank Cross published a few fragments of an ancient Hebrew scroll of

Samuel found in Cave IV at Qumran (4QSam[a]) which dates about one hundred B.C.[28] The

significance of that discovery can hardly be overstated. 4QSam[a] preserved a Hebrew text-

type distinctly different from 𝔐 and closely related to the presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* of the

---

Lectures 1920 (London: Milford for the British Academy, 1923), 16.

[24]H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translations of the Four Books of Kings," JTS 8 (1907): 264-266.

[25]Ibid., 263.

[26]Thackeray gave 10 characteristics of this "translator": the use of οἱ ἀδροί for 'the great men (גדול, שר); κερατίνη for שופר; μονόζωνος for גדוד; the unique use of ἀπάνωθεν; καί γε for גם; καὶ μάλα for אבל; the use of 'Ηνίκα in only the βδ sections of Kingdoms; ἐγώ εἰμι followed by a finite verb; absence of the historical perfect; Ibid., 267-274.

[27]Ibid., 277-78.

[28]F. M. Cross, "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," BASOR 132 (1953): 15-26.

LXX. With the publication of these fragments, scholars had proof that a Hebrew text existed behind some of the variant Greek readings and that variant Hebrew versions existed in Palestine as late as the first century A.D. Two years later, Cross published fragments of another Samuel manuscript (4QSam[b]) from Qumran which antedated 4QSam[a] by approximately two centuries.[29] According to Cross, 4QSam[b] was much closer to the LXX than to 𝕸.[30] Before these discoveries, scholars could only speculate about alternate Hebrew texts based on tentative reconstructions from the differences in the LXX. Qumran MSS, however, did not solve the problem of diverse texts in Samuel; they only verified that a plurality of Hebrew texts existed in Palestine between the third century B.C. and the first century A.D. and that the LXX was an excellent witness to an ancient Hebrew version at variance with 𝕸.

The Significance of This Study

In spite of evidence for diverse Greek and Hebrew versions of Samuel, the reconstructive method as proposed initially by Thenius and Wellhausen has continued to dominate commentaries on Samuel to the present.[31] The problem with the eclectic reconstructive approach is that the diversity of the versions works against it. Furthermore,

---

[29]F. M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrân." JBL 74 (1955): 147-72, esp. 164.

[30]4QSam[b] agrees with LXX against 𝕸 thirteen times; 4QSam[b] agrees with 𝕸 against LXX four times; Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts," 172.

[31]Thenius, Die Bücher; Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis; August Klostermann, Die Bücher Samuelis (SZ III. Nordlingen, 1887); H.P. Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel; ICC (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1899); Karl Budde, Die Bücher Samuel; Kurzer Hand-Commentar VIII (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1902); Le P. Paul Dhorme, Les livres de Samuel; Etudes Bibliques (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1910); S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text, 2d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913); H. W. Hertzberg, I and II Samuel; OTL (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964); Hans Joachim Stoebe, Das erste Buch Samuelis; Kommentar zum Alten Testamentliche VIII (Gütersloch: Gerd Mohn, 1973); P. Kyle McCarter, I Samuel; AB 8; II Samuel; AB 9 (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1980, 1984); Ralph Klein, I Samuel; WBC 10 (Waco: Word Biblical Commentary, 1983); A.A. Anderson, 2 Samuel; WBC 11 (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989).

a fixation on reconstructing an earliest text has led scholars at times to make textual

decisions which were not based on plausible transmissional explanations.[32] In a recent

study, Walters has shown that critical commentaries and modern translations obscure the

alternate versions of the story of Samuel's birth in 1Sam. 1 as represented in ℳ and B.[33]

He concluded,

> The texts of each, while not in perfect condition, can be given a reasonable and
> internally consistent reading which shows them to be discrete narratives, each with
> its own interests and design. Modifications of either under the pattern of the other
> can only produce a hybrid text with no distinctive character at all.[34]

A clear explanation of how these divergent readings came to exist is still beyond

reach because of the indeterminate character of the evidence. The few MSS we have cover

hundreds of years of transmission and use and the lines of transmission are scanty at best.

Since there are textual divergencies which cannot be explained as errors in the

transmissional process, perhaps it is best to interpret the actual texts we have. If there are

alternate versions of a biblical story in 1 Samuel, then they are worth exploring elsewhere.

Preliminary studies by Walters indicate that divergent readings also exist in 2Sam.

21:1-14.[35] To my knowledge no one has interpreted and compared the different versions of

---

[32]In 1Sam. 1 of the ℳ, in a discussion between Hannah and Elkanah regarding whether
Hannah would take Samuel to Shiloh. Hannah expressed her desire to wait until she had weaned him.
Elkanah agreed and then said, "Only, may Yahweh fulfill his word." Because there is no unfulfilled word of
the Lord still remaining in this story, Thenius, the critical commentators, and modern translations (NEB,
NAB, JB), abandoned the difficult reading of the ℳ. They opted for a reading said to be found in the LXX
and 4QSam[a], "Only, may Yahweh fulfill your word." The LXX and 4QSam[a] actually read, "But may the
Lord fulfill what has gone out of your mouth." While the proposed emendation reads better, neither the ℳ
nor the LXX can be derived easily from it. Thus, attempts to create the "earliest" text, has led to the
creation of an eclectic text which exists neither in the Greek nor the Hebrew. The created eclectic text, in
turn, suppresses the actual texts which do exist; Stanley D. Walters, "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and
Hebrew Texts of I Samuel 1," JBL 107 (1988), 408.

[33]Ibid., 385-412.

[34]Ibid., 408.

[35]Stanley D. Walters, "Gibeon of Saul," JSOT 52 (1991): 61-76; and, "Childless Michal,
Mother of Five," In The Tablet and Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo, eds. Mark

the story in 2Sam. 21:1-14. I intend to do that.

Interpretation of Three Versions of 2 Samuel 21:1-14

This study is a comparative analysis of three versions of the biblical story found in

2Sam. 21:1-14. The primary focus of this dissertation is interpretation and not textual

reconstruction. Although text-criticism will be employed herein, I have hermeneutic

concerns that go beyond textual and historical interests. I hope to show that M, ℿ, and B

present three discrete versions of 2Sam. 21:1-14, which reflect different theological and

political interests. This thesis seeks to translate, interpret and compare the alternate forms of

this biblical story. I hope to show that some of the differences between these stories cannot

be resolved as transmissional errors or as stylistic differences but rather by ideological

interests.

In Chapters 2, 3, and 4, I will translate and interpret three actual texts of 2Sam.

21:1-14, namely M, ℿ and B. I will start with M because it is the simplest text, having the

least number of textual problems. I will argue that M's text, though similar in many ways to

B and ℿ, represents a distinct version of the story with different emphases than either B or

ℿ.

In Chapter 5, I will compare M, ℿ, and B. My research will show that the versions

agree throughout most of the story in their words and word order. Where they differ, some

of the differences are the result of transmissional errors, conflations, and stylistic

improvements, and others are the result of different Hebrew text(s). The differences, far

from haphazard, cluster around political and theological issues: Saul's kingship, David's

role in wiping out Saul's descendants, God's role, the role of outsiders in Israelite

community. Each version addresses these theological and political issues from different

perspectives, pointing to different ideological contexts. M is harsh towards Saul and

E. Cohen, et al. (Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993): 290-296.

distinctly sympathetic towards proselytes and outsiders. ₥ emphasizes Saul as a prophetic king and depreciates both the Davidic kingship and the role of outsiders. B is the harshest towards Saul and depreciates the role of outsiders. Based on the data, I explore possible settings within which each version of the story is at home.

In Chapter 6, I will summarize my conclusions and explore the implications that this study might have for future scholarly research.

Defining Terms

For clarity, text, version, and story need to be defined. By text I always mean a specific written form as found in the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts. By version I mean a discrete narrative form as reconstructed from texts that are basically similar to one another. By story I mean the basic set of events as differently reported in the various versions.

CHAPTER 2

INTERPRETATION OF UNCIAL MANUSCRIPT M'S
VERSION OF 2 SAMUEL 21:1-14

The Text of M[a]

Καὶ ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Δαυειδ τρία ἔτη ἐνιαυτὸς ἐχόμενος

ἐνιαυτοῦ, καὶ ἐζήτησεν Δαυειδ τὸ πρόσωπον Κυρίου· καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος Ἐπὶ

Σαοὺλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀδικία περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν τοὺς

Γαβαωνείτας. 2) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς Δαυειδ τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας καὶ εἶπεν

πρὸς αὐτούς· καὶ οἱ Γαβαωνεῖται οὐχ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ εἰσιν, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐκ τοῦ

αἵματος τοῦ Ἀμορραίου, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ ὤμοσαν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐζήτησεν

Σαοὺλ πατάξαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι αὐτὸν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰούδα·

3) καὶ εἶπεν Δαυειδ πρὸς τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας Τί ποιήσω ὑμῖν καὶ ἐν τίνι

ἐξιλάσομαι, καὶ εὐλογήσατε τὴν κληρονομίαν Κυρίου; 4) καὶ εἶπον[b] αὐτῷ οἱ

Γαβαωνεῖται Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον μετὰ Σαοὺλ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ

οἴκου αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ θανατῶσαι ἐκ παντὸς Ἰσραήλ. καὶ

εἶπεν, Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε καὶ ποιήσω ὑμῖν; 5) καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα ὁ ἀνὴρ

ὃς συνετέλεσεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἐλογίσατο ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς·

ἀφανίσωμεν αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ ἑστάναι αὐτὸν ἐν παντὶ ὁρίῳ Ἰσραήλ. 6) Δότε ἡμῖν

ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξηλάσομεν αὐτοὺς τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν τῷ

βούνῳ Σαοὺλ ἐκλεκτοὺς Κυρίου. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Βασιλεύς Ἐγὼ δώσω. 7) καὶ

---

[a]See Appendix A for a facsimile of Codex Coislinianus.

[b]In verse 4, the 2d aorist indicative active 3d singular εἶπεν in the first hand of M has been written over as the 3d plural εἶπον to agree with its third plural subject.

11

12

ἐφείσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ Μεμφιβὸσθε υἱὸν Ἰωναθὰν υἱοῦ Σαοὺλ διὰ τὸν ὅρκον

Κυρίου τὸν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνα μέσον Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθὰν

υἱοῦ Σαούλ. 8) καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ῥεσφὰς θυγατρὸς Αἰὰ

παλλακῆς Σαοὺλ οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σαούλ, τὸν Ἑρμὸνθι καὶ τὸν Μεμφιβὸσθε, καὶ

τοὺς πέντε υἱοὺς τῆς Μερὸμ θυγατρὸς Σαοὺλ οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Ἐσδριὴλ υἱῷ

Βερζελλὶ τῷ Μοουλαθὶ, 9) καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβαωνιτῶν, καὶ

ἐξηλίασαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἔναντιον Κυρίου, καὶ ἔπεσον ἐκεῖ οἱ ἑπτὰ κατὰ

τὸ αὐτό· αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθανατώθησαν ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις, ἐν ἀρχῇ

θερισμοῦ κριθῶν. 10) καὶ ἔλαβεν Ῥεσφὰ θυγάτηρ Αἰὰ τὸν σάκκον καὶ

διέστρωσεν αὐτὸν αὐτῇ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν [ἕως]c

ἔσταξαν ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς ὕδατα θεοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ

οὐρανοῦ καταπαῦσαι ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἡμέρας καὶ τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ νυκτός.

11) καὶ ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Δαυεὶδ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν Ῥεσφὰ θυγάτηρ Αἰὰ

παλλακὴ Σαούλ· 12) καὶ ἐπορεύθη Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαοὺλ καὶ τὰ

ὀστᾶ Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν Ἰαβεὶς Γαλαάδ οἳ ἔκλεψαν

αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους Βαιθσάν, κρεμασάντων αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐπάταξαν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι τὸν Σαοὺλ ἐν Γελβούε. 13) καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν

ἐκεῖθεν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαοὺλ καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήγαγεν

τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἐξηλιασμένων. 14) καὶ ἔθαψαν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαοὺλ καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ

Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων ἐν γῇ Βενιαμεὶν ἐν τῇ

πλευρᾷ τοῦ τάφου Κεὶς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐποίησαν πάντα ὅσα

ἐνετείλατο ὁ Βασιλεύς· καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ γῇ μετὰ ταῦτα.

---

cIn verse 10, most MSS except Mns have ἕως here. Parablepsis probably caused ἕως to drop
out in the uncial period due to the similarity of ЄШСЄСТАꙀΑΝand ЄСТАꙀΑΝ   .

Translation of M and Notes[1]

1) And there was a famine[a] in the time of David,[b] for three years, year after year, and David sought the face of the Lord. The Lord said, "The guilt[c] [rests] upon Saul and upon his house because he killed the Gibeonites."

[a] L MSS have ἐν τῇ γῇ (oc₂e₂) and ἐπὶ τὴν γήν (b),"in/upon the land" after λιμός, "famine." It is impossible to know whether it is an interpolation or if it reflects a different Hebrew text with רעב בארץ. In either case, it heightens the resonance with 2Sam. 24:13.

[b] Here, and in many other places, M shows word-for-word parallelism to the 𝔐. That is, taking into account both common equivalents and word order, Codex Coislinianus seems to go back to a Hebrew text similar in many ways to the 𝔐. The first part of verse 1 is a good example of what is found throughout; M has καὶ ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Δαυειδ following 𝔐's וַיְהִי רָעָב בִּימֵי דָוִד. I will highlight only the places where M is different from 𝔐.

[c] In classical Greek, ἀδικία has the meanings "wrongdoing, unrighteousness" and "punishment of wrongdoing."[2] M seems to have a Hebrew different from 𝔐 here since ἀδικία is commonly opposite עון in the Hebrew Bible, especially in Samuel,[3] but never opposite דם as the 𝔐 has here. Twice in Samuel, ἀδικία is a calque for עון (1Sam. 20:8; 25:24), taking on the meaning "guilt," which it seems to have here but which it does not have in classical Greek.

---

[1] Throughout, I use lettered notes for text and translation explanations and I use numbered footnotes for Scripture reference tabulations and secondary references.

[2] LSJ 23

[3] ἀδικία occurs 12 times in Samuel, 8 of which are opposite עון: 1Sam. 3:13, 14; 20:8; 25:24; 28:10; 2Sam. 3:8; 14:32.

2) And David the king summoned the Gibeonites and spoke to them. Now[a] the Gibeonites are not Israelites but are from Amorite blood.[b] The Israelites swore an agreement with them, but[c] Saul had sought to strike them in his zeal for the Israelites and Judahites.

[a] Normally καί is not disjunctive but here it reflects the disjunctive Hebrew construction *waw* + a non-verb.

[b] αἵματος is difficult here. In context, it should mean something like "race" or "blood descent." It can mean "blood relationship" in both classical[4] and koine Greek (John 1:13), but the Hebrew equivalent דם never has this sense. McCarter believes that αἵματος results from a primitive transmissional error in the Greek: the Hebrew יתר was correctly rendered as λείμματος, "remnant," which was miscopied very early as αἵματος.[5] A few cursives actually have forms of λείμματος.[6]

[c] Normally καί is not adversative but here it follows the Hebrew which has *waw*.

3) And David said to the Gibeonites, "What shall I do for you? And with what shall I atone, that you may bless[a] the inheritance of the Lord?"

[a] εὐλογήσατε is the aorist imperative, "bless ye! (Israel's inheritance)." The Greek imperative corresponds exactly to m's piel imperative with *waw*, "to express with greater energy the intention signified by the preceding verb."[7]

---

[4] LSJ 38b

[5] McCarter, II Samuel, 437.

[6] efkmwx

[7] S. R. Driver, A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. 3d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1892), section 65.

4) The Gibeonites said to him, "We do not have [in mind] silver or gold regarding[a] Saul and regarding his house, nor do we have [in mind] a man to kill from all Israel." And he said, "What are you saying, that I might do it for you?"[b]

[a] μετά // עִם means "with, in connection with, regarding."

[b] The sense of Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε καὶ ποιήσω ὑμῖν is clear enough but the syntax is Hebraic and awkward. M follows word-for-word ℳ's מָה־אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים אֶעֱשֶׂה לָכֶם with one slight variation: M and most LXX MSS have καί before ποιήσω and ℳ has the minor disjunctive accent (tiphha) on אֹמְרִים instead of a waw on אֶעֱשֶׂה. All the Greek MSS have attempted to smooth out the slight awkwardness of the Hebrew, "What are you saying, I will do for you?" Taking ποιήσω as a future indicative, τί would be the object of both verbs, thus, "What do you say and what shall I do for you?" N has τί after M's καί and before ποιήσω to produce, "What are you saying, and what shall I do for you?" Taking ποιήσω as the aorist subjunctive 1st singular, the clearest English would be, "What are you saying, that I might do it for you?" L z^mg has θέλετε instead of λέγετε, "What do you want. . ."

5) And they said to the king, "The man who struck us[a] and persecuted us[b] and planned[c] to utterly destroy us-- let us wipe him out from him having standing[d] in all the territory of Israel.

[a] συνετέλεσεν ἡμᾶς certainly reflects ℳ's כִּלָּנוּ.[8] When כָּלָה is followed by an accusative of person it usually means, "to destroy, kill, wipe out."[9] This seems too strong for the context, unless it means, "He killed [some of] us." How can the Gibeonites speak

---

[8]συνετελέω occurs 14 times in Samuel, 13 times opposite כָּלָה: 1Sam. 10:13; 13:10; 15:18; 20:7; 20:9; 20:33; 24:17; 25:17; 2Sam. 6:18; 11:19; 13:36; 21:5; 22:38.

[9]Ex. 33:5; Ezek. 22:31; Zech. 5:4; Ps. 119:87; Lam. 2:22; 2Chr. 8:8

with David if they had been killed? I have translated it here with a slightly attenuated

meaning, "he struck us," as in Jer. 5:3 where συντελεῖν // כלה does not imply death.

b καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς would normally be opposite וַיִּרְדְּפֵנוּ[10] but M does not have

it. διώκειν means, "to pursue, chase,"[11] similar to רדף except רדף often includes the

sense of hostile intent and can also be translated "persecute."[12]

c λογίζειν // חשב is a standard locution to express intention and purpose;

λογίζειν occurs 84 times in the LXX, usually opposite חשב (72 times), but never דמה

which is M's word. The difference is not easily explained as a transmissional error. See the

discussion below in the interpretation of the stories.

d τοῦ μὴ ἑστάναι is the articular infinitive with the negative and is an acceptable

way to translate מֵהִתְיַצֵּב, M's infinitive construct with מן.[13] The masculine accusative

singular personal pronoun αὐτὸν points to a 3d singular suffix ו which M does not have.

The pronoun emphasizes Saul as the subject of the "standing" infinitive.

6) Give us seven men from his sons, and we will make atonement[a] by means of them to

the Lord on the hill[b] of Saul, [men] chosen[c] of the Lord." And the king said, "I will give."

a For the verb ἐξηλάσομεν, Brooke-McLean list ten additional variants, for a total

of eleven. I understood them to be variant forms of two verbs, ἐξηλιάζειν and

ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, in various spelling deviations, most of which involve the interchange of η

and ι or of indicative and subjunctive moods. Six of these, having the syllable -λι- and a

primary ending, are forms of ἐξηλιάζειν: ἐξηλιάσωμεν B; ἐξιλιάσομεν (ei[a?]w);

---

[10]διώκειν stands opposite רדף 58 of 75 times in the OT.

[11]LSJ 440

[12]BDB 922

[13]Gen. 16:2; 20:6; Ex. 14:5; Jdg. 9:41; 1Sam. 7:8; 8:7; 15:26; 25:26; 2Sam. 18:16; 1Kgs. 2:27; 2Kgs. 5:20; 23:33, et al.

ἐξιλάσομεν (m[mg]); ἐξηλιώσωμεν (44); ἐξαλιάσωμεν (a); ἐξηλιάσομαι (x). Two

others, having the syllable -λα- and a secondary ending, are clearly forms of

ἐξιλάσκεσθαι: ἐξιλασόμεθα (M[mg]b c₂e₂); ἐξιλασώμεθα (b'o). This leaves three forms

having the syllable -λα- which I take to be forms of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι but with primary

endings, something that happens in Hellenistic Greek: ἐξιλάσωμεν (gsvya₂); ἐξιλάσομεν

(fl'[uid]m[txt]qt); ἐξηλάσομεν (M [txt]). The texts with forms of ἐξηλιάζειν, "to hang in

the sun," (BA ael^a?m[mg]wx44) follow a Hebrew text like ℳ which has a form of הוקיע

(see also 2Sam. 21:9, 13). M and other MSS[14] which have forms of ἐξιλάσκεσθαι and

the 𝔏 seem to follow a Hebrew text with כפר, "to atone"; ἐξηλιάζειν stands opposite

כפר 78 of 88 times and never opposite הוקיע. Thus, the difference between the verbs is

not easily explained as a transmissional error in either Greek or Hebrew. I will discuss the

force of this verb later in the interpretation of the story.

b ἐν τῷ βουνῷ reflects the Hebrew בַּגִּבְעָה,[15] the same consonants but different

vowel pointing as ℳ's בְּגִבְעָה, "in Gibeah."

c M and all Greek MSS except Ax have the accusative plural adjective ἐκλεκτούς,

indicating that "chosen" refers to the Seven. ℳ has the singular bound form בְּחִירֵי,

indicating that Saul is "chosen of the Lord."

7) The king spared Memphibosthe son of Jonathan, son of Saul, because of the oath of the

Lord that was between them, between David and between Jonathan the son of Saul.

---

[14]M[mg] L gfl[uid]m[txt]qstvya²

[15] ἐν τῷ βουνῷ occurs 8 times in the LXX, 7 of which are opposite forms of גִּבְעָה
(1Sam. 7:1; 22:6; 23:19; 26:1,3; 2Sam. 6:3; Hos. 10:9) and once גֶּבַע (1Sam. 13:3).

8) The king took the two sons of Respha daughter of Aia, Saul's concubine, whom she bore to Saul,[a] Ermonthi and Memphibosthe, and the five sons of Merom,[b] daughter of Saul, whom she bore to Esdriel son of Berzellai, the Mooulathite.

[a] The definite article before personal names is common in Greek.[16] Sometimes they are anaphoristic but other times they are colloquial. They seem to be stylistic here.

[b] M and cursive mansucript g oddly write Μερομ instead of Μεροβ; the interchange of μ and β is a common cursive error, but not expected in the uncial hand. Many Greek MSS (Niz[txt] rell 246) have forms of Merab as the mother of the five sons, while a number have forms of Michal (ABhvxa₂emqstymz[mg]) in apparent internal conflict with the larger narrative. I discuss this issue below in the interpretation of 𝔐.

9) He handed them over to the Gibeonites, and they hung them in the sun[a] on the mountain before the Lord; the Seven fell there together.[b] They were killed in the first days of the harvest, at the beginning of the barley harvest.[c]

[a] By etymology, the verb ἐξηλιάζειν appears to mean "to make/put (-ζ-) out(side) (ἐκ-) in the sun (ἥλιος)." LSJ give no other instances except the passive in the lexicographer Hesychius. The rendering, "to hang in the sun as a form of torture," is plausible, although the idea of hanging probably comes from reading attributed to Symmachus, ἀνακρεμάσωμεν "to hang up." Aquila gives ἀναπήξωμεν "impale." Verse 14 refers to the slain men as τῶν ἡλιασθέντων, using the simple rather than the compound form, a verb known to have the meanings "bake, bask, expose in the sun."[17] It is not clear whether death came by exposure or whether exposure followed death.

---

[16]F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: The Univerity of Chicago Press, 1961), 135-136.

[17]LSJ 768

[b] οἱ ἐπτὰ reflect 𝔐's qere' שְׁבַעְתָּם. 𝔐's 3d plural suffix is implied. B has the more literal rendering of the qere' with οἱ ἐπτὰ αὐτοὶ.

[c] κατὰ τὸ αὐτό stands opposite יַחַד also in 1Sam. 11:11.

[d] M and some other MSS (ABN rell) have the ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις, a literal rendering of 𝔐's בִּימֵי קָצִיר בָּרִאשֹׁנִים. M(mg) and L have ἐν ἡμέραις ζειῶν. Brock argued persuasively that ζειῶν represents a transliteration of the old Canaanite month of Ziv.[18] Ziv coincided with the second month of the later Jewish calender, late April or early May, the time of the barley harvest. If Brock is correct, M's margin probably reflects an old Hebrew text with בִּימֵי זִו.

10) And Respha daughter of Aia, took sackcloth and spread it out[a] for herself upon the rock, at the beginning of the barley harvest [until] the waters of God dropped[b] upon them out of heaven. She did not let the birds of the sky[c] settle upon them by day nor the beasts of the field by night.

[a] M's διέστρωσεν means "to spread (a bed)"[19] but M's margin has ἔπηξεν "fixed, stretched (i.e. a tent)"[20] agreeing with 𝔐's נטה, offering a different description of what Rizpah did with the sackcloth. We take this up below.

[b] στάζειν means "to drop, let fall, fall in drops, drip, trickle"[21] and refers to "rain" three times: once opposite נתך (Ex. 9:33) and twice opposite נטף (Jdg. 5:4; Ps. 67:9). In each case, rain, or lack thereof, is the result of divine intervention. Thus, M's ἔσταξαν was probably opposite 𝔐's נתך and the rain that came is understood to be an act of God.

---

[18] S. P. Brock. "An Unrecognised Occurrence of the Month Name ZIW [2 Sam. XXI 9]." VT 23 [1973], 100-103.

[19] LSJ 413

[20] LSJ 1399

[21] LSJ 1632.

^c τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ and τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ reflect m's עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם and חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה respectively since the Hebrew construct noun never takes the definite article. The same pattern occurs later in this verse and fifteen times in vv. 11-14.

11) And it was reported to David, all that Respha daughter of Aia, Saul's concubine, had done.

12) And David went and took the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son from the men of Jabesh Gilead, who had stolen them from the wall of Baithsan after the Philistines had hung them there at the time[a] the Philistines struck down Saul in Gilboa.

[a] The relative pronoun ᾗ which occurs in all Greek MSS except L after ἐν ἡμέρᾳ is stylistic; The relative pronoun occurs elsewhere in the LXX where it is absent in the Hebrew.[22]

13) And he brought up from there the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son, and he gathered up the bones of those who had been hanged in the sun.

14) They buried the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son, and the bones of those having been exposed to the sun,[a] in the land of Benjamin, in the side[b] of the tomb[c] of Kish his father. They did all that the king commanded, and God hearkened[d] to the land after these things.

[a] The m does not have a text opposite M's phrase καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων. All LXX MSS except L have the rare verb ἡλιάζω, "bake in the sun, bask

---

[22]Ezra 6:9; Psa. 17:1; Eccl. 12:3; Song 8:8; Jer. 7:22; 11:4; Ezek. 36:33; 38:18.

in the sun, ferment."[23] L uses the aforementioned verb, ἐξηλιάζω, "hang in the sun"[24] to describe the bones. B does not mention τὰ ὀστᾶ, "the bones," at all, probably for stylistic reasons.

b All LXX MSS misread the place name בְּצֵלַע, "in Zela" as ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ (בְּצֵלַע), "in the side." This probably occured because the LXX translator was unaware of the uncommon place name צֵלַע, mentioned only in Josh. 18:28, and because πλευρα stands opposite צֵלַע elsewhere.[25]

c M probably improved the Greek style here by using the genitive case τοῦ τάφου, instead of the dative case which is expected by בְּקֶבֶר as in B's ἐν τῷ τάφῳ.

d ἐπακούω means "to listen to, obey, hear" and where it is opposite נֶעְתַּר, as here, it carries with it the sense of God responding to entreaty.[26] It refers to God "listening to the land" only here and in 2Sam. 24:25.

---

[23]LSJ 768

[24]LSJ 593

[25]Gen. 2:21, 22; Num. 16:13; 2Sam. 16:13; 1Kgs. 6:8, 15; 2Kgs. 7:3; Ezra 41:5, 7, 8, 9 (2 times)

[26]Gen. 25:21; 1Chr. 5:20; 2Chr. 33:13, 19

Interpretation of M

The story opens by reporting a prolonged famine and David's devout prayer in response to it. David does not request an oracle or seek a cause of the country's distress.[27] He "seeks the Lord's face," exactly as 2Chr. 7:14 calls on God's people to do under similar circumstances:

> When I shut up the heavens so that there is no rain . . . if my people who are called by my name humble themselves, pray, seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land.[28]

The divine word that comes to David is specific and clear, "Guilt [rests] upon Saul and upon his house because he killed the Gibeonites." When did Saul kill the Gibeonites? Neither this story nor the larger narrative have any such episode.

The divine word implies the biblical understanding that guilt for shedding innocent blood affects all Israelites and must be atoned for (Dt. 19:11-13; 21:1-9). The divine word also assumes that famine is a natural consequence for failing to atone for the slain, similar to the curses for disobeying the Lord and his commands as described in Dt. 28:23-24, "The sky over your head shall be bronze, and the earth under you iron. The Lord will change the rain of your land into powder, and only dust shall come down upon you from the sky until you are destroyed."

In response to the divine word, David brings the Gibeonites in for talks. At this point, the narrative breaks with two clauses of background information, referring to the Gibeonites' ethnic difference from Israel—they are related by blood to the old Amorite

---

[27]In L David seeks a prophetic word; καὶ ῥῆμα ἐζήτει Δαυεὶδ παρὰ Κυρίου, "And David sought a word from the Lord." The difference between L and the rest of the Greek MSS is not the result of an error in the transmissional process. L either follows a different Hebrew text with ויבקש דבר דוד מאת־יהוה or it was an intentional change for emphasis.

[28]All biblical quotes will be from the NRSV unless otherwise stated.

stock--and to Israel's treaty with them. Josh. 9 describes how the Gibeonites resorted to a

ruse to acquire the treaty that spared them destruction at the time of the Israelite settlement.

Even after their trickery was discovered, the Israelites would not violate the treaty by

attacking the Gibeonites, because the wrath of God would come on those who did so

(Josh. 9:19-20).

The story then describes Saul's motive in striking the Gibeonites, resulting in the

violation of the treaty; he did it ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι αὐτὸν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ

Ἰούδα, "in his zeal for the sons of Israel and Judah." ἐν plus the articular infinitive

expresses Saul's state of being zealous, just as ℼ's בְּ followed by the piel infinitive

construct קַנְאָת. ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι occurs only in Num. 25:11 and 2Kgs. 10:16, both of

which are contexts where those zealous for the Lord kill Israelites who worshipped other

gods. Saul strikes the Gibeonites because of his zeal for the "Israelites and Judahites."

David asks the Gibeonites what he might do for them and how he will "atone." The

meaning of "atone" in the context is ambiguous. Normally atonement means "to expiate an

offense" against God. As such, it is almost exclusively the work of priests[29] and is

associated with bloodshed, usually of animals but sometimes of humans (Num. 25:13;

35:33). Atonement, however, can also mean "to appease," what Jacob attempted to do by

sending flocks and herds to his estranged brother Esau upon his return to the land of

Canaan (Gen. 32:21). The Gibeonites seem to be aware of the ambiguity of what David

means by "atone" as I will discuss below.

David goes on to command the Gibeonites to "bless the inheritance of the Lord."

"To bless" means to articulate best wishes.[30] The phrase "inheritance of the Lord" can be

---

[29]ἐξιλάσκομαι // כפר is almost exclusively used in reference to a priest making atonement on behalf of another Israelite or the people as a whole. In Leviticus, the pair ἐξιλάσκομαι // כפר is used 46 times, exclusively of priests making atonement, with one exception where Moses is asked to make atonement (Lev. 8:15); and, Moses too is from a Levitical family.

[30]BDB 139b

inferred from usage elsewhere. God's "inheritance" in the Pentateuch is associated with both the land (Ex. 15:17) and the people (Ex. 34:9). The expression κληρονομία κυρίου // נחלת יהוה occurs four other times in the Hebrew Bible, three of which are in Samuel (1Sam. 26:19; 2Sam. 14:16; 20:19). In these passages, κληρονομία κυρίου refers to the entire way of life distinctive to a group of people who are linked by ties of blood and common loyalty to the Lord. For example, in 1Sam. 26:19, David said to Saul after sparing his life, "They (men) have driven me out today from my share in the *heritage of the Lord*, saying, 'Go, serve other gods.'" The social linkage is very strong, and religious trust in Israel's God is an essential factor. Exclusion from the Lord's heritage brings isolation and vulnerability while inclusion in the Lord's heritage brings social cohesion and support. Thus, to "bless the Lord's heritage," means to accept Israel's whole culture, including the people, the land, and the God who creates it. By this language, David invites the Gibeonites to affirm their commitment to Israelite tradition, not just to be a people in a privileged treaty relationship. Thus, David offers them some form of restitution for the wrongs Saul did against them, with the understanding that they will enter fully into Israelite life, culture, and faith.

In the palaver that follows (vv. 4-6), David urges the Gibeonites to say what restitution they want. Aware of the ambiguity of David's word "atone," they hint at either a financial or a corporal settlement. Their reference to killing "a man from all Israel" attracts attention in this context, since the Gibeonites subsequently kill Saul's sons. Do the Gibeonites consider Saul an Israelite? Perhaps M's story hints at what the Chronicler subtly alleges by Saul's genealogy, that Saul was not from native Israelite but from Canaanite stock. Saul is the only person in Chronicles whose ancestry does not go back to one of Jacob's twelve sons, but rather to the founders of a place, "Gibeon"-- a non-Israelite city at

that.[31] Recall that, when the tribes of Israel approached David at Hebron to become king, they included the appeal, "We are your own flesh and blood" (2Sam. 5:1). Thus Saul—an ethnic outsider by some views—unjustly and unrighteously attempts to kill off other outsiders, but instead receives the loss of his own posterity.

Whether David is expected to know the subtlety of the request by the Gibeonites or not, he asks the Gibeonites, "What are you saying, that I might do it for you?" In response the Gibeonites stack up charges against Saul without ever mentioning his name; he is the man who struck them, pursued them, and planned to utterly destroy them. Saul is depicted as an aggressive, persistent, and calculating destroyer of the Gibeonites. By specifically using the word "pursued", the Gibeonites expose Saul's thoughts about the them; elsewhere in Samuel, only enemies are "pursued."[32] And so, Saul "plans" to utterly destroy the Gibeonites just as he does his perceived enemies elsewhere in the narrative (1Sam. 18:25).

The Gibeonites state that they wish for the death of seven of Saul's descendants. Then, of first importance, as in all LXX MSS, the object of the withering verb "wipe out" is Saul. Saul is long dead. Thus, the desire to "wipe him out" refers to the destruction of his offspring, and to his disappearance from Israel's memory. The dischronological location of this story within the larger narrative of Samuel also serves the same purpose, to suppress Saul in Israel's memory. Although this story may have once stood with the other conflict stories between the houses of Saul and David (2Sam. 2-4, 9),[33] its location in the final four

---

[31]Walters, "Saul of Gibeon," 75.

[32]2Sam. 18:16; 20:7, 10, 13; 22:38; 24:13

[33]The position of 2Sam. 21 after ch. 20 is not sequential. Although 2Sam. 21:1 does not indicate at which point in David's reign the famine occurred, the content of 2Sam. 21:1-14 best fits chronologically before 2Sam. 9:1 and 16:7-8. 2Sam. 9:1 states, "Is there anyone left in the house of Saul...?" In 2Sam. 16:7-8 Shimei shouted while he cursed, "Out! Out! Murderer! Scoundrel! The Lord has avenged on all of you the blood of the house of Saul, in whose place you have reigned; and the Lord has given the kingdom into the hand of your son Absalom. See, disaster has overtaken you; for you are a man of blood" (NRSV). Furthermore, its context near the end of 2 Samuel interrupts the so-called "Succession

chapters of Samuel, where David and Saul are contrasted and where David is viewed in messianic terms (2Sam. 22:51; 23:1), serves effectively to obscure Saul in Israel's memory.

The phrase "in all the territory of Israel" is an expression distinctive of the Former Prophets,[34] occurring in contexts where thoroughness and inclusiveness are important. Here the phrase emphasizes the thoroughness with which the Gibeonites wish to wipe out Saul's family.

And so, the Gibeonites command David and the Israelites to give them seven sons. The directness of the Gibeonites is shocking. How are subservient non-Israelites able to command an Israelite king and the Israelites? The manuscript tradition is mixed on this. In MSS NA and 4QSam[a] (וּתְנָה־) the Gibeonites address David directly (2d person), over against most of the variants, which are passive or indefinite showing the Gibeonites more cautious and discreet. L and TJ have the 3d plural passive δοτώθησαν and יֻתַּן, "Let them be given"; the qere' (יֻתַּן) and ketiv of (יֻתַּן) יח are 3d singular passives, "Let there be given." B[hx] have the indefinite 3d singular active imperative δότω, "Let him (someone) give." I will comment on this below. Nonetheless, in M the Gibeonites do command David and the Israelites.

Perhaps their boldness is acceptable because of their expressed purpose, to "make atonement by them to the Lord." Atonement in the context certainly means "to expiate an offense" against Israel's God. This is shocking. Can non-Israelites atone? The Gibeonite

---

Narrative" (Leonard Rost, The Succession to the Throne of David, tr. by Michael D. Rutter and David M. Gunn; Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1982.) Far from a haphazard "appendix", the six elements of the final four chapters form an intentional chiastic structure at the end of Samuel (2Sam. 21:1-14 and 24:1-25; 21:15-22 and 23:8-39; 22:1-51 and 23:1-7); cf. R. A. Carlson, David the Chosen King (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell, 1964), 194-259; Brevard S. Childs, Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), 273-75; Gerald Sheppard, Wisdom As a Hermeneutical Construct (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980), 144-58; Walter Brueggemann, "An Appendix of Deconstruction?" CBQ 50 (1988): 383-397.

[34]Jdg. 19:29; 1Sam. 11:3, 7; 27:1; 2Sam. 21:5; 1Kgs 1:3; 2Kgs 10:32; 1Chr. 21:12. The phrase is a plus in 1Chr. 21:12 compared to its parallel in 2Sam. 24:13.

request hints at what is stated explicitly in Num. 35:33, that land polluted by murder can be expiated only by the killing of the murderer, "You shall not pollute the land in which you live; for blood pollutes the land, and no expiation can be made for the land, for the blood that is shed in it, except by the blood of the one who shed it (Num. 35:33). The death of the sons can expiate the land because the guilt rests upon Saul and upon his house. The Gibeonites can command Israelites, even King David, to give the Seven because their executions are not a crude *lex talionis* retribution but an attempt to satisfy God so that the land may be cleansed.

The location of the killing is to be ἐν τῷ βούνῳ Σαοὺλ, "on the hill of Saul," presumably the "hill" associated with Saul elsewhere in Samuel (1Sam. 10:10; 23:19; 26:1). The Hebrew consonants opposite ἐν τῷ βούνῳ, which m points differently, associates this place with Gibeah. This association connects the executions both with Saul's initial charismatic introduction into the kingship, and with certain of his hostile military operations. We return later to those texts that read "Gibeon" here.

Far from acting on their own authority in selecting the Seven, the Gibeonites invoke God's agency; the sons are to be "chosen of the Lord." The Gibeonites may demand the sons, but it is the Lord who chooses. It is wise strategically for them to keep the burden of these deaths off themselves, and they intimate the use of some form of selection involving God's direction (such as the lot).

After this David says, "I will give." It is the King's only word or act of assent in the whole proposal leading to the deaths of the Seven. The Gibeonites command David to give, the sons will be chosen by the Lord, and David promises to give. Thus, the decision to wipe out Saul's clan was clearly the Gibeonites' and not David's. In this way, David remains at some slight distance from the violence and is able to keep his oath with Saul not to cut off Saul's descendants or wipe out Saul's name (1Sam. 24:22-23).

In selecting the seven men to be executed, David also keeps his sacred oath to Jonathan (1Sam. 20:14-17) by sparing the royal son Mephibosheth; he delivers to the Gibeonites seven other male offspring of Saul. The mother of the first two sons is Rizpah, specifically described here as the concubine of Saul. Rizpah's sons are named: Ermonthi and Mephibosthe. The name of the second mother is Merab, Saul's daughter and the wife of Esdriel son of Barzillai of Meholah (1Sam. 18:19), and her sons are left anonymous. Listing Rizpah first gives her unexpected prominence in the story. As a concubine, Rizpah is a woman of lesser social status than Merab. Furthermore, she has a politicized sexual history, having been accused of sleeping with Saul's general, Abner, after Saul's death (2Sam. 3:7). Merab, on the other hand, is one of Saul's daughters who was once promised to David for a wife (1Sam. 18:17) but was given to Adriel the Meholathite (1Sam. 18:19).[35] And yet her sons are not named.

David fulfills his promise to give and the Gibeonites execute the Seven by hanging them in the sun "before the Lord", that is, as offerings intended to expiate Saul's sin that has brought on the famine. The executions are "on the hill"; again, the story is vague about the topography, but the expression is syntactically definite, and the presumption is that it refers to the "hill of Saul" / "Gibeah of Saul" as in 2Sam. 21:6.

A chronological note places the executions at the beginning of the barley harvest but is interrupted by an account of Rizpah's response to the executions. She expresses her grief

---

[35]M has a *lacuna* from 1Sam. 14:27-25:32. The MSS are split about Merab's history. B does not have 1Sam. 18:17-19 whereas A L many cursive MSS and 𝔐 describe Saul promising to give Merab to David. B, having escaped the systematic hexaplaric revisions, is usually considered the best representative of the OG in 1Sam. 1-2Sam. 11[10] where it is not corrupt. Where B is defective, MN+ are often of great value for establishing it; (Sebastian Brock, The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of 1 Samuel [Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1996, 306]). Because of M's *lacuna*, the value of B is difficult to establish here. The minus in B might be the result of an attempt to remove apparent contradictions (Stephen Pisano, S.J. Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984], 78-86) and therefore less original (Wellhausen, Die Text der Bücher Samuelis, 104ff; McCarter, 1 Samuel, 308-309; NAB, NRSV) or it might be more original (Thenius, Die Bücher, 68; Driver, Notes, 150; RSV; NEB; 𝔐). Furthermore, because of the *lacuna*, it is impossible to know whether M's "Merom" is internally congruent with its narrative.

by her use of sackcloth.[36] M's text states that Rizpah "spread"[37] sackcloth (as a bed) for

herself upon the rock. M's margin agrees with B and 𝔐 which describe Rizpah as

"stretching" sackcloth (as a tent) to the rock. Lying on sackcloth, although unusual, is an

extravagant act of mourning.[38]

By repetition of the words "in the beginning of the harvest," the story returns to the

passage of time. Rizpah's vigil begins with the barley harvest and lasts until "the waters of

God poured down upon them out of heaven;" the famine ended when Rizpah's action

moved God to send rain. By the time the barley is ripe, rainfall is not expect nor wanted;

the weather is normally dry from the barley harvest until the early rains come in the

autumn. The expression, "God's waters," seems to imply unusual and divine rainfall.

Thus, the story links the end of the drought and famine with Rizpah's maternal piety and

her heroic vigil.

Rizpah did not allow the bodies to be exposed to birds and beasts of prey. Her

actions have two effects on the story. First, exposure of bodies to birds and beasts of prey

is a biblical curse upon apostates.[39] Rizpah prevents this curse from being carried out on

Saul's descendants. Saul may have disobeyed the prophet Samuel and been rejected as

king, but he was not an apostate. Second, the report of her actions has a direct effect upon

David, propelling him into action. The narrative recalls that the Philistines, after they had

killed Saul and his sons on Mt. Gilboa, dishonored their bodies by impaling them on the

---

[36]Sackcloth is a rough cloth worn by mourners on the occasion of someone's death (Gen. 37:34; 42:25; 2Sam. 3:31) and for personal or other social disasters (Joel 1:8, 18; Is. 15:3; Jer. 4:8; 6:26; 48:37; 49:3; Est. 4:1-4). Sometimes sackcloth was worn to express contrition for disasters predicted by the prophetic word (1Kgs. 21:27; Jon. 3:5-6, 8) and may also have penitential associations (Dan. 9:3; Neh. 9:1).

[37]LSJ 413d

[38]Lying on sackcloth occurs also in Est. 4:3 during a time of the threat of national disaster.

[39]Dt. 28:26; Jer. 7:33; 15:3; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20

wall of Bethshan (1Sam. 31:10-12). In a nighttime raid, the residents of Jabesh-Gilead—

who owed the well-being of their city to Saul (1Sam. 11:1-11)—captured the bodies for

their own city, where they burned the bodies, interred the bones, and fasted for seven days

(1Sam. 31:13). David was prompted by Rizpah's actions to take those bones from the

Jabesh-Gileadites.

The opening lines of this story located the cause of the famine in guilt over Saul's

zealous Israelite chauvinism. Saul and Jonathan did not receive proper burial at the time of

their deaths. For a king to remain unburied or to remain outside his expected resting place

was a particular dishonor, noted in Chronicles for Jehoram (2Chr. 21:20), Joash (2Chr.

24:25), and Ahaz (2Chr. 28:27). Jason was later similarly dishonored (2Macc. 5:10). The

narrative is concerned that this not be true of Saul.[40]

David brought the bones of Saul and Jonathan back across the Jordan for burial in

the tomb of Kish, Saul's father. He also gathered up the bones of the Seven, and had them

buried also in the ancestral tomb.

Furthermore, David's burial of the bones is full of symbolic importance, both

because burials were not ordinarily to be disturbed, and because burial in a proper location

is a form of honor (Gen. 49:29-50:14; Josh. 24:32); on the other hand, not being properly

buried was considered punishment from God (1Kgs. 13:21-22). The only other instance of

moving bones in the Bible is the transport of Joseph's bones when Israel went out of

Egypt. Thus, David's action is rich in the overtones of hope and restoration.

The story closes by asserting that God hearkened to the cry of the land after they

had done everything the king had commanded. It is clear from this that the famine—

associated somehow with divine displeasure—was due to more than Saul's violence but

---

[40]Walters, "Childless Michal," 293.

also arose from David's neglect of the bones of Saul and Jonathan. The completion of the

burial brings hope and potential restoration for the people and the land.

CHAPTER 3

INTERPRETATION OF THE MASORETIC TEXT'S
VERSION OF 2 SAMUEL 21:1-14

The Text of 𝔐[a]

1) וַיְהִי רָעָב בִּימֵי דָוִד שָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים שָׁנָה אַחֲרֵי שָׁנָה וַיְבַקֵּשׁ דָּוִד אֶת־פְּנֵי יְהוָה

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־שָׁאוּל וְאֶל־בֵּית הַדָּמִים עַל־אֲשֶׁר־הֵמִית אֶת־הַגִּבְעֹנִים: 2) וַיִּקְרָא

הַמֶּלֶךְ לַגִּבְעֹנִים וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם וְהַגִּבְעֹנִים לֹא מִבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הֵמָּה כִּי אִם־מִיֶּתֶר

הָאֱמֹרִי וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל נִשְׁבְּעוּ לָהֶם וַיְבַקֵּשׁ שָׁאוּל לְהַכֹּתָם בְּקַנֹּאתוֹ לִבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל

וִיהוּדָה: 3) וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל־הַגִּבְעֹנִים מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה לָכֶם וּבַמָּה אֲכַפֵּר וּבָרְכוּ

אֶת־נַחֲלַת יְהוָה: 4) וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ הַגִּבְעֹנִים אֵין־לָי[b] כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב עִם־שָׁאוּל וְעִם־בֵּיתוֹ

וְאֵין־לָנוּ אִישׁ לְהָמִית בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּאמֶר מָה־אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים אֶעֱשֶׂה לָכֶם: 5) וַיֹּאמְרוּ

אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר כִּלָּנוּ וַאֲשֶׁר דִּמָּה־לָנוּ נִשְׁמַדְנוּ מֵהִתְיַצֵּב בְּכָל־גְּבֻל יִשְׂרָאֵל:

6) יֻתַּן[c]־לָנוּ שִׁבְעָה אֲנָשִׁים מִבָּנָיו וְהוֹקַעֲנוּם לַיהוָה בְּגִבְעַת שָׁאוּל בְּחִיר יְהוָה

וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲנִי אֶתֵּן: 7) וַיַּחְמֹל הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל־מְפִיבֹשֶׁת בֶּן־יְהוֹנָתָן בֶּן־שָׁאוּל

עַל־שְׁבֻעַת יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר בֵּינֹתָם בֵּין דָּוִד וּבֵין יְהוֹנָתָן בֶּן־שָׁאוּל: 8) וַיִּקַּח הַמֶּלֶךְ

---

[a] See Appendix B for a facsimile of Leningrad Codex B 19[A].

[b] The *ketiv* (לִי) allows the statement to be made by one man, where the *qere'* (לָנוּ) requires it to be made on behalf of all of them. Böstrom writes, "*Q[ere']* has the plur. to correspond with the latter part of the verse, where we read וְאֵין לָנוּ. The whole speech of the Gibeonites could have been put either in the sing. or plur. with propriety. The sing. would then have been considered as representing the statement of an individual voicing the sentiment of the mass. It is probable that in this verse some authorities had אֵין לִי in both places, and others אֵין לָנוּ. In order to preserve both these readings one אֵין לִי and אֵין לָנוּ were kept in the text;" Otto Böstrom, Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel (Rock Island, Ill: Augustana, 1918), 56.

[c] The *qere'* יֻתַּן shows that יֻתַּן is a mixture of two forms of נתן: the niphal imperfect 3d masculine singular יִנָּתֵן and the qal passive 3d masculine singular יֻתַּן. Both the *ketiv* and *qere'* are translated virtually the same, "Let there be given." 4QSam[a] has the plural ונתתם, "You shall give".

32

אֶת־שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי רִצְפָּה בַת־אַיָּה אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה לְשָׁאוּל אֶת־אַרְמֹנִי וְאֶת־מְפִבֹשֶׁת

וְאֶת־חֲמֵשֶׁת בְּנֵי מִיכַל בַּת־שָׁאוּל אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה לְעַדְרִיאֵל בֶּן־בַּרְזִלַּי הַמְּחֹלָתִי:

9) וַיִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד הַגִּבְעֹנִים וַיֹּקִיעֻם בָּהָר לִפְנֵי יְהֹוָה וַיִּפְּלוּ שְׁבַעְתָּים ⁴ יָחַד

וְהֵם הֻמְתוּ ᶠ בִּימֵי קָצִיר בָּרִאשֹׁנִים ᵉ תְּחִלַּת קְצִיר שְׂעֹרִים: 10) וַתִּקַּח

רִצְפָּה בַת־אַיָּה אֶת־הַשַּׂק וַתַּטֵּהוּ לָהּ אֶל־הַצּוּר מִתְּחִלַּת קָצִיר עַד נִתַּךְ־מַיִם

עֲלֵיהֶם מִן־הַשָּׁמָיִם וְלֹא־נָתְנָה עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם לָנוּחַ עֲלֵיהֶם יוֹמָם וְאֶת־חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה

לָיְלָה: 11) וַיֻּגַּד לְדָוִד אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עָשְׂתָה רִצְפָּה בַת־אַיָּה פִּלֶגֶשׁ שָׁאוּל:

12) וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִד וַיִּקַּח אֶת־עַצְמוֹת שָׁאוּל וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹת יְהוֹנָתָן בְּנוֹ מֵאֵת בַּעֲלֵי

יָבֵישׁ גִּלְעָד אֲשֶׁר גָּנְבוּ אֹתָם מֵרְחֹב בֵּית־שַׁן אֲשֶׁר תְּלָאוּם שָׁמָּ הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים ᵍ בְּיוֹם

הַכּוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֶת־שָׁאוּל בַּגִּלְבֹּעַ: 13) וַיַּעַל מִשָּׁם אֶת־עַצְמוֹת שָׁאוּל וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹת

יְהוֹנָתָן בְּנוֹ וַיַּאַסְפוּ אֶת־עַצְמוֹת הַמּוּקָעִים: 14) וַיִּקְבְּרוּ אֶת־עַצְמוֹת־שָׁאוּל

וִיהוֹנָתָן־בְּנוֹ בְּאֶרֶץ בִּנְיָמִן בְּצֵלָע בְּקֶבֶר קִישׁ אָבִיו וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־צִוָּה הַמֶּלֶךְ

וַיֵּעָתֵר אֱלֹהִים לָאָרֶץ אַחֲרֵי־כֵן:

ᵈ The *qere'* שְׁבַעְתָּם, "seven of them" was probably an explanatory gloss for the *ketiv*, שְׁבַעְתָּיִם "seven times," to make better sense in the context.

ᵉ The initial consonant is absent in the *ketiv* of ℑℜ whereas the *qere'* has the initial consonant בּ. Loss of בּ is probably the result of a transmissional error, although H. P. Smith argues that תחלת is perfectly intelligible as the accusative of circumstance, without the preposition; (Henry Preserved Smith, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1899], 376.)

ᶠ The *qere'* וְהֵמָּה מֵתוּ, "And these died" preserves a different division of the same letters and hence an alternative reading for the *ketiv* וְהֵםָ הֻמְתוּ, "And they were put to death."

ᵍ The *qere'* שָׁמָּה פְלִשְׁתִּים preserves a different division of the same letters but the meaning is the same.

Translation and Notes of ‫תז‬

1) And there was a famine in the days of David for three years, year after year, and David

sought the face of the Lord. The Lord said, "To Saul and to the house of blood,[a] because

he killed the Gibeonites."

[a]Although the expression ‫בֵּית הַדָּמִים‬ does not occur elsewhere, similar

expressions do: ‫אִישׁ הַדָּמִים‬[1] and ‫עִיר הַדָּמִים‬.[2] Judging from these similar expressions,

the phrase "house of blood" would mean something like "murderous house."

2) And the king summoned the Gibeonites and he spoke to them.[a] Now the Gibeonites are

not Israelites but from the remainder[b] of the Amorites.[c] The Israelites had sworn an

agreement[d] with them, but Saul sought to strike[e] them in his zeal for the Israelites and

Judahites.

[a] The phrase ‫וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם‬, normally followed by direct discourse, is interrupted

by two disjunctive clauses providing parenthetical information about the Gibeonites.

[b] ‫יֶתֶר‬ can imply "inferiority in number or quality."[3]

[c] The term "Amorites" is used both specifically of one tribe among others which

inhabited Canaan,[4] and generally for the inhabitants of Canaan prior to the Israelites.[5] The

latter seems to be implied here.

---

[1]2Sam. 16:7, 8; Ps. 5:6; 26:9; 55:23; 59:2; 139:19; Prov. 29:10

[2]Jer. 19:4; Ezek. 22:2; 24:6, 9; Nah. 3:1

[3]BDB 451b

[4]Gen. 10:16; Ex. 33:2

[5]Gen. 48:22; Josh. 24:15

ᵈ The nif'al נִשְׁבַּע followed by לְ plus a person, without a specific referent to what one is swearing, means "to swear allegiance to."[6]

ᵉ הִכָּה can mean either "to strike, beat" or "to strike, to kill." The context seems to demand the latter meaning.

3) And David said to the Gibeonites, "What can I do for you? And with what will I atone, that you may bless[a] the inheritance[b] of the Lord?"

ᵃ וּבָרְכוּ, the piel imperative with a waw preformative is unusual in a narrative sequence to express result. The only other place the specific form וּבָרְכוּ occurs, it is in sequence with another imperative, "Lift up your hands... and bless the Lord" (Ps. 134:2). It occurs similarly in Neh. 9:5 without the waw, "Stand up and bless the Lord your God" (קוּמוּ בָּרְכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה). The converted perfect וּבֵרַכְתֶּם (Ex. 12:32) or the imperfect תְּבָרֲכוּ (Num. 6:23) would be smoother; thus, B's καὶ εὐλογήσετε. GK §110i cites parallels where imperatives with a waw in an interrogative sentence express "a consequence which is to be expected with certainty." Everywhere else the plural piel imperative בָּרְכוּ occurs, "God", "the Lord" or "His name" is the object.[7] I will return to this in the interpretation.

ᵇ Elsewhere when נַחֲלָה "inheritance" occurs as a bound form with "Lord" or synonyms for "the Lord", it refers either to the people of Israel[8] or to the land of promise.[9] As already mentioned, the phrase, "inheritance of the Lord" refers to the entire way of life

---

[6]Josh. 9:15, 18, 19, 20; 2Kgs. 25:24; Is. 19:18; Jer. 40:9; Ezek. 16:8; 2Chr. 15:14

[7]Jdg. 5:2,9; 2Sam. 21:3; Ps. 66:8, 27; 96:2; 100:4; 103:20, 21, 22; 134:1, 2; 135:19, 20; Neh. 9:5; 1Chr. 29:20

[8]1Sam. 10:1; 2Sam. 14:16; 1Kgs. 8:51, 53; 2Kgs. 21:14; Jer. 10:16; 28:19

[9]1Sam. 26:19; 2Sam. 20:19

distinctive to the Israelites which includes not only the land but also a common loyalty to God and God's people.

4) The Gibeonites said to him, "We do not have [in mind][a] silver or gold regarding Saul and regarding his house, nor do we have [in mind] to kill a man in Israel." And he said, "What are you saying? I will do [it] for you."

[a] אֵין followed by לְ probably expresses obligation.

5) And they said to the king, "The man who assaulted us[a] [b] and who devised against us[c] [so that] we were wiped out[d] from having standing[e] in all the territory of Israel.

[a] As already mentioned, the basic meaning of כלה is "to complete, finish."[10] This sense, however, is too strong for the context. McCarter has called it "impossible and obviously defective."[11] Anderson translates it, "who (nearly) annihilated us."[12] The Gibeonites clearly were not wiped out since they speak with David. It seems best to give it an attenuated meaning here, as in Jer. 5:3: הִכִּיתָה אֹתָם וְלֹא־חָלוּ כִּלִּיתָם מֵאֲנוּ קַחַת מוּסָר, "You have struck them, but they sensed no pain; You have consumed them, but they would accept no discipline."

[b] All LXX MSS have forms of καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς reflecting a Hebrew וַיִּרְדְּפֵנוּ but MT does not have it. Although haplography due to either homoioteleuton or homoioarchton might explain the loss since וַיִּרְדְּפֵנוּ is after כִּלָּנוּ and before וְאֲשֶׁר, the cumulative affect of this minus with other differences between the MT and the LXX versions, points to ideological and theological interests rather than transmissional error.

---

[10] See page 15.

[11] McCarter. II Samuel, 438.

[12] Anderson, 2 Samuel, 246-247.

c The piel form of רִמָּה means "to liken, compare" or "to think, intend." The translation takes up the latter meaning, although רמה followed by לְ plus the substantive does not occur elsewhere. Judges 20:5 is not a parallel, as argued by Driver and Budde, since לְ introduces an infinitive, not a pronoun or a noun.[13] The *atnach* on לָנוּ and the apodosis of the sentence seem to expect an infinitive like לְהִשָּׁמְרֵנוּ. Wellhausen proposed stages in the texts decay -- לְהִשָּׁמְרֵנוּ became לְנִשְׁמְרֵנוּ, which later became לָנוּ נִשְׁמְרֵנוּ[14] -- but he does not explain how scribal lapses can account for the changes. As is, דִּמָּה־לָנוּ is awkward but readable. It should be translated something like, "the one who devised against us."

d 𝔐's vocalization of the consonants נשׁמרנו, as a nif'al perfect 1st common plural נִשְׁמַדְנוּ, required a translation "we were wiped out." According to 𝔐, the subject of the verb is clearly the Gibeonites but the parataxis is so sharp that the meaning of the sentence is awkward, "The man who assaulted us, and who planned against us--we were wiped out from having standing anywhere in Israel--let seven sons be given to us." If נשׁמדנו were instead vocalized as the hif'il imperfect 1st common plural with a 3d plural suffix נַשְׁמִדֵנּוּ, the sentence would read more smoothly, "The man who assaulted us, and who planned against us, let us wipe him out from having standing . . ." Also, the *atnach* that stands on the previous word לָנוּ, "against us", would be exactly right, since the words that follow in the second half of the sentence are the natural apodosis of the first half. This is exactly the meaning of the LXX's ἀφανίσωμεν. Thus, 𝔐 provides an awkward and different way of reading the story than the LXX. We will pick this up below in the interpretation.

e יצב occurs only in the hithpa'el and means "to station oneself, to take one's stand." BDB 426b suggests "having a place or position."

---

[13]Driver, Notes, 350; Budde, Die Bücher Samuel, 307.

[14]Wellhausen, Die Text der Bücher Samuelis, 209.

6) Let seven men[a] from his sons be given to us and we will hang them[b] to the Lord[c] in

Gibeah[d] of Saul, chosen[e] of the Lord. And the king said, "I will give."

[a] אֲנָשִׁים, "men," excludes children and may have in view descendents of Saul who

have attained a particular age or status in the community. In Josh. 9:14, it was "the men"

(אֲנָשִׁים) who believed the deceptive tale of the Gibeonites who seemed to have a quasi-

legal status.

[b] The meaning of וְהוֹקַעֲנוּם is uncertain. The hif'il of יָקַע occurs only in Num.

25:4 where it refers to a type of execution which involves exposure in the sun (נֶגֶד

הַשָּׁמֶשׁ).[15]

[c] Although the NRSV translates לַיהוָה "before the Lord" echoing v. 9 where the

hangings are reported לִפְנֵי יְהוָה, a locative sense of לְ would be unusual and not well

attested. לַיהוָה and τῷ κυρίῳ probably imply a verb of offering or bringing "to/for the

Lord."[16] As such, the request of the Gibeonites was cultic and agrees with the story's

emphasis on God's involvement in the needs of the land.

[d] Gibeah was the location where Saul was seized by the Spirit (1Sam. 10:5-13), the

place of Saul's home (1Sam. 10:26), and occurs elsewhere as "Gibeah of Saul."[17]

[e] בְּחִיר "chosen" is a singular bound form modifying "Saul." Although it is

syntactically possible that בְּחִיר refers to the singular place name, "Gibeah," בְּחִיר in the

Hebrew Scripture always refers to people and never a place.[18] Thus, in 𝔐, Saul is "chosen

of the Lord" and not the Seven as in the LXX.

---

[15]McCarter and Driver provide a full discussion of the possible definitions and conclude that the meaning is uncertain; McCarter, II Samuel, 442; Driver, Notes, 351.

[16]BDB 510d

[17]1Sam. 11:4; 15:34; Is. 10:29

[18]2Sam. 21:6; Is. 42:1; 43:20; 45:4; 65:9, 15, 22; Ps. 89:4; 105:6, 43; Ps. 106:5, 23; 1Chr. 16:13

7) The king spared[a] Mephibosheth, son of Jonathan, son of Saul, because of the oath of

the Lord which was between them, between David and between Jonathan, son of Saul.

[a] חמל על means "to have compassion on" and "to spare." A passage like Dt.

13:6-10 adds support to a specific association of חמל with covenant obligation:

> If anyone secretly entices you ...saying, "Let us go worship other gods,"
> ...you must not yield to or heed any such persons. Show them no pity or
> *compassion* and do not shield them. But you shall surely kill them; your
> own hand shall be first against them to execute them, and afterwards the
> hand of all the people.

8) The king took the two sons of Rizpah, the daughter of Aia, whom she bore to Saul,

Armoni and Mephibosheth and the five sons of Michal, daughter of Saul, whom she bore

to Adriel son of Barzillai, the Meholathite.

9) He handed them over to the Gibeonites, and they hung them on the mountain before the

Lord; and they fell seven-fold[a] together. They[b] were killed in the first days of the harvest,

at the beginning of the barley harvest.

[a] The *ketiv* שבעתים, "seven-fold"[19] is different from the LXX texts which reflect

𝔐's *qere'*, שבעתם, "seven of them." שבעתם makes more sense in the context but

שבעתים resonates with Lev. 26 which describes God's judgment upon covenant

breakers, as I will take up below.

[b] המה of the 𝔐's *qere'* is the demonstrative pronoun but functions like an adjective

and means "these very seven. . ."

10) And Rizpah, the daughter of Aia, took sackcloth and she stretched it[a] for herself to[b] the

rock from the beginning[c] of the harvest until water poured forth upon them from the

---

[19] BDB 988

heavens.[d] She did not let the birds of the heavens settle upon them by day and the beasts of the field by night.[e]

[a] נטה normally means "to stretch out, extend," often in reference to pitching a tent,[20] but never to the spreading out of a cloth. The hiphil of יצע is the normal verb used for "spreading out" sackcloth[21] and פרש for spreading out garments.[22]

[b] Although אל is sometimes used where על is expected in Samuel,[23] a notation in the margin of m alerts the reader to two other occurrences of אל־הצור, Is. 30:29 and 51:1, the significance of which I will explore in m's interpretation.

[c] תחלה does not occur elsewhere with the preposition מן. מן here emphasizes the beginning of the time in which Rizpah began to shoo away the birds and the beasts.[24]

[d] The time when the famine ended is ambiguous. The phrase עד נתך־מים עליהם, "until water poured out upon them" may indicate that the famine lasted until the fall rains came (Sept./Oct.). This would be a long time for Rizpah's vigil, through the year's hottest season. If the rain fell earlier, it would be understood as a divine action.

[e]Exposure of corpses, to be eaten by the birds and wild animals, is associated with public humiliation[25] and divine punishment.[26]

---

[20]Ex. 33:7; Josh. 18:1; 2Sam. 16:22

[21]Est. 4:3; Is. 58:5

[22]Dt. 22:17; Jdgs. 8:25; 2Sam. 17:19; Is. 19:8

[23]1Sam. 2:34; 3:12; 5:4,6; 6:15; 14:34; 16:13, 23; 17:3, 51; 18:10; 19:9, 16, 20, 25; 22:13; 27:10; 2Sam. 2:9; 6:3; 8:7; 20:23; 24:4; Driver, Notes, 101.

[24]Ronald J. Williams, Hebrew Syntax: An Outline, 2d ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), §316.

[25]1Sam. 14:44, 46; Ps. 79:2

[26]Dt. 28:26; 1Kgs. 16:4; 21:24; Jer. 7:33; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20; Ezek. 29:5; 32:40

11) And it was reported to David what Rizpah, daughter of Aia, concubine of Saul, had done.

12) And David went and took the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son from the citizens of Jabesh-Gilead, who had stolen them from the city square at Bethshan where the Philistines hung them on the day the Philistines struck down Saul in Gilboa.

13) And he brought back from there the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son, and they gathered up the bones of those who had been hung.

14) They buried the bones of Saul and of Jonathan his son in the land of Benjamin, in Zela[a] in the tomb of Kish his father. They did all that the king commanded, and God hearkened to the land after these things.[b]

[a] The place name צֵלַע, "Zela" occurs elsewhere only in Josh. 18:28.

[b] אַחֲרֵי־כֵן, "after these things," is unusual at the end of the story since these words normally open a narrative.[27] This is one of the story's links with 2 Samuel 24, which also ends in the same way.

---

[27]BDB 30a

Interpretation of 𝕸

The story opens just as does M by reporting the prolonged famine and David's "seeking the Lord's face." The ס at the end of this phrase separates David's seeking from the oracle that follows, confirming that for the Masoretes "seeking the Lord's face" was not associated with "seeking an oracle" as McCarter assumes.[28] "Seeking the Lord's face" is a general expression of piety associated with prayer, humility, and repentance,[29] and is expected of God's people during times of danger or distress.[30]

The divine word that comes to David points to Saul, but is laconic and oracular: "It has to do with Saul and (his) house of blood, because he killed the Gibeonites." Although the oracle mentions only the violence against the Gibeonites, otherwise unknown, the expression "house of blood" tacitly draws in not only all we know of Saul's violent behavior but also of his family and cohorts. Saul attempted twice to pin David to the wall with his spear (1Sam. 18:11; 19:10); he told his son Jonathan to kill David (1Sam. 19:1); he instructed his aide Doeg to kill the priests of Nob who fed David when he was fleeing from Saul (1Sam. 22:18); he pursued David to kill him (1Sam. 23-24, 26).

Responding to the divine word, David brings the Gibeonites in for talks. At this point, the narrative breaks by two clauses of background information, referring to the Gibeonites' ethnic difference from Israel--they are what "remains" of the old Amorite stock--and to Israel's treaty with them (Josh. 9), which Saul's zealous patriotism had violated. David says that he wishes to "atone" for that old wrong, using a verb-form that

---

[28]McCarter, II Samuel, 440.

[29]2Chr. 7:14

[30]e.g. Hos. 5:15; Ps. 27:8; 105:4=1Chr. 16:11

occurs elsewhere only in Ex. 32:30; if we may suppose a cross-reference, David is a mediator like Moses.

David commands the Gibeonites to "bless the inheritance of the Lord." The piel imperative 2d person plural with the *waw* preformative וּבָרְכוּ, "bless," is unusual in a narrative sequence. The converted perfect וּבֵרַכְתֶּם (Ex. 12:32) or the imperfect תְּבָרֲכוּ (Num. 6:23) would be more normal. As well, where the imperative form has a *waw* preformative, it is in sequence with another imperative. Furthermore, the plural imperative בָּרְכוּ always has the "Lord", "God" or "His name" as its object,[31] and, as such, has cultic associations. For example, in Ps. 134: 2 the psalmist elicits worship, "Lift up your holy hands and bless the Lord" (שְׂאוּ־יְדֵכֶם קֹדֶשׁ וּבָרֲכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה). Similarly, worship is evoked in Neh. 9:5, "Stand up and bless the Lord" (קוּמוּ בָּרֲכוּ אֶת־יְהוָה). Thus, David's command evokes worship from the Gibeonites. That is, David offers some form of expiation in exchange for which the outsiders will worship and embrace Israelite culture (land and people).

In vv. 4-6, David forces the Gibeonites to say what they want, although in the end he promises to give it to them. They hint at both a financial and a corporal settlement, but David does not propose anything. He is not involved in formulating the final solution, and, thus, remains at some slight distance from its violent implementation.

The Gibeonite charge against Saul is difficult in all texts, and ᴍ shows evidence of having been revised from an alternative Hebrew version. See the critical and explanatory notes for details. ᴍ says that Saul "assaulted" and "devised against" the Gibeonites. When did Saul assault the Gibeonites? What did Saul devise against the Gibeonites? The Hebrew

---

[31]Jdg. 5:2, 9; Ps. 66:8, 27; 96:2; 100:4; 103:20, 21, 22; 134:1, 2; 135:19, 20; Neh. 9:5; 1Chr. 29:20.

story does not tell.[32] 𝔐's story simply states it to be fact. Thus, the Gibeonite accusation in 𝔐 focuses primarily on Saul's plans and intent rather than his actions.

𝔐's נִשְׁמַדְנוּ , "we were wiped out," ia syntactically awkward and differs from all Greek forms of the text which have, "let us wipe him out." 𝔐's key action, "wipe out," refers to the Gibeonites who claim that Saul sought their misfortune and plotted against them, to keep them from having standing anywhere in Israel. Perhaps 𝔐's story was created out of a text that read the way M reads, but the tradent refused to accept that the Gibeonites should have asked to wipe out Saul. By altering only the vocalization of the consonants, this tradent reversed the direction of the action "wipe out." At the very least, 𝔐 provides a double reading, putting the more unusual reading in the text so that it will not be lost. In the final analysis, the Gibeonites never request to "wipe out" Saul and his family, they merely state that they were "wiped out." As such, the 𝔐 here is more favorable to Saul in that it depicts the Gibeonites being less violent toward him.

The Gibeonites ask that seven of Saul's descendants "be given." This is different from M's reading where the Gibeonites command David and the Israelites (2d plural) to "give." Compared to M, the Gibeonites are less demanding of David's involvement in the giving. This allows David to distance himself from the giving should he so choose.

The Gibeonites say they will execute "the Seven" לַיהוָה "to the Lord." This implies that the executions have cultic and expiatory significance and, as such, would have a propitiatory effect on the Lord.

One of the distinguishing features of 𝔐's story occurs in vs. 6, as the Gibeonites specify "Gibeah of Saul" as the location for the executions. No Greek MS reads the place name Γαβαα, "Gibeah" here, although some MSS have forms of ἐν Γαβαών, "in

---

[32]Noting a similar argument by Anthony Campbell ("The Reported Story: Midway Between Oral Performance and Literary Art," Semeia 46 [1989], 77-85), Walters suggested that לָנוּ might have been an abbreviation לָ--נוּ "to [--] us," which allowed the story-teller to supply his own verb. Walters, "The Gibeonite Charge," 12.

Gibeon" and others have ἐν τῷ βουνῷ, "on the hill," assuming a Hebrew בַּגִּבְעָה. Saul is associated closely with Gibeah in Samuel; it is not only the place of Saul's empowerment by the Spirit of the Lord and his subsequent prophesying (1Sam. 10:10-11) but also the location of Saul's home (1Sam. 11:4; 15:34). The location of the sacrifice in Gibeah may have served to remind ℿ's hearers that Saul was associated with the prophetic movement and, as such, was an ideal king before his disobedience.

Finally, the Gibeonites refer to Saul as "chosen of the Lord." The expression has long attracted the attention of scholars since it seems unlikely the Gibeonites would refer in this favorable way to their bitter enemy.[33] The conventional emendation to בָּהָר, "on the mountain,"[34] has no manuscript support whatever, and moreover weakens the overall pro-Saul tenor of the story. The narrative incongruity may be granted, but the story shows the Gibeonites as already conciliatory and accepting, even as they ask for retributive justice. The description of Saul as "chosen" establishes him as part of God's people. Though in some ways a failure as a king, he was Israel's first king. Saul still deserves to be described as "chosen of the Lord."

As in M, David spares the royal son Mephibosheth, showing himself respectful of his sacred oath to Jonathan (1Sam. 20:14-17), and he delivers seven other male offspring of Saul to the Gibeonites. The mother of the two named sons, Armoni and Mephibosheth, is Rizpah. ℿ and B agree against other Greek MSS that the mother of the five anonymous grandsons of Saul is Saul's daughter Michal and not Merab. According to the internal evidence Michal is the wrong name for the mother of the five. In 1Sam. 18:19, it is Merab and not Michal who married Adriel of Meholah. Furthermore, 2Sam. 6:23 refers to Michal

---

[33]Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 230.

[34]Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 230; Wellhausen, Die Text der Bücher Samuelis, 209; Driver, Notes, 351-352; McCarter, II Samuel, 438; Anderson, 2 Samuel, 247.

dying childless. Although the dissonance has been heard and solved in different ways,[35]

the fact remains that ᎅ and B agree that Michal is the mother. How can the story have

meaning with Michal as the mother? Walters suggests that Michal replaced Merab as the

mother of the five early in the Hebrew tradition to explain why a Jewish mother could be so

neglectful in her grief. Walters summarizes his conclusions:

> If Saul had a daughter capable of this kind of neglect, it was Michal. She is
> the daughter who was never a mother. She had not had children, because,
> from her window she despised the king in his moment of religious ecstasy,
> and then went out to meet and shrill against him. If Merab had been there,
> we know that she would have grieved. But if it were Michal ...well, from
> her we wouldn't expect any better.[36]

The Gibeonites execute the Seven "before the Lord" (לִפְנֵי יְהֹוָה), that is, as

offerings intended to expiate Saul's sin that has brought on the famine. The executions are

"on the mountain": the story is vague about the topography, but the expression is

syntactically definite.

ᎅ alone states "they fell seven-fold together" (שְׁבַעְתָּיִם יָחַד). What does it mean

that the sons fell "seven-fold"? Although the *qere'* reads שְׁבַעְתָּם, "the seven of them", the

written text with "seven-fold" resonates with Lev. 26 where the Lord warns the Israelites

that he will punish them "seven-fold" if they break his covenant and are disobedient.[37]

Other similarities between 2Sam. 21 and Lev. 26 are striking. For the disobedient, God

---

[35]TJ reads, "five sons of Merab, whom Michal Saul's daughter raised." The Babylonian
Talmud (Sanhedrin §19b) elaborates, "Was it then Michal who bore them? Surely it was rather Merab who
bore them! But Merab bore and Michal brought them up; therefore they were called by her name. This
teaches thee that whoever brings up an orphan in his home, Scriptures ascribes it to him as though he had
begotten him." Modern critical commentators have all agreed that Michal is a copying mistake; Walters,
"Childless Michal", 291 n. 8.

[36]Walters, "Childless Michal", 294.

[37]Lev. 26:18, 21, 24, 28. Although the exact word שְׁבַעְתָּם is not used in Lev. 26, the
meaning is similar. 26:18 reads, "And I will continue to punish you sevenfold for your sins" (וְיָסַפְתִּי
לְיַסְּרָה אֶתְכֶם שֶׁבַע עַל־חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם). 26:21 reads, "I will continue to plague you sevenfold for your
sins" (מַכָּה שֶׁבַע כְּחַטֹּאתֵיכֶם וְיָסַפְתִּי עֲלֵיכֶם); 26:24 reads, " I myself will strike you sevenfold for
your sins" (וְהִכֵּיתִי אֶתְכֶם גַּם־אָנִי שֶׁבַע עַל־חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם); 26:28 reads, "I in turn will punish you myself
sevenfold for your sins" (וְיִסַּרְתִּי אֶתְכֶם אַף־אָנִי שֶׁבַע עַל־חַטֹּאתֵיכֶם).

says the "skies will be like bronze" (Lev. 26:19), but, for those who confess their sins and the sins of their fathers, God will remember the land (Lev. 26:40, 42). If such a connection can be made, the Seven play a typical or figural role in the 𝔐. That is, they become the embodiment of the disobedient and covenant law breakers. As such, they reap the punishment which God said would come upon such.

A chronological note places the executions at the beginning of barley harvest, but is interrupted by an account of Rizpah's response to the executions. She expresses her grief by her use of sackcloth. 𝔐's verb נטה, agrees with B and M's margin which have ἔπηξεν here, and describes Rizpah "stretching" the sackcloth, that is, "pitching a tent." 𝔐's reading is different from M's text which describes Rizpah "spreading a bed" (διέστρωσεν) with the sackcloth. Considered literally, 𝔐's "sackcloth tent" reading provides shelter for Rizpah from the summer sun and anticipates perhaps a long waiting period.

The 𝔐 narrative describes Rizpah pitching a tent "to the rock" (אֶל־הַצּוּר), undoubtedly a reference to God. Elsewhere in Samuel, all references to "rock" (צוּר) except one refer to God.[38] In 1Sam. 2:2, Hannah says, "There is no Holy One like the Lord, no one besides you; there is no *rock* like our God." In 2Sam. 22, God is referred to as "rock" four times. In 2Sam. 22:2-3, David states, "The Lord is my rock (סֶלַע), my fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my *rock* (צוּר). . ." In 2Sam. 22:32, David says, "For who is God, but the LORD? And who is a *rock*, except our God?" And again in 2Sam. 22:47, "The LORD lives! Blessed be my *rock*, and exalted be my God, the *rock* of my salvation. . ." Finally, in 2Sam. 23:3, David refers to God as "rock" in his oracle, "The God of Israel has spoken, the *rock* of Israel has said to me. . ." Thus, in her heroic vigil, Rizpah also takes her grief to God, the rock of Israel.

---

[38]In 1Sam. 24:2, the plural form of צוּר is part of a place name.

Furthermore, the use of the preposition אֶל before הַצּוּר is not expected; עַל "upon" would be more usual (see the critical note on עַל/אֶל). m has glossed the words אֶל־הַצּוּר with the notation that they occur three times. For the following reasons, I argue that the gloss is hermeneutical in nature. The other two passages in which אֶל־הַצּוּר occurs are Isaiah 30:29 and 51:1. In the context of Is. 30, Israel is reminded that the appropriate response to divine judgment because of disobedience (v. 12) is repentance (v. 15). The passage describes the Lord longing to be gracious and compassionate to his people (v. 18). He will restore His people: "Truly, O people in Zion, inhabitants of Jerusalem, you shall weep no more. He will surely be gracious to you at the sound of your cry; when he hears it, he will answer you." Part of restoration will include the sending of rain (v. 23) and the establishment of a new world order in which God's people will sing and rejoice as on the night of the holy festival, as when people go up to the mountain of the Lord, *to the rock* of Israel (v. 29). In Isaiah 51, those who would pursue righteousness and seek the Lord are commanded to "look *to the rock* from which you were hewn. . . look to Abraham, your father, and Sarah, who gave you birth" (v. 1). The Lord promises to bring comfort and to have compassion (vv. 3, 12) and to make deserts like Eden. Again, salvation and deliverance come from the Lord (v. 6). Furthermore, it is the Lord who visits wrath on His people (v. 17), an evidence of which is famine (v. 19). There is hope, however, because the Lord will at some point also stay His wrath (v. 22). The marginal cross reference associates these oracles with the Rizpah story, bringing alongside it the prophetic emphases on disobedience, penitence, and restoration. As such, Rizpah is no longer a sad but a heroic figure in the story, cast in the role of an intercessor for Israel who looks to God "the rock" for deliverance and restoration. Furthermore, the connection with Isaiah 30 and 51 clearly draws the story out into a figural reading. I will take this up below in the comparative chapter.

By repetition of the words "from the beginning of harvest," the story returns to the passage of time. ℳ's story is unclear about the length of time before the coming of the rain; it simply states that Rizpah's vigil lasts from the beginning of the barley harvest "until water poured upon them from the sky." If no supernatural intervention is implied, it refers to the early rains of autumn, some five or six months later. If so, it is unpleasant to imagine Rizpah's vigil continuing through the summer, during which decomposition would certainly have reduced the corpses to mere bones, but the story shortly refers to "the bones of those who had been hung" (v. 13).

As mentioned already in M's interpretation, Rizpah's vigil has another effect, in that exposure of bodies to birds and beasts of prey is a biblical curse upon apostates.[39] Rizpah prevents this curse from being carried out on Saul's descendants. In this way, the story gently prompts its readers to entertain positibe thoughts about Saul; Saul may have been disobedient to Samuel's orders, but he was not an apostate.

The story takes a new departure when Rizpah's actions were reported to David. ℳ describes Rizpah as Saul's "concubine" for the first time, heightening the social disparity between David and Rizpah. Rizpah is a social outsider, yet her actions remind David, the king, of his neglect of the bodies of Saul and Jonathan, which still lie across the Jordan in Jabesh-Gilead. The description of Rizpah as "concubine" has two effects on the story. First, it emphasizes that an outsider is capable of proper actions during a time of divine judgment and hope for restoration. Second, it may cast a slightly negative light on David; it took the righteous actions of a concubine to prompt King David to provide proper burial for Saul in the land of Israel.

David acts immediately to get the bones of Saul and Jonathan from the citizens of Jabesh Gilead who had them because they had buried them after Saul's death (1Sam. 30:11-14; 2Sam. 2:4). ℳ and M differ here about the location from which the men of

---

[39]Dt. 28:26; Jer. 7:33; 15:3; 16:4; 19:7; 34:20

Jabesh-Gilead stole the bones; 𝔐 and some LXX MSS (BA) describe the men of Jabesh

stealing the bones "from the public square" (מֵרְחֹב) of Beth Shan, whereas M and other

MSS (NL TJ) and the story as told in 1Sam. 31:12 describe them stealing the bones "from

the wall" (מֵחוֹמַת) of the same town.

David brought up the bones of Saul and Jonathan and placed them in Saul's

ancestral burial location. The bones of those who had been hung were gathered up at the

same time, but 𝔐's story does not report their actual burial. Perhaps 𝔐's text sees Saul and

the Seven differently. The deaths of Saul and Jonathan were noble, taking place on the field

of battle against Israel's enemies the Philistines. The Seven were victims of judgment

because of Saul's murderous house. As such, exposure would serve as part of the penalty.

The story closes by asserting God hearkened to the cry of the land when--and only

when--they had done everything the king had commanded. The famine--associated

somehow with divine displeasure--was due to more than Saul's violence, but also arose

from David's neglect of the bones of Saul and Jonathan.

CHAPTER 4

INTERPRETATION OF UNCIAL MANUSCRIPT B'S
VERSION OF 2 SAMUEL 21:1-14

The Text of B[a]

Καὶ ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Δαυεὶδ τρία ἔτη, ἐνιαυτὸς ἐχόμενος

ἐνιαυτοῦ, καὶ ἐζήτησεν Δαυεὶδ τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Κυρίου· καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος

Ἐπὶ Σαοὺλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἀδικία διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θανάτῳ[σαι

θανάτῳ][b] αἱμάτων, περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας. 2) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ

Βασιλεὺς Δαυεὶδ τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· καὶ οἱ

Γαβαωνεῖται οὐχ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ εἰσιν, ὅτι ἀλλ᾿ ἢ ἐκ τοῦ αἱμάτος τοῦ

Ἀμορραίου, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ ὤμοσαν αὐτοῖς· καὶ ἐζήτησεν Σαοὺλ

πατάξαι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι αὐτὸν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰούδα· 3) καὶ

εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ πρὸς τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας Τί ποιήσω ὑμῖν καὶ ἐν τίνι ἐξιλάσωμαι,

καὶ εὐλογήσετε τὴν κληρονομίαν Κυρίου; 4) καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ οἱ Γαβαωνεῖται

Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀγρύριον καὶ χρυσίον μετὰ Σαοὺλ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ,

καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ θανατῶσαι ἐν Ἰσραήλ. καὶ εἶπεν Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε καὶ

ποιήσω ὑμῖν; 5) καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα ὁ ἀνὴρ συνετέλεσεν ἐφ᾿ ἡμᾶς καὶ

ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς, ὃς παρελογίσατο ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς· ἀφανίσωμεν αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ

ἑστάναι αὐτὸν ἐν παντὶ ὁρίῳ Ἰσραήλ. 6) Δότω ἡμῖν ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν

αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξηλιάσωμεν αὐτοὺς τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν Γαβαὼν Σαοὺλ ἐκλεκτοὺς

---

[a] See Appendix C for a facsimile of Codex Vaticanus.

[b] We may postulate a haplography of the underlined letters: διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θανάτωσαι
θανάτῳ αἱμάτων περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν.

Κυρίου. καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Βασιλεύς Ἐγὼ δώσω. 7) Καὶ ἐφείσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ

Μεμφιβόσθε υἱὸν Ἰωναθὰν υἱοῦ Σαοὺλ διὰ τὸν ὅρκον Κυρίου τὸν ἀνὰ μέσον

αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνα μέσον Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθὰν υἱοῦ Σαούλ. 8) καὶ

ἔλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ῥεσφὰ θυγατρὸς Αἰὰ οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σαούλ,

τὸν Ἑρμωνοεὶ καὶ τὸν Μεμφιβόσθε, καὶ τοὺς πέντε υἱοὺς Μιχὸλ θυγατρὸς

Σαοὺλ οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σερεὶ υἱῷ Βερζελλεὶ τῷ Μωουλαθεὶ, 9) καὶ ἔδωκεν

αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβαωνειτῶν, καὶ ἐξηλίασαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἔναντι

Κυρίου, καὶ ἔπεσαν οἱ ἑπτὰ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθανατώθησαν ἐν

ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις, ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν. 10) καὶ ἔλαβεν

Ῥεσφὰ θυγάτηρ Αἰὰ τὸν σάκκον καὶ ἔπηξεν αὐτῇ πρὸς τὴν πέτραν ἐν ἀρχῇ

θερισμοῦ κριθῶν ἕως ἔσταξεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὕδωρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐκ

ἔδωκεν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταπαῦσαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡμέρας καὶ τὰ θηρία

τοῦ ἀγροῦ νυκτός. 11) καὶ ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Δαυεὶδ ὅσα ἐποίσεν Ῥεσφὰ θυγάτηρ

Αἰὰ παλλακὴ Σαούλ· καὶ ἐξελύθησαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Δὰν υἱὸς Ἰωὰ

ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων. 12) καὶ ἐπορεύθη Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰ ὀστᾶ

Σαοὺλ καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν υἱῶν Ἰαβεὶς

Γαλαάδ, οἳ ἔκλεψαν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς πλατείας Βαίθ[σαν],[c] ὅτι ἔστησαν αὐτοὺς

ἐκεῖ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐπάταξαν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι τὸν Σαοὺλ ἐν Γελβοῦε.

13) καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν ἐκεῖθεν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαοὺλ καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ

αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήγαγεν τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἐξηλιασμένων. 14) καὶ ἔθαψαν τὰ ὀστᾶ

Σαοὺλ καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων τῶν[d] ἐν γῇ

---

[c] Only B reads Βαίθ while the rest of the LXX MSS have forms of Βαίθσαν following 𝔐's
בֵּית־שָׁן. The apocopated form suggests that B copied from an exemplar that had a *lacuna* or another defect
here, and the scribe did not know the correct spelling. I have adopted the spelling Βαίθσαν which is
reflected in M rell.

[d] τῶν after ἡλιασθέντων which occurs only in B is probably the result of dittography.

Βενιαμεὶν ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Κεὶς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐποίησαν

πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο ὁ Βασιλεύς· καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ γῇ μετὰ ταῦτα.

Translation of B

1) And there was a famine in the time of David for three years, year after year, and David sought the face of the Lord.[a] The Lord said, "Guilt [rests] upon Saul and upon his house because he [killed with bloody violence],[b] because he killed the Gibeonites."

[a] B prefers the definite article before Κυρίου as it does elsewhere when it is opposite the anarthrous tetragrammaton יְהוָה in construct relationship.[1]

[b] B's text is garbled. If it is correct to assume the above mentioned haplography, then B's text reads διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θανάτωσαι θανάτῳ αἱμάτων περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν. As such it was triply conflate. διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θανάτωσαι and περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν are two different ways of expressing "because he killed." αἱμάτων surely derives from דָּמִים. Although McCarter is probably correct to see behind θανάτῳ αἱμάτων a misreading of הַדָּמִים בֵּית,[2] B's text can still be translated. There are other parallels for αἱμάτων as a plural genitive. ἀνὴρ αἱμάτων means something like "murderer" or "bloodthirsty"[3] and πόλις αἱμάτων means something like "city of bloodshed" or "bloody city."[4] It is reasonable, therefore, to translate θανάτῳ αἱμάτων as "bloody death" or "bloody violence."

---

[1] 1Sam. 6:11, 12, 15, 17; 13:12; 21:1; 22:17, 21

[2] McCarter, II Samuel, 437.

[3] 2Sam. 16:7, 8; Ps. 5:7; 54:24; 58:3; 138:19; Prov. 29:10

[4] Nah. 3:1; Ezek. 22:2; 24:6

2) And David the king summoned the Gibeonites and spoke to them. Now the Gibeonites are not Israelites but[a] are from Amorite blood. The Israelites swore an agreement with them, but Saul had sought to strike them in his zeal for the Israelites and Judahites.

    [a] Although M's ἀλλ' ἤ is the normal way to translate the strong adversative,[5] B's ὅτι ἀλλ' ἤ is also opposite אִם כִּי.[6] About the latter, Conybeare comments, "The range of literature, within which this combination of particles is found, is very limited, being almost confined to the four books of Kingdoms. It looks therefore as if we had here a mere device of translation, not any recognized usage of later Greek."[7]

3) And David said to the Gibeonites, "What shall I do for you? And how might I atone,[a] so that you will bless[b] the inheritance of the Lord?"

    [a] B is the only Greek MS which has the aorist subjunctive ἐξιλάσωμαι. All other LXX MSS have the future indicative ἐξιλάσομαι. Both forms are acceptable opposite M's אֲכַפֵּר.[8] The preceding 1st person singular verb ποιήσω can either be a future indicative or an aorist subjunctive. The scribe probably wrote the second verb ἐξιλάσωμαι in line with how he understood ποιήσω. As such, ἐξιλάσωμαι is here formal and elegant and may indicate less certainty that David will do anything once the Gibeonites answer his question.

---

[5]Gen. 28:17; Ex. 12:9; Lev. 21:2, 14; Num. 14:30; 26:37; Dt. 10:12; 12:5, 14, 18; 16:6; Josh. 14:4; 17:3; 1Sam. 8:19; 2Sam. 12:3; 19:29; 1Kgs. 17:12; 22:8, 31, *et al.*

[6]1Sam. 21:5, 7; 30:17, 22; 2Sam. 13:33; 1Kgs. 18:18; 2Kgs. 4:2; 5:15; 10:23; 14:6; 17:36, 39; 23:23; 2Chr. 2:5; Eccl. 5:10

[7]F. C. Conybeare and St. George Stock, Selections from the Septuagint (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905; repr. A Grammar of Septuagint Greek (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980), 109.

[8]The future ἐξιλάσομαι is opposite אֲכַפֵּר in Gen. 32:20 and the subjunctive ἐξιλάσωμαι is opposite אֲכַפֵּר in Ex. 32:30.

b If B's future indicative active 2d plural εὐλογήσετε implies a different Hebrew than 𝔐's imperative וּבָרְכוּ it was probably וּבֵרַכְכֶם.[9] It is also possible that B preferred the future indicative because the imperative seemed awkward in the context.

4) And the Gibeonites said to him "We do not have [in mind] silver or gold regarding Saul and regarding his house; nor do we have [in mind] a man to kill in Israel. And he said, "What are you saying, that I might do it for you?"

5) And they said to the king, "The man made up his mind against us[a] and persecuted us-- the one who deceived[b] to utterly destroy us--let us wipe him out from having standing in all the territory of Israel.

a συντελεῖν in classical Greek usually means "to bring to an end, complete." Where it stands opposite כָּלָה, it can also mean "to kill, destroy."[10] Both meanings seem too strong here, and in the interpretion of both M and 𝔐 I adopt the somewhat attenuated meaning "strike." The Hebrew כָּלָה can also mean, "to decide, determine," as an intransitive[11] and transitive.[12] Now, only in B, the verb is construed with ἐπί, a rare construction paralleled (only in B) in 1 Samuel 20:34, where Jonathan is described as grieving for David because Saul "resolved himself against him."[13] I adopt a similar translation for B here.

_____

[9]McCarter, II Samuel, 438.

[10]1Sam. 15:18; 2Sam. 22:38; 1Kgs 22:11; 2Chr. 18:10; 20:23; Ps. 118:87; Hos. 13:2; Is. 1:28; Jer. 14:12, 15; Ezek. 5:12; 6:12; 7:15; 13:14

[11]1Sam. 20:7, 9, 33; 25:17; Est. 7:7

[12]Prov. 16:29-30

[13]McCarter, I Samuel, 340.

b παρελογίζομαι usually stands opposite רמה and means "to deceive."[14]

6) Let someone give[a] us seven men from his sons so that we might hang them in the sun[b] to the Lord in Gibeon of Saul, [men] chosen of the Lord." And the king said, "I will give."

[a] The 3d person singular imperative δότω can be read as an imperative of permission or a command, "Let him give." I have used the indefinite pronoun "someone" because the subject is unclear.

[b] B's rendering of ἐξηλιάσωμεν αὐτοὺς as "so that we might hang them in the sun," is plausible, given the verb's components, "out" and "sun."

7) The king spared Memphibosthe son of Jonathan, son of Saul, because of the oath of the Lord which was between them, between David and between Jonathan, son of Saul.

8) And the king took the two sons of Rizpah daughter of Aia, whom she bore to Saul, Ermonoi and Memphibosthe, and the five sons of Michal,[a] daughter of Saul, whom she bore to Serei son of Berzelli, the Mooulathite.

[a] B has Μιχολ, imitating אתּ's מיכל, rather than the LXX's usual form of the name of Saul's daughter, Μελχολ. Also, B does not have the definite article before the proper name as MSS MN rell do. This shows that B follows closely the אתּ or to the tradition that has informed אתּ's distinctive telling of the story.[15]

---

[14]παρελογίζομαι occurs 10 times in the LXX. 6 times opposite רמה (Gen. 29:25; Josh. 9:22; 1Sam. 19:17; 28:12; 2Sam. 19:27; Lam. 1:19), once opposite חלף (Gen. 29:25), and three times opposite תלל in MS A (Jdg. 16:10, 13, 15)

[15]McCarter, II Samuel, 439.

9) He handed them over to the Gibeonites, and they hung them in the sun on the mountain before the Lord; the seven themselves[a] fell together.[b] And they[c] were killed in the first days of the harvest, at the beginning of the barley harvest.

[a] αὐτοὶ is translated as the intensive pronoun and stands opposite the 3d plural suffix on 𝔐's *qere'* שִׁבְעָתָם.

[b] ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό is a standard locution for יַחַד.[16]

[c] The identical pronoun αὐτοὶ here reflects 𝔐's *qere'* הֵמָּה and means "these very."

10) And Rizpah the daughter of Aiah, took sackcloth and she stretched [it] for herself to the rock at the beginning of the barley harvest until water fell upon them from the heavens. She did not let the birds of the sky settle upon them by day nor the beasts of the field by night.

11) And it was reported to David what Rizpah daughter of Aia, concubine of Saul, had done. [a] And they were unloosed and Dan, son of Ioa, of the descendants of the giants, took them.[a]

[a-a] At this point, B alone has a plus of thirteen words: καὶ ἐξελύθησαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Δὰν υἱὸς Ἰωὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων. McCarter explains the words—which, in the Lucianic story stand earlier in the narrative—as a marginal gloss misplaced from 2Sam. 21:15 ff.,[17] a passage that describes David's wars and heroes.

---

[16]2Sam. 10:15; Ezra 4:3; Ps. 2:2; 4:9; 48:3, 11; 61:10; 73:6, 8; 97:8; 132:1; Mic. 2:12

[17]McCarter suggested the clause may have derived from a marginal correction of the corrupt text of vv. 15-16 which found its way into the text at this point because the tradent had עוֹף, "birds" in mind; McCarter, II Samuel, 440, 448.

12) And David went and took the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son from the men of the Jabesh Gileadites who had stolen them from the city square at Baithsan, for the Philistines placed them there at the time the Philistines struck Saul in Gilboa.

13) He brought back from there the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son, and he gathered the bones of those who had been hanged in the sun.

14) And they buried the bones of Saul and the bones of Jonathan his son, and of those having been hanged in the sun,[a] in the land of Benjamin, in the side, in the tomb[b] of Kish his father. They did all that the king commanded, and God hearkened to land after these things.

[a] M and most LXX MSS have καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων, "and the bones of those having been exposed to the sun," and B has καὶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων without τὰ ὀστᾶ. B's meaning is essentially the same as M's although M is more explicit about the bones. As already mentioned, ᵯ does not mention the burial of the Seven at all.

[b] B's ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ ἐν τῷ τάφῳ, "in the side, in the tomb" is a literal but awkward rendering of ᵯ's consonants בצלע בקברו. B's reading is awkward because it has two prepositional phrases with locative datives together. As already mentioned, this occurred when the LXX translator misread the place name "Zela" as "in the side."

Interpretation of B

Because B's story is quite similar to M and barM, I will comment here primarily on the places where it is different from one or both. The story opens identically to the stories in barM and M, by reporting the prolonged famine and David's "seeking the Lord's face." The divine word that comes in B is conflate, with the clause "because he killed the Gibeonites" being given in two different forms, neither being a satisfactory rendering of the Hebrew attested in barM. The main clause of the oracle specifically uses the language of liability for sin, naming as the cause of the guilt Saul's campaign against the Gibeonites. B portrays Saul as excessively violent. Between the two references to Saul's killing the Gibeonites, stands the statement, because he killed "with bloody violence."

David summons the Gibeonites for talks and proposes some form of propitiation. The aorist subjunctive ἐξιλάσωμαι indicates that David was uncertain of his ability to atone. ἐξιλάσωμαι occurs elsewhere only in Ex. 32:30 where Moses proposes to make propitiation for the people of Israel after they made the golden calf. In the context, Moses functions like a priest, and if we can assume a connection, David may be cast in the priestly function here similar to Moses.

David's desire to atone is followed by the future indicative 2d plural εὐλογήσετε, "[so that] you will bless" the inheritance of the Lord. εὐλογήσετε occurs elsewhere in the LXX only in Num. 6:23 where the Lord through Moses gave Aaron a blessing for the Israelites. He said, "This is how *you will bless* them" and the Aaronic blessing follows. If we might see a connection, the Gibeonites are called upon by David to function like the priests who "bless" the Lord's people. Here they are called to bless "the Lord's inheritance," which means to accept Israel's whole culture, including their God who creates it.[18]

---

[18]See comments on the interpretation of M, pp. 23-24.

Negotiations ensue between David and the Gibeonites. The Gibeonites bring three charges against Saul in v. 5: he "made up his mind against us"; "he persecuted us"; "he deceived to utterly destroy us." The charge, Saul "made up his mind against us," uses vocabulary found elsewhere only in 1Sam. 20:33-34, in which Saul even took up his spear against Jonathan, proving to Jonathan that Saul had "settled upon" evil against David, having "made up his mind" to kill him. The parallel draws into the story Saul's readiness to kill both David and Jonathan. Thus, the charge that Saul "persecuted" them, reiterates Saul's intent to destroy.[19]

The Gibeonites' description of Saul as one "who deceived" (ὃς παρελογίσατο), sets up strong ironic resonances between this and other biblical stories. First, when the Israelites entered the land of Canaan, it was the ancestors of the Gibeonites who deceived the Israelites into making an agreement with them; Joshua said, "Why did you deceive me/us?"; τί παρελογίσασθέ με / לָמָּה רִמִּיתֶם אֹתָנוּ (Josh. 9:22). Those whose ancestors deceived the Israelites to avoid being utterly destroyed are hardly in a position to complain about Saul's deception. Second, Saul's own daughter, Michal, deceived him by helping David flee when Saul's men were attempting to kill him. Saul demanded of Michal, "Why have you deceived me?"; τί οὕτως παρελογίσω με / לָמָּה כָּכָה רִמִּיתָנִי (1Sam. 19:17). Like father, like daughter. Third, Saul himself deceived the necromancer at Endor; She cried out, "Why have you deceived me?"; τί παρελογίσω με / לָמָּה רִמִּיתָנִי (1Sam. 28:12). Saul, who was upset with his daughter Michal for deceiving him about David, feels free also to deceive. Thus, the mention of Saul's alleged deception is ironic and draws in what we know of Saul's deception elsewhere.

The Gibeonites demand that "someone give" them seven sons of Saul so that they might impale them in the sun to the Lord. The Gibeonites, though speaking to David, do

---

[19]ἐδίωξεν usually stands opposite רדף. As such, it carries with it the intent to destroy (2Sam. 18:16; 20:7, 10, 13; 22:38; 24:13).

not demand that David do the giving, only that someone give. By implication, the Gibeonites allow David to be somewhat distanced from the giving if he so desires.

Furthermore, the Gibeonites propose that the Seven be executed "in Gibeon of Saul." While the Hebrew book of Samuel makes no connection between Saul and Gibeon, Chronicles mentions twice that Saul's ancestors were from Gibeon.[20] If Walters is correct, that the Chronicler links Saul to the ancient Canaanite city of Gibeon rather than one of Jacob's twelve sons,[21] then the reference to Saul "of Gibeon" is perhaps an inference of the illegitimacy of Saul's kingship (Dt. 17:15).[22]

As in M, the Gibeonites invoke God's agency in selecting the Seven: the sons are to be "chosen of the Lord." Though the Gibeonites are demanding the death of the sons, the Lord will make the final decision as to who will die.

The story continues with the sparing of Mephibosheth, the selection of the Seven victims, their execution, Rizpah's vigil, and the report of her actions reaching David. We may accept the presumption that the large plus at verse 11 in B is misplaced, although an attempt to read the story intelligibly with the plus present might be attempted. David heard what Rizpah had done, but, in the meantime, the Seven expired, or fell from their place of execution, and Dan, the son of Ioa, removed the bones. This could have been thought to explain where the bones were when David finally got around to having them gathered up (v. 13). In any case, David retrieved the bones of Saul and Jonathan, and had them buried.

As the story moves to its close, the story reports that the bones of those who had been hung were placed in the tomb of Saul's family, along with the bones of Saul and

---

[20]1Chr. 8:29-33 and 9:35-39 mention Saul's great-grandfather was Jeiel, "the father of Gibeon."

[21]Stanley D. Walters, "Saul of Gibeon," JSOT 52 (1991): 61-76, esp. 71.

[22]Whether Saul ever made his headquarters in Gibeon, as hypothesized by Blenkinsopp, is irrelevant to the theological force of the narrative; Joseph Blenkensopp, "Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital," VT 24 (1974): 1-7.

Jonathan. The completion of the burial brings hope and potential restoration for the people

and the land; God hearkened to the cry of the land after they had done everything the king

had commanded. As in the other stories, it is clear that the famine--associated somehow

with divine displeasure--was due to more than Saul's violence, but also arose from David's

neglect of the bones of Saul and Jonathan and the burial of the Seven.

CHAPTER 5

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE M, ᵯ, AND B
VERSIONS OF 2 SAMUEL 21:1-14

Introduction

Having translated and interpreted M, ᵯ, and B independently, I will now compare

each version of the story, describing the theological and political interests which can be

inferred from each. A comparison of these versions will show there is a story common to

all three. A contrast of the three versions will show that the differences can be explained as

transmissional errors, stylistic differences and improvements, and as different Hebrew

texts. Some of the Hebrew differences have to do with pointing and others are consonantal.

Having analyzed the similarities and differences, I will show that the significant differences

cluster around certain theological and political issues. I hope to show that the three texts

represent three specific versions of the general story that address the theological and

political issues from somewhat different perspectives. Having explored the theological and

political emphases of each of the three versions, I will speculate about ideological contexts

within which each story was embraced.

I. A Summary of the Similarities Among M, ᵯ, and B

MSS M, ᵯ, and B agree throughout most of the story: M's and B's words agree

with ᵯ's words 93% and 94% respectively; M and B agree together with ᵯ's words 88%

of the time. Where M and B agree with ᵯ's words, they always follows ᵯ's word order

except for a simple transposition in verse 10 in B.

II. The Story Common to M, barM, and B

The story common to M, barM, and B is summarized as follows. A prolonged famine

leads David to seek the Lord's face. A divine word associates the famine with Saul's

partisan violence against the Gibeonites, and David seeks their reconciliation with Israel.

When the Gibeonites ask for the death of seven of Saul's descendants, David gives two

sons by Rizpah and five of Saul's grandsons, and they are killed. After the deaths, one of

the mothers, Rizpah, Saul's concubine, keeps vigil over the dead bodies to prevent their

violation until rain falls. David, hearing of Rizpah's actions, brings back from Transjordan

the bones of Saul and Jonathan and has them buried in Saul's family grave. After this, God

listens to the land.

III. A Summary of the Differences between M, barM, and B

There are four types of differences between the three versions: (1) transmissional

errors and conflations, (2) stylistic differences, (3) those which reflect different Hebrew

pointing, and (4) those which reflect different Hebrew consonants. These differences are

summarized qualitatively below. I will refer to each variant by the verse number and line

letter from the Comparison of Manuscripts Chart.[1]

A. Transmissional Errors, Conflations and Glosses

1e.-1g. B's θανάτῳ αἱμάτων reflects הדמים מית, a possible misreading for barM's בית

הדמים.

1g.-1h. Haplography has caused the underlined letters to drop out in B; διὰ τὸ αὐτον

θανάτωσαι θανάτῳ αἱμάτων περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν. If θανάτῳ αἱμάτων

implies מות הדמים, "death of bloods," B is triply conflate.

---

[1] See Appendix D.

2d. Most LXX MSS misread AIMATOΣ for ΛIMATOΣ.

4a. In the first hand, M has the 3d singular εἶπεν which has been written over as the 3d

plural εἶπον to agree with its third plural subject.

9f. In m, the initial consonant is absent in the *ketiv*, whereas the *qere'* has the initial

consonant ב. Loss of ב is probably the result of a transmissional error.

10e. M's ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὕδατα θεοῦ may reflect a conflation of two Hebrew texts: one with

אליהם and the other with אלהים.

10e. ἕως has dropped out in M in the uncial period due to homoioarchton; EΩΣEΣTAΞAN

became EΣTAΞAN.

11c. B and the hexaplaric MSS have the large displacement καὶ ἐξελύθησαν, καὶ

κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Δὰν υἱὸς Ἰωὰς ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάνων probably

reflecting the Hebrew וישפו וישמבם רן בן יאש מילידי הרפאים.

12e. B alone reads Βαίθ while the rest of the LXX MSS have forms of Βαίθσαν following

m's בית־שן. B probably copied from an exemplar that had a *lacuna* or other defect

here, and the scribe did not know the correct spelling.

14c. Simple dittography caused the plus τῶν after ἡλιασθέντων in B.

B. Stylistic Differences and Improvements

1c. B's definite article before Κυρίου is a stylistic preference of B when it is opposite

יהוה in construct relationship.

2a. LXX MSS except L have the plus Δαυείδ after ὁ Βασιλεὺς which m does not have,

clarifying the subject of the sentence as David and not Saul.

2d. M's ἀλλ' ἦ and B's ὅτι ἀλλ' ἦ are both ways to translate m's כי אם.

3c. B has the formal and elegant aorist subjunctive ἐξιλάσωμαι opposite m's אכפר,

whereas the rest of the LXX MSS have the future indicative ἐξιλάσομαι.

3d. B's future indicative active 2d plural εὐλογήσετε was probably an attempt to smooth

out the awkwardness of the imperative forms εὐλογήσατε and וּבָרְכוּ which

occur in M N rell and 𝔐.

4e. M B and most LXX MSS have καί before ποιήσω and 𝔐 has the minor disjunctive

accent (*tiphha*), calling for a slight pause, instead of a *waw*. All the Greek MSS

have attempted to smooth out the slight awkwardness of the Hebrew, "What are

you saying, I will do for you?" M and B's *Vorlage* probably added καί to

subordinate the verb ποιήσω to the question, making τί the object of both verbs.

5b. The absence of the relative pronoun ὅς after ὁ ἀνήρ in B, where it occurs in M N rell

and 𝔐, is probably stylistic.

5b. B's συνετέλεσεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς and M's συνετέλεσεν ἡμᾶς both seem to reflect 𝔐's

כָּלְנוּ. B's ἐφ' may have been added to create stylistic resonance with 1Sam. 20:34.

8c-8f. The addition of definite articles before the proper names Saul, Ermonthi,

Mephibosthe, Merom, and Esdriel is common Greek style.

9c. B's ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and M's κατὰ τὸ αὐτό are both standard locutions for 𝔐's יַחַד.

9d. M's αὐτοὶ δὲ and L's καὶ αὐτοὶ are common Greek expressions opposite וְהֵמָּה or

וְהֵם. B's καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ could be a stylistic improvement or conflation.

12g. The relative pronoun ᾗ which occurs in all Greek MSS except L is a stylistic plus.

14b. 𝔐's minus of אֶת־עַצְמוֹת before Jonathan is probably an attempt to avoid

monotonous repetition.

14c. B does not have τὰ ὀστᾶ.

14d. As already mentioned, all LXX MSS misread the place name בְּצֵלַע, "in Zela" as ἐν τῇ

πλευρᾷ (בַּצֵלַע), "in the side." This makes for an awkward rendering of 𝔐's

בְּקֶבֶר. B takes both as datives, ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ ἐν τῷ τάφῳ, "in the side, in the

tomb." M and other LXX MSS have improved the Greek style by using the genitive

case for the second phrase, ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ τοῦ τάφου, "in the side of the tomb of."

C. The Same Hebrew Consonants with Different Vowel Pointing

5f. The LXX has ἀφανίσωμεν αὐτὸν reflecting נַשְׁמִידֵהוּ, "let us wipe him out" rather than 𝔐's נִשְׁמַדְנוּ, "we were destroyed."

6d. 𝔐's בַּגִּבְעָת, "in Gibeah" reflects the same Hebrew consonants as M N reII which have ἐν τῷ βουνῷ (בַּגִּבְעָה), "on the mountain."

9c. M's οἱ ἑπτὰ and B's οἱ ἑπτὰ αὐτοὶ reflect 𝔐's *qere'* שִׁבְעָתָם, "the seven of them," but 𝔐's *ketiv* has שְׁבַעְתַּיִם, "seven-fold."

12g. LXX MSS have ἐν Γελβουε, without the definite article reflecting בְּגִלְבֹּעַ, whereas 𝔐 has בַּגִּלְבֹּעַ.

14d. LXX MSS have ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ reflecting בְּצֵלָע, while 𝔐 has the place name בְּצֵלָע, "in Zela."

D. Different Hebrew Consonants

1f. LXX MSS have ἀδικία, "wrongdoing" reflecting a Hebrew with עָוֺן, "iniquity, guilt", which 𝔐 does not have.

5c. All LXX MSS have forms of καὶ εδίωξεν ἡμᾶς reflecting a Hebrew וַיִּרְדְּפֵנוּ which 𝔐 does not have.

5d. M has ἐλογίσατο, "planned," reflecting חָשַׁב. B has παρελογίσατο, "deceived," reflecting רִמָּה and 𝔐 has דִּמָּה, "devised."

5e. LXX MSS have ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς, "to utterly destroy us", reflecting the Hebrew לְהַכְרִיתֵנוּ or לְהַשְׁמִידֵנוּ and not 𝔐's verbless לָנוּ.

5g. All LXX MSS, except L, have the personal pronoun αὐτόν after the articular infinitive, whereas, the 𝔐 does not have a pronoun.

6d. B and some LXX MSS have ἐν Γαβαων reflecting בְּגִבְעוֹן, "in Gibeon," instead of ℳ's בְּגִבְעָה, "in Gibeah." M's ἐν τῷ βούνῳ reflects ℳ's consonants בגבעת but different vowel pointing.

6e. All Greek MSS except the hexaplaric have ἐκλεκτούς Κυρίου, "(men) chosen of the Lord," reflecting בְּחִירֵי יְהוָה whereas ℳ has בְּחִיר יְהוָה, "(Saul) chosen of the Lord."

10d. M N B A x rell have ἐν ἀρχῇ, "in the beginning" and L TJ reflect ℳ's מִתְּחִלָּה, "from the beginning."

14b. All LXX MSS except L have καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ Ἰωναθὰν reflecting וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹת יְהוֹנָתָן, "and the bones of Jonathan." L and TJ reflect ℳ's וִיהוֹנָתָן, "and Jonathan."

14c. All LXX MSS describe the burial of the bones of the Seven but ℳ never does. M and most LXX MSS have καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων, "and the bones of those having been exposed to the sun." B describes their burial but not their bones, καὶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων.

IV. Theological and Political Issues Raised By the Differences in M, ℳ, and B

I will summarize below the theological and political issues raised by the differences in the versions. The summary will show that the differences cluster around the roles and responsibilities of key persons of the story: Saul, David, the Lord, and the outsiders (the Gibeonites, Rizpah, the mother of five, and the seven sons).

A. Differences Regarding Saul in the Versions

Saul and Guilt

The LXX texts all agree that "guilt" rests squarely on Saul and on his house because Saul killed the Gibeonites. The conflated words of B are the strongest words against Saul; Saul killed with "bloody violence." ℳ by comparison, is less negative. ℳ never describes

Saul in terms of "guilt." Instead, ₥ has a broader focus for the reason of the famine; it has to do with Saul and his violent house. That is, Saul is not alone in the indictment; it has to do also with his violent family.

The Gibeonite Charge

When David calls the Gibeonites in for talks, the Gibeonites charge Saul with wrongdoing. The charge is different in all three versions. M's version is straightforward: the Gibeonites say, "The man who struck us and pursued us and planned to utterly destroy us..." In B, the Gibeonites say, "The man made up his mind against us and pursued us—the one who deceived to utterly destroy us..." ₥'s version is less negative, describing Saul as "The man who struck us and who devised against us..." As such, M and B want Saul to be wiped out but ₥ does not allow it.

The Location of the Killings

The location of the killing of the Seven also presents different views of Saul. M's location is neutral toward Saul; the Seven are killed "on the hill of Saul." Which hill is this? Presumably the hill of Saul's home in Gibeah but the reader is not told. The ₥ indicates the killings took place in Gibeah of Saul. Saul's connection with Gibeah is positive. Gibeah is Saul's home, the location of his Spirit empowerment and his subsequent prophesying. It reminds the reader that the beginning of Saul's kingship was quite positive. In contrast, B states the location of the killings was in "Gibeon of Saul." Saul's connection with Gibeon is negative. If we are correct to assume a connection with Saul's genealogy in Chronicles,[2] Saul's ancestors were not Israelite but Canaanite. As such, B's description "Gibeon of Saul" raises questions about the legitimacy of Saul's kingship since the Torah states that an Israelite king must be an Israelite.

---

[2]Walters, "Gibeon of Saul," 61-76.

Saul is Chosen of the Lord in M

In M, the Gibeonites refers to Saul as "chosen of the Lord," whereas, the LXX texts describe the sons as "chosen of the Lord." Put in the negative, Saul is not chosen of the Lord in the LXX and the sons are not chosen of the Lord in the M.

B. Differences Regarding David in the Versions

David's Initiative

All three versions describe David seeking the Lord's face at the beginning of the story. After the Lord tells David of Saul's wrong against the Gibeonites, all versions describe David asking the Gibeonites how he might atone for the deaths. The three versions differ in the Gibeonite verbs of request. In M, the Gibeonites command David and the Israelites (2d plural) to give seven sons of Saul, calling for his direct action. M and B have impersonal expressions, "let someone give us seven sons" and "let be given to us seven sons," allowing David the opportunity of being distanced from the giving of the sons; but he chooses otherwise. Thus, in M's story David is obedient and cooperative, whereas, in M and B, David takes initiative in the killings.

As part of their request, the Gibeonites ask to kill seven of Saul's sons. In M and B, the Gibeonites describe the Seven as "chosen of the Lord", whereas, M describes Saul as "chosen of the Lord." The subject of the "chosen" has a direct effect on how God, David, Saul, and the Gibeonites are portrayed in the story. As it relates to David, M describes Saul as "chosen of the Lord," and thus infers that David chose the Seven. M and B, on the other hand, present the Seven as chosen of the Lord, and portray David as cooperative and passive in choosing the Seven.

All versions agree that David spared Jonathan's son Mephibosheth because of his oath with Jonathan and that the name of the mother of the two sons was Rizpah. In M the

name of the mother of the five is Merom (Merab), whereas 𝕸 and B agree her name is

Michal. M's Merab is consistent with the larger Samuel narrative which describes Merab

being married to Adriel the Meholathite (1Sam. 18:19). 𝕸 and B are incongruent with the

rest of the Samuel narrative since Michal, David's wife (1Sam. 25:27) was given to Paltiel

(1Sam. 25:44; 2Sam. 3:15) and not Adriel, and since Michal was supposed to have died

childless (2Sam. 6:23). 𝕸 and B do not resolve these tensions. Furthermore, by this time in

the narrative, Michal has again become David's wife. Thus, in 𝕸 and B, David gave his

wife's sons to be killed. David takes more initiative in 𝕸 by choosing the sons, whereas in

B the sons are chosen of the Lord.

After the death of the sons, the mother of the two sons, Rizpah, keeps vigil over the

bodies, making sure they are not eaten by the birds and the beasts. All versions agree the

report of Rizpah's actions influenced David to bury the bones of Saul and Jonathan in their

ancestral tomb. M had already described Rizpah as a concubine in verse 8 but 𝕸 and B do

not mention it until verse 11. The appearance of her social status for the first time in verse

11 has a slight surprise effect in 𝕸 and B, emphasizing the social disparity between Rizpah

and David. In all versions, the actions of a concubine inspired, perhaps shamed, King

David to action. Compared to David, Rizpah's actions are more commendable.

All versions agree David went down and took the bones of Saul and Jonathan from

the Jabesh Gileadites and brought them up from there. The LXX states that "he (David)

gathered the bones of those who had been hung in the sun," making David solely

responsible for the gathering of the bones of the Seven. The 𝕸 states "they" gathered the

bones of the seven, not necessarily implying David's involvement in the gathering.

Furthermore, the LXX also indicates they buried the bones of Saul, Jonathan and the Seven

in the land of Benjamin while 𝕸 does not mention the burial of the bones of the Seven. The

absence of David's gathering the bones of the Seven and the lack of burial of the Seven

reveals an emphasis of 𝕸: Saul's bones need burial but the burial of the others is not

important. The LXX, on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of both sets of bones being buried. What happens to the bones of the Seven is an important part of the LXX stories.

𝔐 also emphasizes the importance of David's action regarding Saul's bones; God did not listen to the land until David made sure Saul's bones were properly buried. By implication, Saul's actions against the Gibeonites necessitated the offering up of his seven sons, but David was equally wrong in his failure to bury God's chosen king in the land. The LXX, on the other hand, emphasizes the equal treatment of both sets of the deceased: all the bones are buried in Saul's patriarchal tomb in Benjamin. Thus, the LXX emphasizes the need for proper burial of the deceased.

C. The Differences Regarding God in the Versions

Does God Declare Saul Guilty?

As mentioned, all versions begin with David seeking the Lord's face. The Lord speaks only once in the story, to David, in answer to his seeking. The Lord tells David that the reason for the famine has to do with Saul's killing the Gibeonites. The LXX and the 𝔐 differ in the Lord's description of Saul. In the LXX MSS, the Lord pronounces guilt upon Saul and upon his house, whereas in 𝔐, the Lord's pronouncement is broader; "it has to do with Saul and his house of blood." The LXX statement about Saul's guilt in the mouth of the Lord is direct and implies a response is necessary to right Saul's wrong. The broader statement in 𝔐 does not indicate directly the Lord's opposition to Saul and his house.

Who is the Lord's Chosen?

In all versions, David calls in the Gibeonites and expresses his desire to expiate the wrong. The theological assumption is that the deaths need to be atoned. The Gibeonites appear to be aware of this problem and ask for seven sons of Saul that they might hang them up, "to the Lord." In their request, the Gibeonites ask to kill the sons, the location of which is different in the three versions: "on the hill of Saul" (M), "in Gibeah of Saul" (ℳ), and "in Gibeon of Saul." The phrase "chosen of the Lord" that follows refers to the Seven in the LXX, whereas, in the ℳ it refers to Saul. This difference has direct bearing on the theology of each story. In the LXX, the Gibeonites say the Lord chooses the Seven, whereas, in the ℳ the Lord chooses Saul. Thus, the Lord is involved in the killings in the LXX but in the ℳ he is not.

Does God Answer the Prayer of Outsiders?

The Gibeonites kill the Seven "before the Lord" but the famine does not end, implying the expiation is not fully complete. In response, Rizpah grieves and, in M, makes a sackcloth bed upon the rock. B and ℳ describe Rizpah stretching sackcloth for herself "to the rock." As already mentioned, אֶל־הַצּוּר, "to the rock," is undoubtedly a reference to God. ℳ has glossed these words with the notation they occur three times; the other two occurrences are Isaiah 30:29 and 51:1. The marginal cross reference brings alongside this story the prophetic emphases of disobedience, penitence, and restoration. The phrase "to the rock" reminds the reader of the hope for God's people during times of national crisis when they, like Rizpah, turn to God. The connection with the prophetic passages moves the story toward a figural reading; Rizpah is not only a grieving mother but a heroic figure, cast in the role of an intercessor for Israel who looks to God "the rock" for deliverance and restoration. As well, ℳ and B remind the reader of the Lord's grace and compassion for those who repent.

In all stories, Rizpah refused to let the wild animals and the birds feast on the dead bodies for a season of time. M implies divine intervention, describing her staying there until "the waters of God dropped upon them out of heaven." B and ⅏ do not imply divine intervention and are ambiguous about the length of time before the rain came; Rizpah defends the bodies until "water dropped upon them out of the heavens." Thus, B and ⅏ leave open the possibility that Rizpah waited until the autumn rains which came six months later. If this is the case, the Lord did not answer Rizpah's prayer for a long time.

D. The Differences Regarding the Social Outsiders in the Versions

The Gibeonites

All versions agree that the Lord said the famine came upon Israel because Saul killed the Gibeonites. The reader is reminded that Gibeonites were not Israelites. ⅏ describes them as מִיֶּתֶר הָאֱמֹרִי, "from the remains of the Amorites," and M and B describe them ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ᾽Αμορραίου, "from Amorite blood."

What Do the Gibeonites Say About Saul?

Following the Gibeonite charge, the LXX and ⅏ differ in who was wiped out. In the LXX, the Gibeonites request to "wipe out Saul," whereas, in the ⅏ they say, "We were wiped out." As a result, the antecedent of the following phrase, "from having standing in all the territory of Israel," is Saul in the LXX and the Gibeonites in ⅏. In the LXX, the Gibeonites desire to wipe out Saul from having standing in Israel and in the ⅏ the Gibeonites say they were wiped out from having standing. The comparison heightens the emphasis of each story. By comparison, in the LXX, the Gibeonites are victims who seek retribution for the wrong committed against them and in the ⅏ the Gibeonites are only the victims and they never request to wipe out Saul.

How Do the Gibeonites Request the Seven Sons From David?

The Gibeonites request seven of Saul's sons so they might kill them to the Lord. The verb of request is different in all three versions. M has the 2d plural command, δότε, "Give." ℳ has יֻתַּן , a mixture of two forms of יֻתַּן: the nif'al imperfect 3d masculine singular יִנָּתֵן and the qal passive 3d masculine singular יֻתַּן. Both of these forms are translated virtually the same, "Let there be given." B has the 3d person singular imperative δότω, "Let someone give." In M, the social outsiders are powerful; they command a king to give and he gives. In ℳ and B, the Gibeonites neither command nor require David's involvement in the giving of the sons but in both versions David gives them anyway.

Do the Gibeonites Wish to Atone?

Perhaps the Gibeonites are able to command David in M because of their declared purpose. They say, "we will atone by them to the Lord." This request implies that it is possible for the Gibeonites to atone and that the Lord will accept the deaths for such. The Gibeonites have a different purpose in ℳ and B. They never ask to atone but to kill. While "to the Lord" may imply a verb of offering or bringing, their purpose is less overtly cultic; they desire to kill the sons for retribution. By comparison, the Gibeonites are pious in M's description and vindictive in ℳ and B.

When is Rizpah's Social Status Revealed?

The social outsider Rizpah is mentioned first in verse 8 as the mother of five sons who were to be killed. M indicates her social status at that point; she is "the concubine of Saul." ℳ and B, however, do not mention her status until verse 11. Mentioning her social status for the first time in verse 11 has a surprise effect on the story. The juxtaposition of the concubine with the king heightens the social disparity, enhancing the force of Rizpah's

role; it was a concubine that prompted David to provide proper burial for Saul and Jonathan.

Rizpah: Grieving Mother or Pious Heroic Figure?

After the Gibeonites kill the Seven, the famine does not end. In M, Rizpah makes a sackcloth bed upon the rock upon which to lie and grieve. In B and ℳ, Rizpah stretches something like a sackcloth tent for herself to the rock. As already mentioned, ℳ's words אֶל־הַצּוּר, "to the rock," are undoubtedly a reference to God. Thus, in ℳ and B, Rizpah, the concubine, is more than a grieving mother; she is a pious and heroic figure who seeks the Lord in a time of crisis.

How Long Does Rizpah Wait?

Rizpah fends off the wild animals and the birds for a season of time. In M, she stays until God intervenes and drops water out of heaven, whereas, in B and ℳ she stays until water dropped on them out of heaven. In M, Rizpah gets a response from God; God sends water from heaven. In ℳ and B, however, there is no clear indication that God is involved. As a result, Rizpah appears differently in the versions. In M, God responds by sending His water on the land as a result of the actions of a grieving mother. In B and ℳ, Rizpah is a pious, enduring, grieving mother who seeks the Lord. Although rain eventually comes to the land, the Lord does not answer her prayer directly and promptly.

Do the Seven Fall Together or Sevenfold?

All three versions agree the seven sons from Saul's family were killed. M, B, and ℳ's *qere'* agree "the Seven fell there together." ℳ's *ketiv* states the Seven fell "sevenfold." The former makes sense in the context but the latter attracts the attention of the reader. What does it mean they fell "seven-fold?" As already mentioned, this reading resonates with

other places in Hebrew Scripture where God's judgment comes upon covenant breakers. If such a connection can be made, the Seven play a typical or figural role, the embodiment of the cursed. As such, they reap divine punishment.

From Whom and From Where Did David Retrieve the Bones?

After the Seven were killed, they were left exposed for a season of time. After hearing about Rizpah's actions, David acquired the bones of Saul and Jonathan from the Jabesh Gileadites. The three versions differ on the persons from whom David took the bones and the location from which the Jabesh Gileadites stole the bones. M describes David taking the bones from the "men of Jabesh Gilead from the wall of Baithsan after the Philistines had hung them there." In B he takes them from the "men of the sons of Jabesh Gilead who stole them from the city square at Baith[san], for the Philistines placed them there." In ᴫ he takes them from the "rulers of Jabesh Gilead who stole them from the city square at Bethshan where the Philistines hung them." M agrees with the story as told in 1Sam. 31 but ᴫ disagrees with it. B allows for another alternative; the Philistines first hung them on the wall and then later placed them in the city square. The significance of this is yet to be determined.

Were the Bones of the Seven Buried?

The three versions agree David brought up the bones of Saul and Jonathan from Baithsan but they differ on who gathered the bones of the Seven. The LXX describes David doing it and the ᴫ indicates that more than one person did it. All three stories agree "they buried" the bones of Saul and Jonathan in Saul's family tomb, but the LXX and the ᴫ differ about the burial of the Seven. The LXX describes the Seven being buried with the bones of Saul and Jonathan in the family tomb. M states that "the bones" of the Seven were buried, implying a length of time after the deaths in which the bodies would decay leaving only the

bones. Perhaps Rizpah no longer fended off the birds and the beasts from the bodies after God sent rain. Perhaps God's rain did not fall for a long time. M does not tell. The reader is only told that "the bones" of the Seven are buried with Saul's. Although B does not mention the bones of the Seven in verse 14, it does mention the gathering of them in verse 13. Thus, B agrees with M's burial of the bones with Saul's. ⅿ, on the other hand, never mentions the burial of the Seven. Thus, the burial of Saul's and Jonathan's bones are important for ⅿ but the burial of the Seven is not.

Was the Mother of the Five Sons Merab or Michal?

The stories disagree about the name of the mother of the five sons. M calls her "Merom" a form of "Merab" and ⅿ and B call her "Michal." M's Merab is congruent with what is known about her elsewhere; Merab was the wife of Esdriel son of Barzillai, the Meholathite (1Sam. 18:19). Also, since Michal is supposed to have died childless (2Sam. 6:23), how can she be the mother of five? In all stories, Rizpah fended off the wild animals and birds of prey from the bodies, while the mother of five, Merab or Michal, did not. This does not reflect positively on the mother of five. How can a mother who loses five sons care less than one who loses two? The disparity in the social status of Rizpah and the mother of five, heightens the actions of Rizpah and the lack thereof by Merab or Michal. A concubine is a pious hero and a king's daughter is apathetic! The emphasis on social disparity is even greater in ⅿ and B where Michal is the mother since by this time in the narrative she is also the wife of King David. By inference, the story with Michal may also reflect negatively on David. In political terms, David allowed his step sons to be killed. In ⅿ, David is aggressive; he chooses them to be killed. David eliminates any possibility of Michal's children becoming heirs to his throne. Thus, by contrasting Rizpah with Merab, M portrayed Merab as a neglectful mother. B portrays Michal, King David's wife, as the

neglectful mother. M portrays both Michal and David negatively since David chose Michal's sons for the killings.

V. Theological and Political Interests of M, M, and B

Having compared the three versions of the story and highlighted the theological and political interests raised by the stories, I will now summarize the theological and political interests of each story.

A. The Theological and Political Interests of M

God is an Active Participant in the Story

God is actively involved in M's version of the story. When David seeks the Lord's face, the Lord tells him that guilt for the famine rests upon Saul; God answers when people seek His face during times of crisis. Saul's guilt requires atonement which comes by killing seven of Saul's descendants. In M, God chooses the Seven and the Gibeonites kill them on the mountain before the Lord. The concubine Rizpah makes a bed of sackcloth on a rock and defends the bodies from the wild beasts and birds of prey until God intervenes: "waters of God fell upon them out of heaven." When David sees all that Rizpah did he buries the bones of Saul and Jonathan and the bones of the Seven in the patriarchal tomb and the reader is told, "God listened to the land after these things."

Saul is a Guilty Aggressive King

In M, Saul incurred "guilt" upon himself and his family because he killed the Gibeonites. The Gibeonites describe Saul's wrong specifically; Saul assaulted them, pursued them, and planned to wipe them out. By doing this, Saul broke an old covenant which the Israelites had made with the Gibeonites, thus bringing the curse for such on the

Israelites. This wrong caused a famine in the land and the killing of seven of his descendants.

David is a Pious, Innocent and Cooperative King

David's piety shows forth throughout the story. He seeks the Lord's face during this time of national crisis. He calls the Gibeonites in and expresses his desire to atone and commands the Gibeonites to bless the inheritance of the Lord. Later David is described as keeping his oath with Jonathan when he spared Jonathan's son Mephibosheth.

Throughout, David is cooperative but politically distant from the deaths of the sons. He cooperates by expressing his willingness to give the Gibeonites that which they are demanding. The Gibeonites command David and the Israelites to give them seven of Saul's sons so they might kill them. David gives the sons but it is the Lord who chooses the sons.

David acts again when he hears all Rizpah did in protecting the bodies from the birds and the beasts. He responds by gathering and bringing up the bones of Saul and Jonathan from Bethshan along with those of the Seven. Then, he has the bones of them all buried in Saul's patriarchal tomb. After the burials the story ends with God hearkening to the land.

Outsiders Can Be Pious

M portrays social outsiders as pious in several ways. Although the Gibeonites were clearly wronged by Saul, their stated purpose for killing the Seven is "to atone." Also, the Gibeonites' role in the death of the Seven is ancillary since the Seven are "chosen of the Lord." Furthermore, the social outsider Rizpah mourns, prompting God to action; she makes a bed of sackcloth and defends the bodies until the "waters of God dropped from heaven."

Outsiders Can Have Power Over the Israelites as God's Instruments of Judgment

The Gibeonites appear quite powerful in their dialogue with King David. Though

their stated request is to atone, in their charge against Saul, they seek retribution, "He

reasoned to wipe us out. Let us wipe him (Saul) out from having standing in all Israel."

They even command King David and the Israelites to give them seven sons so they can kill

them, and David gives. It is as though the Gibeonites have all the power and David is at

their beck.

B. The Theological and Political Interests of ‏מ‎

God is Distant From the Executions

The theological emphasis of ‏מ‎ can be seen as much in what is not stated as in what

is stated. After David seeks the Lord's face, the Lord gives a broad and cryptic statement

about the reason for the famine, "It has to do with Saul and his house of blood." Unlike the

LXX, ‏מ‎ does not describe Saul as guilty. Furthermore, the Gibeonites request that seven

sons be given to them, but ‏מ‎ never describes them as "chosen of the Lord." It is Saul who

is "chosen of the Lord." Thus, by inference, it is David who chooses the Seven and the

Lord is distant from the executions.

When Rizpah makes a sackcloth tent "to the rock," that is, to the Lord, ‏מ‎ is

ambiguous about God's response. The rain that falls is not "the waters of God out of

heaven" but "water from the heavens." Furthermore, the reader is not told how long

Rizpah waited for the rain. It leaves open the possibility that she stayed until the seasonal

rain fell five or six months later. The Lord listens to the land only after David buries the

fallen King Saul while the burial of the Seven is not important in ‏מ‎.

Saul is the Lord's Chosen and an Ideal King

By comparison with the LXX, 𝕸 is much more positive about Saul. Again, the view of Saul espoused by 𝕸 is seen as much in what is not stated as in what is stated. For instance, Saul is never described as guilty. Furthermore, the Gibeonites never say Saul pursued/persecuted them. Saul only "devised" against them. The Gibeonites never say, "Let us wipe out Saul" but rather describe themselves as the ones who were wiped out.

𝕸's positive reflection on Saul can also be seen in the location of the killings. The Gibeonites ask for seven sons of Saul so that they might kill them "in Gibeah of Saul, chosen of the Lord." Gibeah was the location of Saul's home, the place where the Spirit empowered him, changed heart and subsequent prophesying. Though shocking in the mouths of the Gibeonites, this location reminds the reader that Saul was the Lord's chosen, a king anointed by a prophet, and as such associated with the prophetic movement.

The way 𝕸 distinguishes between the bones of the Seven and those of Saul and Jonathan also reflects positively on Saul. 𝕸's *ketiv* describes the Seven falling "seven-fold" probably associating them with the accursed. As already mentioned, a description of the Seven falling "seven-fold" resonates with Lev. 26 where the Lord warns he will punish covenant breakers "seven-fold" (vs. 18). For the covenant breakers, the Lord will make the skies to be like bronze, (vs. 19) multiply their afflictions "seven times" (vs. 21), and afflict them for their sins "seven times" over (vs. 24). If such a connection can be made, the Seven are associated with the accursed falling "seven-fold." This explains why the bones of the Seven are never buried and the bones of Saul are. Saul is not like the accursed. In fact, the sole reason for the Lord's hearkening to the land is David's burial of Saul's and Jonathan's bones. Saul is the Lord's chosen, a prophetically anointed king, who deserved proper burial.

David Takes Initiative in the Death of the Seven Which is Not Required and is Neglectful for Not Burying Saul

By comparison, David is viewed less positively in ווו than in the LXX. Although David is described in some positive ways (he prays, wishes to atone), ווו portrays him as an active and willful participant in the killing of the Seven. He is involved in the choosing of the Seven when it is not required. They said, "Let seven of his sons be given to us." Anyone could have given them but David said, "I will give." That is, David had the opportunity to distance himself from the killings but he chose the opposite.

ווו's singular construct בְּחִיר, making Saul the antecedent of "chosen" in verse 6, also points to an emphasis in ווו on David's involvement in the killings. Since Saul is the "chosen," ווו implies that David chose the Seven. Which of Saul's sons did David choose? He chose two sons from the concubine Rizpah and five sons from Michal. By this time in the narrative, Michal is David's wife. According to the Samuel narrative, Michal was married to David, given to Paltiel by Saul, and then given back to David. The details of the narrative in Samuel resist Michal as the mother, since she does not bear children, at least by David. Read as is, although incongruent with the larger narrative, David chose the sons of his estranged wife to die. This can hardly be positive toward David, especially when he is an active participant in the choosing.

Afterwards, it was reported to David how Rizpah, the mother of the two, kept the the birds and the beasts from eating the corpses. This report prompted David to provide proper burial for Saul in his patriarchal tomb. Rizpah's social status, a concubine of Saul, is mentioned for the first time in the story. The contrast is shocking; a concubine prompts a king to action. Why did he not bury Saul's bones earlier? Why does a concubine need to inspire a king? This is shameful to David. Is a king a great leader who has to be shamed by a concubine to do what the law requires?

The end of the story drives home the less positive commentary about David. The bones of Saul and Jonathan are buried in Saul's ancestral tomb but the ווו never mentions

the burial of the Seven. Thus, the sole reason for God's hearkening to the land is David's action to bury the bones of Saul, and it has nothing to do with the burial of the Seven. Put differently, David's neglect of burying Saul's and Jonathan's bones kept God from listening to the land. By implication, David was as complicious as Saul for the divine curse on Israel's land.

Outsiders Can Serve as Pious Heroic Figures in Israel

After the death of the Seven, Rizpah stretches her sackcloth "to the rock", that is, to God. As such, she exemplifies what Israel should do during times of crisis. 𝔐 notes the words "to the rock" occur three times, and it is possible to regard the phrase as hermeneutic. The contexts of the other two references (Isaiah 30:29; 51:1) remind the reader that God longs to be gracious and compassionate to his people, to restore them if they will repent when divine judgment comes. Rizpah's stretching her sackcloth "to the rock," pushes the reader to look beyond the story to view her as a figure of hope. Rizpah embodies what Israel should do during times of divine judgment. And, her social status as a concubine reminds the reader that even those with low social status can inspire recalcitrant Israelites, even kings, to make decisions that will lead to the restoration of God's people and their land. As such, Rizpah is a figure of hope in 𝔐's story.

Outsiders Do Not Atone

The Gibeonites' stated purpose for the Seven in 𝔐 is retribution; they seek "to impale them to the Lord." Although there are cultic implications in that request, they do not say they wish to atone as in M and other LXX texts. Atonement by outsiders is not possible in 𝔐.

Outsiders Are Not Aggressive Towards Kings Even When They Are Functioning as
Instruments of Divine Judgment

In contrast to the LXX, the Gibeonites in 𝔐 are less aggressive and more positive about Saul in their interaction with David. Again, more is seen by what the Gibeonites do not say than by what they say. In 𝔐, the Gibeonites never say, "Let us wipe out Saul." Instead, they say, "We were wiped out." The Gibeonites never command David to "give" seven sons of Saul. They use the third person passive, "Let seven sons be given." They call Saul and not the Seven "chosen of the Lord." These differences provide a cumulative effect on the story. The Gibeonites, though instruments of divine judgment, are not aggressive in their request for retribution against Saul.

C. The Theological and Political Interests of B

Saul's Kingship Was Quite Negative and Illegitimate

Of the three versions, B is the most negative toward Saul and his family. Like all LXX MSS, B describes Saul as guilty because he killed the Gibeonites. B's triple conflation includes a harsh statement: Saul "killed with bloody violence." Later in the story, the Gibeonites describe Saul as the man who "made up his mind against them." The same words are used only in 1Sam. 20:34 where Jonathan grieves because Saul had made up his mind to try to kill David. As such, it reminds the reader of Saul's pattern to attempt to destroy his perceived foes, even persons who are part of God's people--David and the Gibeonites. In that way, Saul shows himself to be an enemy of God and God's people.

Like the other LXX MSS, B describes Saul pursuing the Gibeonites, but B alone describes Saul as one who "deceived." As already mentioned, this sets up ironic resonance with other biblical stories: the Gibeonite deception in Joshua 9; Michal's deception when she helped David flee from Saul in 1Sam. 19; Saul's deception of the necromancer at Endor in 1Sam. 28. To be called a deceiver is negative for Saul.

As a result, the Gibeonites request that someone give seven sons of Saul so they can kill them "in Gibeon of Saul." Saul's connection with Gibeon may connote that Saul's kingship was illegitimate. According to the Chronicler, Saul's genealogy is not linked to one of the twelve tribes of Israel. Saul's great-grandfather was "the father of Gibeon" and not from one of Jacob's twelve sons. As such, the Gibeonites were from the same town as Saul's ancestors. Whether Saul ever made his headquarters in Gibeon, as hypothesized by Blenkinsopp, is irrelevant to the theological force of the narrative.[3] If Saul's ancestry was Canaanite and not Israelite, he did not fit the criteria for an Israelite king as prescribed in Dt. 17:15, "Do not place a foreigner over you, one who is not a brother Israelite." As such, "Saul of Gibeon" probably hints at Saul's illegitimacy as a king. By contrast, the tribes of Israel could say of David that he was their own flesh and blood (2Sam. 5:1).

If the above mentioned assumptions are correct, B's version presents Saul as a violent killer, an enemy at times of God and God's people, a deceiver, and a illegitimate king. B's version ends like the rest of the LXX versions, with Saul's and Jonathan's bones being buried in Saul's father's tomb. Though Saul, his family, and his kingship are quite negative, he still deserves to receive proper burial in his ancestral tomb.

David is a Pious, Innocent and Cooperative King

B's description of David is almost the same as M's. He is pious. He seeks the Lord during a time of national crisis. The Lord tells David that Saul's guilt is the reason for the famine. He expresses his desire to atone. He keeps his oath by sparing Jonathan's son Mephibosheth. Throughout, David is a king who seeks the Lord.

As in M, David cooperates with the Gibeonite request to kill the sons by giving the Seven. Though the Gibeonites did not require David's involvement in the giving--they said, "Let someone give"--David steps forward to give the sons. David's giving indicates

---

[3]Blenkensopp, "Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital," 1-7.

cooperation and is not a breach of David's oath not to wipe out Saul's sons since the sons are "chosen of the Lord." David responds when he hears about Rizpah's heroic acts by gathering and bringing up the bones of Saul and Jonathan and those of the Seven. David has all of them buried in Saul's patriarchal tomb and the story ends with God hearkening to the land.

God was Actively Involved in the Killing of the Seven

B's portrayal of God is similar to M's. God answers David when he seeks the Lord. God's pronouncement of guilt upon Saul and his murderous house is more negative to Saul than any other version. As in the rest of the LXX, David gives the Seven sons but the Lord chooses them. As such, the Lord is actively involved in the killing of the Seven.

God Does not Respond Promptly to Rizpah's Grief

The Lord does not respond to Rizpah's grief by sending the "waters of God out of heaven" as in M. The rain that falls upon them is only "water from the sky" and that only after a length of time. The story is silent about God's involvement in sending the rain. Also, in all MSS, the "bones" were gathered (vs. 13). This assumes enough time lapsed for the bodies to decompose. Furthermore, God hearkens to the land only after David has all the bones of Saul and Jonathan and the Seven brought up and buried in their ancestral tomb. Thus, in B the Lord responds to David's action but not to Rizpah's grief.

God Chose to Wipe Out Michal's Sons (An Outsider's Sons)

As in M, the name of the mother of five is Michal. As already mentioned, according to the Samuel narrative, Michal is the wrong mother; Michal did not have children and Merab was the wife of Adriel the Meholathite. Interpreted as is, the story is quite negative toward Michal. It was God and not David who chooses Michal's sons to be killed.

Social Outsiders Can Prompt God's People to Action

Like the ℿ, B portrays Rizpah crying out to the Lord after the death of her sons but the Lord does not answer her for a long time. She stretches her sackcloth "to the rock," but the rain that eventually comes is only water from the sky and not the "water of God." Nonetheless, Rizpah's pious acts do have their effect. David hears of Rizpah's actions and he is prompted to bury all the bones. B and ℿ mention for the first time that Rizpah is a concubine of Saul. This detail draws attention to the social disparity between Rizpah and David; a concubine prompts a king to take action. Thus, the piety of social outsiders may not cause God to act, but it can prompt God's people, even a king, to act which in turn can bring about God's blessing.

Outsiders Can Be Vindictive As Instruments of Divine Judgment

After the Gibeonites described Saul's wrongdoing, they ask for seven sons of Saul so they might hang them out in the sun to the Lord. Their request seems to be a desire for retribution. They want revenge and they get it.

VI. Ideological Contexts of M, ℿ, and B

We turn our attention now to the ideological contexts of each version of the story. By ideology I mean the "representation of reality, that through which reality is experienced and mediated."[4] I will look for the cluster of ideas, beliefs, social needs, and aspirations within which each story is at home. I hope to show that M's ideological context was sympathetic towards proselytes and outsiders, that ℿ's emphasized the prophetic movement and depreciated Davidic kingship and the role of outsiders, and that B shares an ideological context similar to the Chronicler.

---

[4] A. D. H. Mayes, "Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament," JSOT 82, (1999): 61.

A. The Ideological Context of M

Sympathetic Toward Proselytes and Outsiders

The core story and many of the distinct features of M point to an ideological context sympathetic toward proselytes. Proselytes are secure in their position in Israel because their agreement to become part of God's people is binding for all generations. Three such agreements are mentioned in 2Sam. 21:1-14; two are explicit and one is implied: the Israelite treaty with the Gibeonites (2Sam. 21:2; Josh. 9); David's covenant with Jonathan's family (2Sam. 21:7; 1Sam. 20:14-17); and David's oath to Saul not to wipe out Saul's name (1Sam. 24:22-23). Saul broke an old agreement between the Israelites and the Gibeonites and as a result incurred divine punishment on his family and Israel. A famine ravaged the land of Israel and the Gibeonites are allowed to kill seven of Saul's sons whom the Lord chooses. Thus, proselytes have God on their side when they become part of God's people.

Proselytes can seek retribution from those who attempt to destroy their position within Israel. When David calls in the Gibeonites to discuss how he might atone for Saul's wrong, the Gibeonites describe Saul's wrong. Then, they seek retribution and are allowed to have it. They say Saul wiped them out and because of that wish to wipe him out. They can even command King David and the Israelites to give (2d plural) them seven sons.

Proselytes can also share in the atoning process like others within Israel. The Gibeonites, like David, express their desire to atone; David wants to atone (2Sam. 21:3) as do the Gibeonites. They are also able to command a king and the Israelites to give what is necessary--seven sons--to bring about the atonement. Furthermore, the Gibeonites invoke God's involvement and express their cooperation in the atoning process by saying the Seven would be "chosen of the Lord." In this way, atonement comes when all of God's people--David, the Gibeonites, Rizpah--cooperate with God in the atoning process.

Outsiders in the community, even those rightfully executed, are protected by Jewish law against improper treatment. Although God sends rain after Rizpah mourns on sackcloth, He does not listen to the land until David buries all the bones—the bones of Saul, Jonathan and the Seven—in their ancestral tomb. This assumes an awareness of Dt. 21:22-23 which explicitly states that unburied bones defile the land:

> When someone is convicted of a crime punishable by death and is executed, and you hang him on a tree, his corpse must not remain all night upon the tree; you shall bury him that same day, for anyone hung on a tree is under God's curse. You must not defile the land that the Lord your God is giving you for possession.

The land is defiled, not because of the killings, but because the bodies are left unburied after the day they expired. Israel cannot enjoy God's blessing on the land if they mistreat outsiders.

Thus, M's version is sympathetic to proselytes and outsiders in that it illustrates the security of their position in the community, their power to seek retribution against those who try to destroy them, equal participation in the atonement process, and equal protection under the law.

B. The Ideological Context of M

Interest in Saul's Connection with the Prophetic Movement

One of the distinctive characteristics of M is the connection between Saul and the prophetic movement; M is the only version that connects Saul with Gibeah. As already mentioned, Gibeah was the location of Saul's empowering by God's Spirit, his subsequent prophesying, and his changed heart. As already indicated, M has a much more positive view of Saul than the LXX versions: Saul is never described as guilty; he never pursues the Gibeonites; the Gibeonites never ask to wipe Saul out but instead call Saul the Lord's chosen; the burial of Saul's bones at the end of the story was the sole reason for the Lord

listening to the land. 𝔐's positive portrayal of Saul coupled with Saul's connection with the prophetic movement, provides a window into 𝔐's ideological context. 𝔐's ideological context probably looked to the prophetic movement for its ideals and as such saw Saul as an ideal Israelite king.

The interest in the prophetic movement is also seen in the marginal gloss regarding Rizpah's use of sackcloth; she stretched the sackcloth to herself "to the rock." I have already argued that 𝔐's note, which indicates the words "to the rock" occur three times, is hermeneutic. "To the rock" occurs twice in Isaiah (30:29; 51:1) where God is described longing to restore his people if they will repent. The passages read alongside 2Sam. 21:1-14, present a vision of hope for God's people through the prophetic message.

From these connections with the prophetic, it can be inferred that prophetic kingship and the prophetic movement were important to 𝔐's ideological context. Saul was probably seen as an ideal king because of his connections with the prophetic movement and Rizpah was an ideal Israelite woman who embodied the essence of what Israel should do during times of national crisis according to the prophetic word in Isaiah.

Davidic Kingship was Depreciated

𝔐 portrays David in a less positive way than the LXX. In 𝔐, David is intentionally involved in killing the Seven; David gives the Seven when he could have distanced himself from the killings and he chooses five sons from his estranged wife Michal to die. Though Rizpah grieves and seeks the Lord, the narrative does not describe God answering her. 𝔐 emphasizes the length of time of her vigil, "from the beginning of the harvest until water dropped upon them from the sky." Her vigil can be understood as having no effect on the Lord, but it did have an effect on David. Rizpah's actions shamed David into burying the bones of Saul and Jonathan. God hearkened because David buried Saul's and Jonathan's bones. One of the distinct characteristics of 𝔐's ideology is the absence of the burial of the

Seven at the end of the story. This is positive for Saul but negative for David. Saul's bones are distinguished from those of the Seven. Saul, the Lord's chosen, a king associated with the prophetic movement, deserves to be buried, whereas, the Seven who were killed because of Saul's wrong against the Gibeonites are not buried. David's neglect in burying Saul and Jonathan emphasizes David's failure. The sole reason for God's not hearkening to the land had to do with David and had nothing to do with Rizpah's vigil or the burial of the Seven. It can be inferred from this that Saul's kingship was important to 𝔐's ideological context and that David's was depreciated.

Violence Against Saul's Sons By the Gibeonites is Not Allowed

𝔐 is different from the LXX regarding the responsibility for the killing of the Seven. The LXX is clear that Saul is responsible for the famine because of his killing the Gibeonites. The Gibeonites describe Saul's violence against them and then ask to wipe out Saul from having standing in Israel. Their request for the seven sons involves the Lord's choosing and therefore implies that God condones their deaths. The 𝔐 tells a different story in this regard. 𝔐's ideological context does not allow the Gibeonites to seek retribution against Saul's family. As well, the Gibeonite charge against Saul is less violent in 𝔐; Saul struck them and devised against them but he did not wipe them out. Furthermore, 𝔐's awkward נִשְׁמַדְנוּ in verse 5 does not allow the Gibeonites to request to wipe out Saul. Also, 𝔐's singular bound form בְּחִיר modifies Saul and not the Seven indicating the Lord's choosing Saul and not the Seven. Thus, in 𝔐, the Lord is distant from the killings and at no point is violence (verbal or physical) condoned against Saul by the Gibeonites. It may be inferred from this that the ideological context of 𝔐 did not allow violence by non-Jews against Jews even for retribution.

Depreciation of the Role of Outsiders

After the Seven were killed, 𝔐 describes Rizpah taking sackcloth and stretching it to the rock--to God. 𝔐 implies a long time for Rizpah's vigil, from the beginning of the barley harvest until water dropped from the sky. As already mentioned, if the rain that came was the autumn rains, then Rizpah watched over the bodies for five or six months and the only rain which came was probably the seasonal rains. Thus, 𝔐 reflects an ideological context in which social outsiders may influence Israelites to action but they cannot move God's heart.

The Importance of Congruity with the Torah

Compared to the LXX, 𝔐's statement about the reason for the famine is broad and vague: "It has to do with Saul and his murderous house because he killed the Gibeonites." 𝔐's "murderous house" evokes more than Saul's own violence; it also extends the responsibility to include those around him, such as Doeg's killing the priests of Nob (1Sam. 22:18) or even beyond his death to his general Abner's murder of Asahel (2Sam. 2:23). Why does it matter that Saul's sons are implicated along with Saul for the reason for the famine? Perhaps it has to do with a perceived contradiction with Dt. 24:16 which specifically states, "Parents shall not be put to death for their children, nor shall children be put to death for their parents; only for their own crimes may persons be put to death." As 𝔐 reads, Saul's sons do not die for Saul's crime; they die for their own. Whether it can be proved that 𝔐's *Vorlage* changed the text to comply with the law in Deuteronomy or not is inconsequential for our purposes. 𝔐's version does comply with the law and can be read without an apparent contradiction. Thus, it may be inferred from this reading that congruity with the Torah was important in 𝔐's ideological context.

C. The Ideological Context of B

Biblical Stories Can Inform Other Biblical Stories

B's version has several verbal connections with other biblical stories. Some of these

connections portray Saul as a violent and illegitimate king who brought disaster on Israel.

Another portrays David potentially as a Moses-type figure. The cumulative effect of these

verbal connections pushes the reader to interpret the story within the larger context of

Hebrew Scripture. It may be inferred that B's ideological context valued this type of

interpretation. I will explore these connections below.

Illegitimate Kingship Brings Violence and Disaster On Israel

Of the three versions, B alone describes the Gibeonites requesting to kill the Seven

in "Gibeon of Saul." As already noted, Saul's association with Gibeon reminds the reader

that Saul's genealogy is not Israelite but Canaanite (1Chr. 8:29-33; 9:35-39). As such, and

if we can assume an awareness of the qualifications of an Israelite king from Dt. 17:14-15,

this connection with Gibeon suggests that Saul is an illegitimate king:

> When you have come into the land that the Lord your God is giving you, and have
> taken possession of it and settled in it, and you say, "I will set a king over me, like
> all the nations that are around me," you may indeed set over you a king whom the
> Lord your God will choose. One of your own community you may set as king over
> you; you are not permitted to put a foreigner over you, who is not of your own
> community.

In verse 5, the Gibeonites charge that "Saul made up his mind against us," using a

phrase that is found elsewhere only in 1Sam. 20:33-34. The parallel draws into the story

Saul's violence and readiness to kill. In 1Sam. 20, David had fled from Saul after Saul

attempted to kill him. In a clandestine meeting, David and Jonathan discuss David's safety.

Together they pledge themselves to protect David and Jonathan's family. Jonathan commits

to discover Saul's intent regarding David and to communicate that to David. In Jonathan's

discussion with Saul, Saul's anger flares up at Jonathan and he throws his spear at

Jonathan. Then, Jonathan knows that his father has "made up his mind against" David.

Saul's violence is unpredictable, even to the extent that, in a sudden outburst, he tries to kill his son. Thus, it is possible to see B's phrase "made up his mind against" as hermeneutic, a commentary on Saul's violent kingship.

In B alone, the Gibeonites describe Saul as one who "deceived them." As already mentioned, this charge sets up ironic resonances between this and other biblical stories of deception. In Josh. 9, the ancestors of the Gibeonites won their place in Israel by a ruse. They whose descendants were deceptive now complain about Saul's deception. In 1Sam. 19, Saul's daughter Michal deceived Saul by helping David escape when Saul's men were trying to kill David. Like father, like daughter. Finally, in 1Sam. 28, Saul deceived the witch at Endor to call up Samuel from the grave. Saul's duplicity reveals his character the night before his death. Saul was a deceiver and as such was a pitiful example for an Israelite king.

The cumulative affect of B's connections to other biblical stories as mentioned above, presents a quite negative portrait of Saul: Saul is guilty; he killed with "bloody violence"; he pursued; he deceived to utterly destroy the Gibeonites. It may be inferred from this that B's ideological context perceived Saul as an example of what happens when an illegitimate king comes to power in Israel; his kingship is characterized by violence and deception.

Legitimate Kings Serve Like Moses

Seeing the verbal connections that B's version has with other biblical stories raises the possibility that B's elegant 1st person singular aorist subjunctive ἐξιλάσωμαι, "I might atone," is another such connection. ἐξιλάσωμαι occurs only in Ex. 32:30 where Moses proposes to make propitiation for the people of Israel after they made the golden calf. In the context, Moses functions as a priest, interceding for God's people who are about to be

destroyed because of their idolatry. If we can assume a connection, David may be cast in the priestly function here similar to Moses.

VII. Proposed Settings for M, ᵐ, and B

This study has attempted to show that the MSS M ᵐ and B present different versions of the biblical story found in 2 Samuel 21:1-14, which reflect different theological and political interests. These distinct versions have been shrouded in the last one hundred and fifty years primarily because critical scholars and translators have fixated on recreating a hypothetical oldest text. However, these different versions are available to the modern reader because group(s) of people preserved them as sacred Scripture. Unfortunately, there is not enough data independent of these narratives, to locate the different versions of the story within particular historical and religious settings. If a linear relationship between the three versions can be assumed, a chronological sequence which makes sense of the data is M, B, and ᵐ, as I will explain below. Whether M and B correspond to the OG and the *kaige* recension is beyond the scope of this work. Since the discovery of the manuscripts in the Judean Desert proved that more than one type of Hebrew text of Samuel existed in Palestine during the first century B.C., a linear relationship among the three versions is not required. At the least, M, B and ᵐ are three different versions of the same story which reflect different theological and political interests. I will summarize what is known about the three MSS traditions, propose a chronological sequence which makes sense of the data, and from that, propose settings for each version.

A. The Dating and a Brief Description of MSS M, ᵐ, and B

As already mentioned, the manuscripts discovered at Qumran verified that a plurality of Hebrew texts existed in Palestine between the third century B.C. and the first century A.D. After the destruction of the Jerusalem temple in A.D. 70 and the conflicts

between Jews and Christians about the variances between the Hebrew and LXX texts in the first and second centuries A.D., the Jews retranslated the Hebrew Bible into Greek to reflect the received Hebrew text, and the old LXX versions became the Bible for many Christians. It is no surprise thus that the MSS M and B were discovered among Christians and the m among Jews.

Manuscript B, Codex Vaticanus, is the oldest manuscript of the three. It probably dates to the fourth century A.D.[5] and has been housed in the Vatican Library, Rome, since at least the late fifteenth century except for a brief trip to Paris during the Napoleonic wars. B's 759 leaves include every book of the Greek Old Testament[6] except 1-4 Maccabees.[7]

Manuscript M, Codex Coislinianus, dates to the sixth or seventh century A.D.,[8] consists of 227 leaves and covers with lacuna the Old Testament books Genesis 1:1-1Kings 8:40.[9] It was acquired in the East in the middle of the 17th century and still resides at Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris.

m is represented in the Leningrad Codex B 19[A] which was written in A.D. 1008, and is the oldest manuscript of the complete Hebrew Bible. Although m's vocalization, accentuation, and the apparatus of the Masoretic notes were added during the Middle Ages,

---

[5]Swete, Introduction, 128; Jellicoe, Septuagint, 179, note 3.

[6]B lacks Gen.1:1-46:28, 2Sam. 2:5-7, 10-13 and Ps. 105:27-137:6.

[7]Jellicoe points out that Rahlfs was the first to definitely associate B with Athanasius "on the ground that the number and order of the books in both the Old and New Testaments of this manuscript correspond exactly to the Canon of Scripture as given in his 39th Festal Letter of A.D. 367. . ." Jellicoe, Septuagint, 178-79, citing A. Rahlfs, "Alter und Heimat der vatikanischen Bibelhandschrift", NKGW, Phil.-hist. Ll. i (1899), 72-79.

[8]B. Montfaucon, Bibliotheca Coisliniana, from Swete, Intro., 140.

[9]Gen. 1:1-34:2; 38:24-Num. 29:23; 31:4-Josh.10:6; 22:34-Ruth 4:19; 1Sam. 1:1-4:19; 10:19-14:26; 25:33 - 1Kgs. 8:40.

its consonantal framework reflects an ancient tradition that was in existence more than a thousand years earlier.[10]

B. The Chronological Sequence of M, Ⅲ, and B

Dependency and development are required for establishing a chronological sequence of the MSS. Although a great deal of the verbal dependency is apparent (88%), certainty about dependency among the three versions is still out of reach. Development, however, does seem apparent in two of the versions as I will discuss below.

B Appears to be a Developed Text

In B, the Gibeonites express their desire to kill the seven sons of Saul in "Gibeon of Saul," whereas, M and the Ⅲ, reflecting the same Hebrew consonants, have "on the hill of Saul" and "in Gibeah of Saul" respectively. Since the great majority of Greek MSS read "on the hill" and since the MSS which have "in Gibeon" are from the late recensions only, "Gibeon" is probably a late alteration of an earlier Greek text with "on the hill." The affect of the "Gibeon" reading on the story is to enhance the already negative description of Saul in the LXX, reminding the reader of Saul's genealogy in Chronicles, and probably hinting at Saul's illegitimacy as king of Israel. According to 1Chr. 9:35-39, Saul is the son of Kish, son of Ner, son of Jeiel, the father of Gibeon. The Hebrew book of Samuel, on the other hand, does not connect Saul with Gibeon. According to 1Sam. 9:1, Saul is the son of Kish, son of Abiel, son of Zeror, son of Becorath, son of Aphiah, a Benjaminite. Chronicles, on the other hand, links Saul's ancestors twice with Gibeon.[11] If Walters is correct, that the Chronicler links Saul to the ancient Canaanite city of Gibeon rather than to

---

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

[11]1Chr. 8:29-33 and 9:35-39

one of Jacob's twelve sons,[12] B's version is quite negative toward Saul since Israelite kings are supposed to be selected only from among the Israelites (Dt. 17:15). As such, B's version presents Saul's kingship as illegitimate and explains ultimately why he was rejected.

Two other developments in B present Saul also in a negative light. B's Greek phrase in 2Sam. 21:5, Saul "made up his mind against us," is found elsewhere only in 1Sam. 20:33-34. The parallel draws into the story Saul's readiness to kill both David and Jonathan. In 2Sam. 21:5, B also refers to Saul as one "who deceived." As already noted, this reference sets up strong ironic resonances between this and other biblical stories about deceptiveness.[13] Since these differences occur only in what are considered the late recensions, B appears to be a developed text and later than M in a chronological sequence.

B also shows what is probably a development with the formal and elegant future subjunctive form of "bless" in vs. 3 where the rest of the LXX MSS have the future indicative. B's form occurs elsewhere only in Ex. 32:30 where Moses functions like a priest, proposing to make propitiation for the people of Israel after they made the golden calf. The fact that such a connection can be made in the Greek text, suggests that B is a developed text. If a connection was intended, David is cast into the priestly function here similar to Moses.

ℳ Appears to be a Developed Text

There are four minuses in the Hebrew which point to intentional development in ℳ's version. In 2Sam. 21:1 of ℳ, God does not say that "guilt" rests upon Saul like all Greek versions. Furthermore, the Gibeonites do not say that Saul "pursued/persecuted"

---

[12]Walters, "Saul and Gibeon," 61-76.

[13]Josh. 9:22; 1Sam. 19:17; 28:12

them, or planned "to utterly destroy" them in vs. 5. As already explained, the awkwardness of 𝕸's reading, especially with the absence of the "to utterly destroy" verb, may show evidence of revision from an alternative Hebrew version. Also, in vs. 14, 𝕸 has a minus where all LXX versions mention the burial of the bones of the Seven. The cumulative effect of these minuses points to intentionality and the development in the story toward a less negative description of Saul.

Three other readings that occur only in 𝕸 point also to development in 𝕸. In 2Sam. 21:5, 𝕸's vocalization of the "destroy" verb is different from that of the LXX. As a result, the Gibeonites say, "we were destroyed" rather than "let us destroy him." 𝕸's verb is awkward in the larger context and reverses the direction of the action "wipe out" so that the Gibeonites are not able to say "let us wipe him out." 𝕸 is probably a developed text here.

In 2Sam. 21:6, 𝕸 also has a different vocalization of the Hebrew consonants expected by M for the location of the execution of the Seven. M describes the Gibeonites requesting to kill the sons "on the hill" while 𝕸 describes them requesting to kill them "in Gibeah." The "Gibeah" reading allows the story to resonate with other Samuel passages about Saul and Gibeah, reminding the reader that Gibeah is positive for Saul. As well, 𝕸's "in Gibeah" does not occur in any LXX MSS, and in conjunction with 𝕸's other pro-Saulide readings, it points to a developed text.

Similarly, in 2Sam. 21:6, 𝕸 has the singular construct "chosen" while all LXX MSS except the hexaplaric, expect the plural. The singular form identifies Saul rather than the Seven as the chosen of the Lord. The singular "chosen" reading can be added to the other pro-Saul readings of 𝕸 which point to development.

Material Shared by B and 𝕸 Point to Development

In 2Sam. 21:6, B and 𝕸 have the 3d person singular form of "give", whereas, M has the 2d person plural imperative, "you give." B and 𝕸 appear to be developed texts here

since M's 2d plural form is supported by a similar form in 4QSam^a. As such, B and ᵯ

present the Gibeonites as less demanding of David.

In 2Sam. 21:10, B and ᵯ describe Rizpah pitching a sackcloth tent "to the rock",

whereas, M and other LXX MSS describe her making a bed "upon the rock." As already

mentioned, ᵯ has glossed the words "to the rock" with the notation that they occur three

times. The other passages in which "to the rock" occur are in Is. 30:29 and 51:1 and it is

possible to regard the notation as hermeneutic. The marginal reference associates the

Samuel passage with prophetic oracles which emphasize disobedience, penitence, and

restoration. As such, ᵯ and B appear to be developed versions of the story enriched by

their verbal connection with another Scripture.

M as an Earlier Version in the Chronological Sequence

Since much of the three versions of 2 Samuel 21:1-14 is exactly the same (88%),

and since M is the least developed of the three versions, it is plausible to assume that M is

the earliest of the three versions in chronological sequence. According to current theories of

the history of Greek text, the OG is potentially found in readings different from the ᵯ,

where the differences cannot be explained as transmissional errors and where the

differences are not hexaplaric.[14] According to such a theory, M's would be closest to the

OG. Certainty about M's connection with a supposed OG, however, is out of reach since M

---

[14]Although M is hexaplaric in the Pentateuch (Swete, Introduction, 140; Jellicoe, Septuagint, 196-197), it rarely, if at all, is influenced by the Hexapla in I Samuel (Sebastian P. Brock, The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel [Torino: Silvio Zamorani, 1996], 305-306), and not at all in 2Sam. 21:1-14. MSS Acx are the best witnesses to the hexaplaric text in 2Sam. 11-24; Dominique Barthélemy, Les Devanciers D'Aquila (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), 138-139. M differs from the hexaplaric MSS Ax 36 times in 2Sam. 21:1-14. Of these, A agrees with B 23 times and the two times M agrees with Ax against B they are not hexaplaric. In 2.21:3, AxMN rell Thdt have ἐξιλάσομαι where only Bg have ἐξιλάσωμαι. In 2.21:6, AMN rell δότε where Bhx have δότω. In the latter, the hexaplaric MSS are split. In the former, the other MSS associated with the non-hexaplaric in Samuel, ya₂Eth, have ἐξιλάσομαι. Brock's conclusions about 1 Samuel may be the case with 2 Samuel, that MN+ are of greatest importance and have frequently been overlooked as an excellent source for the original LXX; Brock, Recensions, 306.

has readings where such judgments cannot be made. Furthermore, it is not important to establish M as the OG for this thesis.

C. M's Setting

As already mentioned, M's theological and political interests include the following: Saul as a guilty aggressive king; David as a pious, innocent and cooperative king; God as an active participant; outsiders as pious, powerful instruments of God's judgment, and people who can prompt God to act. Although there is not enough independent data to establish a historical setting for M, M reflects a similar political and theological milieu to that of the Chronicler. All the major emphases of M's version of 2Sam. 21:1-14 are emphases of Chronicles.

According to Chronicles, Saul was a failure as a king. 1Chr. 10:13-14 clearly states that Saul's kingdom was taken from him and given to David:

> So Saul died for his unfaithfulness; he was unfaithful to the Lord in that he did not keep the command of the Lord; moreover, he had consulted a medium, seeking guidance, and did not seek guidance from the Lord. Therefore the Lord put him to death and turned the kingdom over to David son of Jesse.

A comparison of the description of Saul's death in 1Chr. 10:6 with its parallel passage in 1Sam. 31:6, indicates that the Chroniclers' negative view of Saul extends also to his descendants. In 1Chr. 10:6, Saul, his three sons and "all his house died together," whereas, 1Sam. 31:6 does not mention Saul's house dying. It was Saul's "armor-bearer and all his men" who died with Saul. Furthermore, after the description of Saul's rejection in 1Chr. 10:13-14, Saul's descendants are never mentioned again in Chronicles. By contrast, 2Sam. 1-4 describes Saul's son Ishbosheth as a rival king over Israel who wars against David for seven years and six months. Furthermore, Saul has seven descendants left who can die in 2Sam. 21. Thus, for the Chronicler, everything that happened to Saul's descendants after his death was insignificant for his purpose since he was a rejected king.

Chronicles, like M's version of 2Sam. 21:1-14, describes David in positive

terms.[15] Although much of 1 Chronicles parallels 1 and 2 Samuel, the selective omissions

and additions project the positive aspects about David and ignore the negative. For

example, most of the story of David's decline is missing (2Sam. 9-20; 1 Kgs.1- 2),

including the story of his sin with Bathsheba. As well, the largest addition of new material

in Chronicles presents David as the progenitor of the cultic traditions of Israel.

Chronicles, like M's version, presents God as an active participant: God puts

people to death (1Chr. 10:14); He strikes people with diseases (2Chr. 26:20). God even

uses outsiders to bring about destruction on the unfaithful Israelites (2Chr. 21:16; 22:7;

33:9,11).

The conclusion drawn from M's similarities with Chronicles is that M is at home in

the same ideological environment as that of the Chronicler. Chronicles was written during

the Persian period (*ca.* 538-333 B.C.), possibly *ca.* 400 B.C.[16] This does not mean that

M's translation was completed during the time of the Chronicler. M could represent a

Vorlage much older than the Chronicler, and M's translation could have occurred much

later. It does, however, verify that M's ideological emphases are at home among some

Jews before the third century B.C.

---

[15]Most scholars agree that a central focus of the books of Chronicles is David and the Davidic dynasty. Representatives of this positive view of David in Chronicles include the following: A.C. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler, Its Purpose and Its Date (London: Oxford, 1939); D. N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," CBQ 23 (1961), 436-442; R. North, "Theology of the Chronicler," JBL 82 (1963), 369-381; P. R. Ackroyd, "The Theology of the Chronicler," Lexington Theological Quarterly 8 (1973), 101-116; Jacob M. Myers, 1 Chronicles; AB 12 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973); H. G. M. Williamson, 1 and 2 Chronicles; NCBC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

[16]Myers, I Chronicles, LXXXVIII-LXXXIX.

D. 𝔐's Setting

It is not surprising that 𝔐's version of 2Sam. 21:1-14 is reflected in rabbinic

literature.[17] The discovery of the MSS in the Judean Desert provided evidence that there

was more than one form of many biblical books in Palestine between the third century B.C.

and the first century A.D. At some point near the end of the first century A.D. or during the

first part of the second century A.D., the proto-Masoretic text seems to have became fixed

or at least much less fluid. There is no evidence that the solidification of the Hebrew text

took place because of the work of an official council at Jamnia as many have assumed.[18]

The situation was probably as Tov argues:

> There was no stabilization . . . or standardization bringing about what is
> often called the 'victory of the proto-Masoretic family.' The situation was
> probably an outcome of political and socio-religious factors. . . It is not that
> 𝔐 triumphed over the other texts, but rather, that those who fostered it
> probably constituted the only organized group which survived the
> destruction of the Second Temple.

The proto-𝔐 was sustained by this group and was accepted as authoritative by all Jewish

communities from the 2d century onward. It was out of this group that rabbinic Judaism

came. 𝔐's similarities with rabbinic literature are summarized below.

Saul is Appreciated

Like the 𝔐, the rabbinic literature presents Saul in a less negative manner than the

LXX. 𝔐's broader focus for the reason for the famine than only Saul's guilt is similarly

expressed in the rabbinic literature. The statement, "It has to do with Saul and his bloody

house, because he killed the Gibeonites," is both a statement for and against Saul. "For

---

[17]A critical analysis of rabbinic interpretation is beyond the scope of this thesis. I have used as my source a simplified form of the rabbinic literature as found in Louis Ginzberg's, Legends of the Jews (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1942) and the English translation of the Babylonian Talmud, edited by Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein (New York: Traditional Press).

[18]Tov, Textual Criticism, 195.

Saul" means because Saul was not mourned for in a proper manner.[19] This statement

broadens the reason for the famine to include David and the Israelites for not providing

proper burial for Saul. "Because he killed the Gibeonites" refers to Saul's killing the

inhabitants of Nob, the city of the priests, whereby he indirectly killed the Gibeonites since

the priests supplied them with water and food.[20] Although justice for Saul's wrong against

the Gibeonites still needed to be served, rabbinic literature describes Saul as forgiven for

this wrong since Samuel said, "'Tomorrow shalt thou and thy sons be with me,' and Rabbi

Johanan said: 'With me means, in my compartment [in Paradise].'"[21] Saul's innocence is

further substantiated by a divine affirmation. When the Gibeonites say, "We will hang them

unto the Lord in Gibeah of Saul, the chosen of the Lord," it was a divine voice and not the

Gibeonites that proclaims Saul "the chosen of the Lord."[22]

David is Perceived Negatively

According to the rabbinic literature, David was in the wrong because he did not

provide proper burial for Saul, because he gave his gifts to only one priest and because he

did not use his wealth to relieve people's suffering during the famine. As mentioned above,

rabbinic literature indicts David and the Israelites for not mourning properly for Saul.

According to rabbinic literature, David searched three years for the reason for the famine

and finally concluded that the matter "depends entirely upon me [David]."[23] David

---

[19]Yebamoth 78b

[20]Baba Kamma 119a; Yebamoth 78b

[21]Berekoth 12b

[22]Ibid.

[23]Yebamoth 78b

concludes it is too late to arrange for Saul's mourning since a year has passed.[24] Another

Talmudic reference indicates David inquired of the Lord about the reason for the famine and

God replied, "Was not Saul a king anointed with holy oil, did he not abolish idolatry, is he

not the companion of Samuel in Paradise? yet, while you all dwell in the land of Israel, his

is 'outside of the land.'"[25] David and the Israelite leaders respond by bringing the remains

of Saul and Jonathan back to the land and in solemn procession bearing them through the

whole land of Israel, finally burying them in Benjamin. As a result, "The tributes of

affection paid by the people of Israel to its dead king aroused the compassion of God, and

the famine came to an end."[26]

> David is also indicted for the famine because he gave his gifts to only one priest:

> R. Abba B. Zabda stated: Whoever gives his priestly gifts to one priest [only] brings famine into the world. For it is said in Scripture, *Ira the Jairite was priest to David*. Now was he priest to David alone and not to all the world? But the meaning is that David sent to him his priestly gifts; and this is followed by the text, *And there was a famine in the days of David*.[27]

> David is also wrong because he did not use his private wealth to ameliorate the

people's suffering during the three year famine. Instead, he saved his wealth for the

temple. As a result, "God said, 'Thou didst refrain from rescuing human beings from

death, in order to save the money for the Temple. Verily, the Temple shall not be built by

thee, but by Solomon.'"[28]

---

[24]Yebamoth 79a

[25]Ginzburg, Legends, vol. IV, 110.

[26]Ibid.

[27]'Erubin 63a

[28]Ginzburg, Legends, vol. IV, 111.

The Gibeonites are Described Negatively

Rabbinic literature presents the Gibeonites also in a negative light for demanding the death of the Seven. While justice for Saul's wrong to them needed to be exacted, the Gibeonites' insistence on killing seven sons resulted in their exclusion from the community of Israel. David's statement, "Now the Gibeonites were not of the children of Israel" (2Sam. 21:2) is taken as a decree of prohibition against the Gibeonites.[29] David issued this decree because he tried to pacify them but they would not be pacified:

> Thereupon he said to them: This nation is distinguished by three characteristics: They are merciful, bashful and benevolent. 'Merciful', for it is written, *And shew thee mercy, and have compassion upon thee, and multiply thee.* 'Bashful', for it is written, *That His fear may be before you.* 'Benevolent', for it is written, *That he may command his children and his household* etc. Only he who cultivates these three characteristics is fit to join this nation.[30]

By implication, the Gibeonites' vengeful and vindictive response excluded them from the people of Israel. Stated directly, "In the course of events it became obvious that the Gibeonites were by no means worthy of being received into the Jewish communion, and David, following Joshua's example, excluded them forever, a sentence that will remain in force even in the Messianic time."[31]

Miscellaneous Incongruities between ווו with other Scriptures are Solved

The incongruity regarding the mother of the five in 2Sam. 21:8 is solved in rabbinic literature by describing Merab as the mother but Michal as the one who raised the five. The Talmud presents Rabbi Joshua ben Korha's answer to the problem:

> Was it then Michal who bore them? Surely it was rather Merab who bore them! But Merab bore and Michal brought them up; therefore they were

---

[29]Yebamoth 78b

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ginzburg, Legends, 10.

called by her name. This teaches thee that whoever brings up an orphan in his home, Scripture ascribes it to him as though he had begotten him.[32]

Similarly, TJ solves the problem right in the text, "And the five sons of Merab, whom Michal the daughter of Saul raised, whom she bore to Adriel the son of Barzillai who was from Meholath."

The rabbis also solved the problem of the extended exposure of the bodies and Dt. 21:23 which states that "bodies should not remain all night on the tree":

> Rabbi Johanan replied in the name of Rabbi Simeon ben Jehozadak: It is proper that a letter be rooted out of the Torah so that thereby the heavenly name shall be publically hallowed. For passers-by were inquiring, 'What kind of men are these?'— 'These are royal princes'. 'And what have they done?' —'They laid their hands upon unattached strangers'. Then they exclaimed: 'There is no nation in existence which one ought to join as much as this one. If [the punishment of] royal princes was so great, how much more that of common people; and if such [was the justice done for] unattached proselytes, how much more so for Israelites.'[33]

The result of their exposure was that a hundred and fifty thousand men immediately joined Israel.[34]

Concerning the problem of sons being put to death for their father (Dt. 24:16), "R. Hiyya b. Abba replied in the name of R. Johanan: It is better that a letter be rooted out of the Torah than that the Divine name shall be publically profaned."[35]

Conclusions

It is significant that all of Iπ's particular readings and none from the narrative tradition attributed only to M can be found in rabbinic literature. Whether a linear connection between the LXX versions can be established or not, there is no question that

---

[32]Sanhedrin 19b

[33]Yebamoth 79a

[34]Ibid.

[35]Ibid.

ℳ's version, even difficult readings, were accepted as the authoritative Hebrew text by Judaism after the second century A.D.

E. B's Setting

If a linear relationship is assumed regarding the three versions, then B probably represents an intermediary revision of M's kernel story toward the proto-Masoretic text. Like M, B has a negative view of Saul's kingship. It also describes David as a pious, innocent and cooperative king and God as actively involved in the story. B agrees with ℳ and disagrees with M regarding the role of outsiders: ℳ and B have the 3d person rather than 2d person request for David to give seven sons (vs. 6); the request to hang up the Seven rather than to atone by them (vs. 6); Rizpah's vigil did not bring about divine rain but only water out of sky (vs. 10).

Where B is different from ℳ, the differences fall into two categories: those where B's version represents developments in Greek and those which represent developments in ℳ's version. As already noted, most of B's developments create resonance with other biblical passages presenting Saul in a more negative way than even M. ℳ's developments present Saul in a less negative and even a positive way. It can be argued that B is an intermediary revision of the proto-ℳ since some of ℳ's developments are found in B. However, since some of ℳ's developments are not represented in any of the LXX versions, ℳ could possibly represent a later revision than B's Hebrew. In other words, if B's version followed a *Vorlage* exactly like ℳ, then why does B not have all of ℳ's characteristics. As well, if ℳ's pro-Saul readings were represented in the *Vorlage* used by the LXX translators, then why would no Greek text have at least some of ℳ's pro-Saul readings. The answer that makes sense of all the data is that B represents an intermediary revision and that ℳ's Hebrew is later than that represented by the LXX versions.

If B is an intermediary revision, its *Vorlage* dates to somewhere between the time of M's kernel story, after 250 B.C., and before the final acceptance of ℳ by Jews in the latter part of the first century A.D.

Based on its similarities and differences between M and ℳ, it is possible to speculate about the setting which embraced B's version. First, those who embraced B's version had a very negative view of Saul's kingship. Although M was already negative about Saul, B was even more negative. Saul's association with Gibeon reminds the reader of his genealogy in 1Chr. 8 and 9 where his ancestors are described as Canaanites rather than from one of the twelve tribes (see above). As such, B hints that Saul's kingship is illegitimate since Dt. 17:15 requires that Israelite kings not be foreigners. Second, B's agreements with ℳ where they differ from M, suggest B's community may have been uncomfortable with the powerful and pious role outsiders played in M's version. Third, since B's developments create resonance with other Scriptures, it is likely that B's audience was strongly affected by the consciousness of a body of authoritative writings. The group who held a more negative view of Saul, a less positive view of outsiders and a heightened awareness of authoritative writings is still out of reach.

Conclusions

Based on the developments in both B and ℳ and assuming a linear relationship among M, ℳ and B, it is possible to argue that M is the earliest of the three versions of 2Sam. 21:1-14. As such, M shares a similar ideological milieu with Chronicles and a third century B.C. date for its *Vorlage* is plausible. B may represent an early proto-ℳ revision since it shares some but not all of ℳ's distinct characteristics. The reason and date for such a revision is beyond the scope of this study. ℳ's version is probably the latest version of the three versions since its pro-Saul readings are not found in any of the LXX MSS. ℳ's version is reflected in and embraced by later Judaism.

VIII. Conclusions

I have attempted to show that MSS M, ℳ and B represent three specific versions of the story in 2 Samuel 21:1-14. Although there are many similarities among M, ℳ and B, there are distinct differences. Some of the differences are transmissional and stylistic while others point to different Hebrew texts. Far from haphazard, these differences cluster around certain theological and political issues: Saul's kingship, David's involvement in the killings, God's involvement, and the role of outsiders in Israelite community. M, ℳ, and B address the theological and political issues from different perspectives and point to different ideological contexts which nurtured them. M's context embraced a story that was negative about Saul and sympathetic towards proselytes and social outsiders. ℳ's context embraced a story that emphasized Saul's connection with the prophetic movement and the importance of his burial in the land. ℳ's context also embraced a story that had a depreciated view of the Davidic kingship and outsiders. B's context embraced a version that hints at Saul's kingship as illegitimate, depreciates the role of outsiders, and emphasizes the interpretive potential this story has when read with other biblical stories in view. B also hints that David is a Moses type figure who can bring hope in the midst of disaster. Whether a linear relationship among the three versions can be established is still yet to be determined. Having discovered three distinct versions of 2Sam. 21:1-14 in MSS M, ℳ, and B, and having explored the theological and political emphases of each, I will now examine the implications of this study for future biblical and theological research.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

I. The Comparative Method: Its Value and Results

Using the comparative method in 2Sam. 21:1-14, I have shown that MSS M, m,
and B represent three discrete versions of the biblical story which have different theological
and political interests. These versions are similar at many points, sharing the same words
88% of the time and always following the same word order. The differences can be
explained sometimes as transmissional errors and stylistic improvements but others times
as different Hebrew texts. Far from haphazard, the significant differences cluster around
theological and political issues which each version addresses from a different perspective.

The comparative method does not solve the problem of diverse texts. The value of
the comparative method is that it insists that readers interpret the diverse actual texts that do
exist rather than creating a hypothetical reconstructed one that one may wish existed. It
takes seriously the fact that each text served as someone's Bible, and, as such, deserves a
hearing.

II. Implications for Textual Criticism

The different versions of 2Sam. 21:1-14 described in this study were not clearly
identified or heard for at least a century because modern critical scholars fixated on
reconstructing a hypothetical "oldest" text. Since all manuscripts are defective, it was
assumed that only an eclectic text can come closest to the "original." Kyle McCarter
summarizes this prospective:

113

Only an eclectic reconstruction can bypass the haplographic defectiveness of the received Hebrew text on the one hand and the expansionistic conflatedness of the Old Palestinian tradition on the other, and arrive at an approximation, however rough, of the primitive text of Samuel.[1]

Unfortunately, instead of admitting there is insufficient data to reconstruct confidently an oldest text, however, critical scholars at times have made textual emendations that were not based on plausible transmissional solutions. Two such examples in 2Sam. 21:1-14 can be highlighted. Critical commentators[2] and recent English versions, including the NRSV, have accepted Wellhausen's reconstruction of 2Sam. 21:6 which read, "in Gibeon on the mountain of the Lord."[3] Wellhausen does explain the transmissional process. He simply states that בְּחִיר "chosen" deteriorated into בָּהָר "mountain" and that בְּגִבְעוֹן "in Gibeon" came to be understood as בְּגִבְעַת שָׁאוּל "in Gibeah of Saul." [4] While it is orthographically possible to confuse ה for ח, no Hebrew or Greek manuscript attests בָּחִיר. Furthermore, if Cross's theory of recensional development is correct, the textual evidence for the place name is split between older and later versions; "in Gibeon" occurs in the later recensions[5] and "on the hill / in Gibeah" in the earlier version. It is unusual for text critics to choose readings attested only by the late witnesses especially when they conflict with both the "oldest" Greek and the Hebrew. As well, nowhere does the Greek offer "Gibeon" as an alternative to ℳ's "Gibeah," or vice versa. Also, every MS includes the name of "Saul" which the emendations all drop. Thus, Wellhausen's proposed reading "in Gibeon on the mountain of the Lord" is a hypothetical

---

[1]McCarter, I Samuel, 8.

[2]Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, 209; Driver, Notes, 351-352; McCarter, II Samuel, 438; Anderson, 2 Samuel, 247.

[3]Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 230.

[4]Wellhausen, Bücher Samuelis, 209.

[5]MSS B and A

reading for which there is no textual evidence. Rather, there are at least two and possibly three versions of the story, one with "hill/Gibeah" and another with "Gibeon," and all versions include the reference to "Saul."

The emendation of the name of the mother of the five from "Michal" to "Merab" (2Sam. 21:8) was also not based on a plausible transmissional solution. ℳ apparently has an incorrect name of the mother "Michal" since the larger context describes Michal as childless to her death (2Sam. 6:23). Critical commentators and most English translations[6] have adopted "Merab" as a better reading. In support of this emendation, M N rell and two Hebrew MSS have forms of "Merab." According to the reconstructive theory "Merab" is preferred because it is the "oldest" text. This emendation, however, was not based on a plausible transmissional explanation. How did the ℳ and B become the more difficult Michal reading? Thenius's solution, that "Merab" was mistakenly written as "Michal," is problematic because the names are not similar enough.[7] A better explanation is that alternate versions of the story exists, one with "Merab" and another with "Michal."

In the examples mentioned above, critical scholars emend the text where there is insufficient data to do so. By doing this, commentators reconstruct an eclectic story that probably never existed in any MS. Such dubious reconstructions are "not textual criticism, but textual improvement, with the commentator's literary sense the standard."[8] And, the actual versions of the story that do exist lay submerged in a sea of text critical notes.

Based on the conclusions of this study, the following recommendations for textual criticism can be made:

---

[6]e.g., RSV, NEB, JB, TEV, NIV.

[7]Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 230.

[8]Stanley Walters, review of I Samuel, by P. Kyle McCarter, in JBL 101 (1982): 437.

1. Text critical scholars should be cautious about emendations. Text criticism can help explain transmissional errors or stylistic improvements but it has not been able to solve the problem of multiple versions. Where differences in the MSS cannot be explained by plausible transmissional solutions, the texts should not be emended. To do otherwise is to risk creating a hypothetical text which never existed and destroying the real texts that do.

2. Text critical scholars should rethink the criteria for emendations. Emendations should not be done based on external evidence alone. This study has shown that 𝔐's dissonance gives it its distinctive shape. For example, the Gibeonites never ask to wipe out Saul but David gives the Seven anyway. The Gibeonites, Saul's enemy, also call Saul "chosen of the Lord." According to the larger narrative, Michal could not have been the mother of the five. Finally, the lack of burial of the bones of the Seven shows that 𝔐's story emphasizes David's negligence and Saul's positive status. All of these aspects of 𝔐's distinctive readings are lost if 𝔐 is emended based on external evidence.

3. Scholars should rethink the assumption that a reconstructed earliest text is necessarily a better text. This study has shown that B and 𝔐 are developed texts. M, on the other hand, is less developed and probably earlier. To adopt what appears to be an earlier version of 2Sam. 21:1-14 would miss the distinct character and richness of B and 𝔐's homiletical readings. If we adopt 𝔐's *qere'* based on the LXX, we would miss that Saul's descendents can fall "seven-fold" and be associated with the disobedient and punishment like in Lev. 26. We would also miss the intrabiblical connection created by Rizpah's stretching sackcloth "to the rock." The reading is unusual enough to invite the alert reader to associate God with "rock" and to read this story alongside Isaiah 30 and 51 where "to the rock" is also used in contexts which remind Israel they must repent during times of divine judgment to find deliverence.

4. Scholars should explain the extant versions. Currently the extant MSS provide insufficient data for confidently reconstructing an earliest text of Samuel. As well, the extant MSS resist being interpreted as a single story with a synchronic story base. In some cases, the different versions provide instead a cacophony rather than a symphony. Text criticism as part of the comparative process, can help explain the actual versions we do have.

This study argues that the diversity of texts in 2Sam. 21:1-14 works against the two main emphases of textual criticism—to reconstruct the earliest text and to establish the history of transmission. While text critics have made great strides in explaining some difficult readings, to reconstruct a single eclectic text from the extant MSS is to skew the data. Though text criticism is important, this study suggests its role will be limited until there is more data. The value of traditional text criticism in the future will be its ability to explain how diverse versions of a text came to exist.

III. Implications for the Literary Approach to the Bible

This work shares some of the same concerns as Robert Alter's work, namely, to provide a close reading of the actual biblical story.[9] Alter describes his literary approach to the text as "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."[10] Alter's work provides a good corrective to modern biblical criticism which he says focuses on the "excavative" at the expense of the final literary form. Although he does not deny the historical nature of the

---

[9]Robert Alter, The Art of Biblical Narrative (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1981).

[10]Ibid., 12.

text, his central approach to the narratives is literary and not historical. In this way, he challenges the presupposition of historical-criticism that the meaning of the text lies in its historical origins. He approaches the text as a unified literary art piece, " . . . a coherent unfolding story in which the meaning of earlier data is progressively, even systematically, revealed or enriched by the addition of subsequent data."[11]

The strength of Alter's literary approach is its emphasis on interpreting an actual biblical narrative. The weakness of the literary approach is the insistence that these narratives are a unity and always coherent. This study has shown there are at least three versions of of 2Sam. 21:1-14 that resist being reduced to a synchronic story base. ℼ's version, for example, resists being read as a coherent unfolding story: Michal is the wrong mother of the five; the Gibeonites call Saul "chosen of the Lord" immediately after asking to kill his seven sons; David gathers up the bones of Saul and Jonathan and those of the Seven but it never mentions the burial of the Seven.

J. P. Fokkelman's work on 2Sam. 21:1-14 illustrates the problem with assuming coherence.[12] Fokkelman argues, against McCarter, that 2Sam. 21:1-14 is an integrated unit. He proceeds to demonstrate acute attention to the details of the ℼ where many modern commentaries adopt readings from the LXX: "bloodguilt" and not "iniquity" (vs. 1); "devised" and not "deceived" or "planned" (vs. 5); "we were exterminated" not "let us exterminate" (vs. 5); "Gibeah of Saul" and not "Gibeon of Saul" (vs. 6); Saul and not the men are "chosen of the Lord" (vs. 6); "from the beginning of the harvest" and not "in the beginning of the harvest" (vs. 10).

Where Fokkelman describes MS ℼ, his analysis is similar to the conclusions of this study. Because his approach presupposes coherency, however, he cannot resist replacing

---

[11]Ibid., 11.

[12]J. P. Fokkelman, Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel, vol. III, Throne and City; II Sam. 2-8 & 21-24 (Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1990), 271-292.

Michal with Merab and he insists that the bones of the Seven were buried. To his credit, Fokkelman acknowledges he has broken with the text, but, nonetheless, he changes 𝔐's story to fit his expectation of a coherent story. Regarding the change of Michal, he writes, "Like so many others I too see myself forced to restore the name Merab at the place where the MT has Michal."[13] Regarding the burial of the bones of the Seven he writes, "I am of the opinion. . . that the remains of the seven hanged are placed next to the bones of the king and his son, even though the text of 14a on this is elliptic."[14] By burying the Seven, Fokkelman misses one of the distinguishing features of 𝔐, namely, the importance of Saul's burial in the land and the positive affects this has on the image of Saul; 𝔐 is not concerned about the burial of the Seven. Fokkelman's analysis of 2Sam. 21:1-14 illustrates one of the hazards of the literary approach; it assumes coherency when the diverse MSS resist it.

The implications of this study for the literary approach are as follows:

1. Those who use a literary approach should at least interpret the extant MSS. This study has shown there are at least three versions of 2Sam. 21:1-14 and that the diverse MSS resist being reduced to a synchronic story base.

2. Coherence should not be forced on the narratives. Sometimes their dissonance creates tension, emphasizing the distinct shape of a story.

IV. Suggestions for Further Research

Careful comparative research needs to be done on other biblical narratives to see if there are other places where multiple forms of narratives exist. If there are, instead of

---

[13]Fokkelman, Narrative Art in Samuel, 282 n. 11.

[14]Ibid., 289.

dismantling the stories to reconstruct a hypothetical version, commentaries should describe the similarities and differences of the multiple versions. Modern translations would need to declare the particular version they are following. A pluriform Bible, perhaps like Origen's Hexapla, with parallel columns of ₥ and LXX, might be in order.[15]

Scholars also need to continue to wrestle with the question, "What makes a text authoritative?" Is it the oldest available version of a narrative? Is it the ₥? It is incumbent upon us to come to grips with the fact that the various versions served as authoritative texts for their respective communities. The Jews accepted the ₥ as authoritative for almost two millennia. Christians used various versions as authoritative texts from the beginning. The question still begs to be asked of Christians, "Is there a single authoritative version of 2Sam. 21:1-14?"

Regardless of the answer to these questions, the fact remains the extant Greek and Hebrew manuscripts present multiple forms of the biblical story found in 2Sam. 21:1-14 which reflect different theological and political interests. This study attempted to compare and contrast these versions in order to hear each of their messages more clearly.

---

[15]J. A. Sanders suggests this possibility in his recent article "The Hebrew University Bible and Biblia Hebraica Quinta," JBL 118 (1999): 525.

APPENDIX A

CODEX COISLINIANUS FACSIMILE

APPENDIX B

LENINGRAD CODEX B 19ᴬ FACSIMILE

APPENDIX C

CODEX VATICANUS FACSIMILE

ΤΩCΕΡΕΙΥΙΩΒΕΡΖΕΛ
ΛΕΙΤΩΜΜΟΥΛΛΘΕΙΚΝ
ΕΔΩΚΕΝΑΥΤΟΥCΕΝΧ
ΡΙΤΩΝΓΑΒΑΩΝΕΙΤΩΝ
ΚΑΙΕΞΗΛΙΑCΑΝΑΥΤΟΥ
ΕΝΤΩΟΡΕΙΕΝΑΝΤΙΚΥ
ΕΠΕCΑΝΟΙΕΠΤΑΛΥΤ
ΕΠΙΤΟΛΥΤΟΚΑΙΑΥΤ
ΔΕΕΘΑΝΑΤΩΘΗCΑΝΕ
ΗΜΕΡΑΙCΘΕΡΙCΜΟΥΕΝ
ΠΡΩΤΟΙCΕΝΑΡΧΗΘΕΡΙ
ΜΟΥΚΡΕΙΘΩΝ ΚΑΙΕΛΛ
ΒΕΝΡΕCΦΑΘΥΓΑΤΗΡ
ΑΙΑΤΟΝCΑΚΚΟΝΚΑΙΕ
ΠΗΞΕΝΑΥΤΗΠΡΟCΤΗ
ΠΕΤΡΑΝΕΝΑΡΧΗΘΕΡΙ
ΜΟΥΚΡΕΙΘΩΝΕΩCΕCΤ
ΞΕΝΕΠΑΥΤΟΥCΥΔΩΡ
ΕΚΤΟΥΟΥΡΑΝΟΥΚΑΙ
ΚΕΔΩΚΕΝΤΑΠΕΤΕΙΝΑ
ΤΟΥΟΥΡΑΝΟΥΚΑΤΑΠ
CΑΙΕΠΑΥΤΟΥCΗΜΕΡΑ
ΚΑΙΤΑΘΗΡΙΑΤΟΥΑΓΡ
ΝΥΚΤΟC ΚΑΙΑΠΗΓΓΕ
ΛΗΤΩΔΑΥΕΙΔΟCΛΕΠ
ΗCΕΝΡΕCΦΑΘΥΓΑΤΗΡ
ΑΙΑΠΑΛΛΑΚΗCΑΟΥΛΚ
ΕΞΕΛΥΘΗCΑΝΚΑΙΚΑΤ
ΛΑΒΕΝΑΥΤΟΥCΔΑΝΥΙ
ΙΩΑΕΚΤΩΝΑΠΟΓΟΝ
ΤΩΝΓΙΓΑΝΤΩΝ ΚΑΙΕ
ΠΟΡΕΥΘΗΔΑΥΕΙΔΚΑΙ
ΛΑΒΕΝΤΑΟCΤΑCΑΟΥΛ
ΚΑΙΤΑΟCΤΑΙΩΝΑΘΑΝ
ΤΟΥΥΙΟΥΑΥΤΟΥΠΑΡΑ
ΤΩΝΑΝΔΡΩΝΥΙΩΝΙΑ
ΒΕΙCΓΑΛΛΑΔΟΙΕΚΛΕΨ
ΑΥΤΟΥCΕΚΤΗCΠΛΑΤ
ΑCΒΑΙΘΟΤΙΕCΤΗCΑΝ
ΑΥΤΟΥCΕΚΕΙΟΙΑΛΛΟ
ΦΥΛΟΙΕΝΗΜΕΡΑΙΕΠ
ΓΑΞΑΝΟΙΑΛΛΟΦΥΛΟΙ

ΤΟΝCΑΟΥΛΕΝΓΕΛΒΟΥ
ΚΑΙΑΝΗΝΕΓΚΕΝΕΚΕΙ
ΤΑΟCΤΑCΑΟΥΛΚΑΙΤΑ
CΤΑΙΩΝΑΘΑΝΤΟΥΥΙΟΥ
ΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΙCΥΝΗΓΑΓΕ
ΤΑΟCΤΑΤΩΝΕΞΗΛΙΑCΙ
ΝΩΝΚΑΙΕΘΑΨΑΝΤΑΟ
CΤΑCΑΟΥΛΚΑΙΤΑΟCΤΑ
ΙΩΝΑΘΑΝΤΟΥΥΙΟΥΑΥ
ΤΟΥΚΑΙΤΩΝΗΛΙΑCΘΕ
ΤΩΝΤΩΝΕΝΓΗΒΕΝΙΑ
ΜΕΙΝΕΝΤΗΠΛΕΥΡΑΕΝ
ΤΩΤΑΦΩΚΕΙCΤΟΥΠΑ
ΤΡΟCΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΙΕΠΟΙ
CΑΝΠΑΝΤΑΟCΑΕΝΕΤΕΙ
ΛΑΤΟΟΒΑCΙΛΕΥC ΚΑΙ
ΕΠΗΚΟΥCΕΝΟΘΕCΤΗΓΗ
ΜΕΤΑΤΑΥΤΑΚΑΙΕΓΕΝ
ΘΗΕΤΙΠΟΛΕΜΟCΤΟΙC
ΑΛΛΟΦΥΛΟΙCΜΕΤΑΙC
ΡΑΗΛΚΑΙΚΑΤΕΒΗΔΑΥ
ΕΙΔΚΑΙΟΙΠΑΙΔΕCΑΥΤ
ΜΕΤΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΙΕΠΟΛ
ΜΗCΑΝΜΕΤΑΤΩΝΑΛΛ
ΦΥΛΩΝ ΚΑΙΕΠΟΡΕΥΘ
ΔΑΥΕΙΔΚΑΙΙΕCΒΙΟCΗ
ΕΝΤΟΙCΕΚΓΟΝΟΙCΤΟΥ
ΡΑΦΑΚΑΙΟCΤΑΘΜΟCΤΗ
ΔΟΡΑΤΟCΑΥΤΟΥΤΡΙΑΚ
CΙΩΝCΙΚΛΩΝΟΑΚΗΧ
ΚΟΥΚΑΙΑΥΤΟCΠΕΡΙΕ
ΖΩCΜΕΝΟCΚΟΡΥΝΗΝ
ΚΑΙΔΙΕΝΟΕΙΤΟΠΑΤΑΞΑ
ΤΟΝΔΑΥΕΙΔΚΑΙΕΒΟΗ
ΘΗCΕΝΑΥΤΩΑΒΕCCΑ
ΥΙΟCCΑΡΟΥΙΑCΚΑΙΕΠΑ
ΤΑΞΕΝΤΟΝΑΛΛΟΦΥΛ
ΚΑΙΕΘΑΝΑΤΩCΕΝΑΥΤ
ΤΟΤΕΩΜΟCΑΝΟΙΑΝΔΡ
ΔΑΥΕΙΔΛΕΓΟΝΤΕCΟΥΚ
ΞΕΛΕΥCΗΕΤΙΜΕΘΗΜ
ΕΙCΠΟΛΕΜΟΝΚΑΙΟΥΜΗ

CΒΕCΗCΤΟΝΛΥΧΝΟΝ
ΙCΡΑΗΛ ΚΑΙΕΓΕΝΗΘΗ
ΜΕΤΑΤΑΥΤΑΕΤΙΠΟΛΕΜ
ΕΝΓΕΘΜΕΤΑΤΩΝΑΛΛ
ΦΥΛΩΝΤΟΤΕΕΠΑΤΑΞ
ΟΕΒΟΧΑΟΑCΤΑΤΩΟΕΙ
ΤΟΝCΕΦΤΟΝΕΝΤΟΙC
ΕΚΓΟΝΟΙCΤΟΥΡΑΦΑΚ
ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΟΠΟΛΕΜΟC
ΡΟΜΜΕΤΑΤΩΝΑΛΛΟ
ΦΥΛΩΝΚΑΙΕΠΑΤΑΞ
ΕΛΕΑΝΑΝΥΙΟCΑΡΙΩΡ
ΓΕΙΜΟΒΑΙΘΛΕΕΜΜΕΙ
ΤΟΝΓΟΔΟΛΙΑΝΤΟΝΧ
ΤΑΙΟΝΚΑΙΤΟΞΥΛΟΝΤ
ΔΟΡΑΤΟCΑΥΤΟΥΩCΑΝ
ΤΙΟΝΥΦΑΙΝΟΝΤΩΝ
ΚΑΙΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΕΤΙΠΟΛ
ΜΟCΕΝΓΕΘΚΑΙΗΝΑΝ
ΜΑΔΩΝΚΑΙΟΙΔΑΚΤΥΛ
ΤΩΝΧΕΙΡΩΝΑΥΤΟΥC
ΟΙΔΑΚΤΥΛΟΙΤΩΝΠΟ
ΔΩΝΑΥΤΟΥΕΞΚΑΙΕΞ
ΕΙΚΟCΙΤΕCCΑΡΕCΑΡΙ
ΘΜΩΚΑΙΓΕΑΥΤΟCΕΤ
ΧΘΗΤΩΡΑΦΑΚΑΙΩΝΕΙ
ΔΙCΕΝΤΟΝΙCΡΑΗΛΚΑΙ
ΕΠΑΤΑΞΕΝΑΥΤΟΝΙΩΝ
ΘΑΝΥΙΟCCΕΜΕΕΙΑΔΕΛ
ΦΟΥΔΑΥΕΙΔΟΙΤΕCCΑ
ΡΕCΟΥΤΟΙΕΤΕΧΘΗCΑΝ
ΑΠΟΓΟΝΟΙΤΩΝΓΙΓΑΝΤ
ΕΝΓΕΘΤΩΡΑΦΑΟΙΚ
ΚΑΙΕΠΕCΑΝΕΝΧΕΙΡΙΑ
ΕΙΑΚΑΙΕΝΧΕΙΡΙΤΩΝΑ
ΛΩΝΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΙΕ
ΛΑΛΗCΕΝΔΑΥΕΙΔΤΩΚ
ΤΟΥCΛΟΓΟΥCΤΗCΩ
ΤΑΥΤΗCΕΝΗΗΜΕΡΑC
ΞΕΙΛΑΤΟΑΥΤΟΝΚCΕΚ
ΧΕΙΡΟCΠΑΝΤΩΝΤΩΝ
ΕΧΟΡΩΝΑΥΤΟΥΚΑΙΕΚ

APPENDIX D

COMPARISON CHART OF MANUSCRIPTS M, 𝔐 AND B

vs	M		m	B
1	Καὶ ἐγένετο λιμὸς / ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Δαυειδ	a	וַיְהִי רָעָב / בִּימֵי דָוִד	Καὶ ἐγένετο λιμὸς / ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Δαυειδ
	τρία ἔτη / ἐνιαυτὸς ἐχόμενος ἐνιαυτοῦ,	b	שָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים שָׁנָה / אַחֲרֵי שָׁנָה	τρία ἔτη, / ἐνιαυτὸς ἐχόμενος ἐνιαυτοῦ,
	καὶ ἐζήτησεν Δαυειδ / τὸ πρόσωπον Κυρίου·	c	וַיְבַקֵּשׁ דָּוִד אֶת־ / פְּנֵי יְהוָה	καὶ ἐζήτησεν Δαυειδ / τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Κυρίου·
	καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος	d	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה	καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος
	Ἐπὶ Σαούλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ	e	אֶל־שָׁאוּל וְאֶל־בֵּית	Ἐπὶ Σαούλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ
	ἡ ἀδικία	f	הַדָּמִים	ἀδικία
		g		διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θανάτῳ[σαι] θανάτῳ] / ἀδικία
	περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν / τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας	h	עַל־אֲשֶׁר־הֵמִית / אֶת הַגִּבְעֹנִים	περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν / τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας
2	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς Δαυειδ / τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας	a	וַיִּקְרָא הַמֶּלֶךְ / לַגִּבְעֹנִים	καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς Δαυειδ / τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας
	καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·	b	וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵיהֶם	καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·
	καὶ οἱ Γαβαωνεῖται οὐχ υἱοὶ / Ἰσραὴλ εἰσιν,	c	וְהַגִּבְעֹנִים לֹא מִבְּנֵי / יִשְׂרָאֵל הֵמָּה	καὶ οἱ Γαβαωνεῖται οὐχ υἱοὶ / Ἰσραὴλ εἰσιν,
	ἀλλ' ἡ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος / τοῦ Ἀμορραίου,	d	כִּי אִם־מִיֶּתֶר / הָאֱמֹרִי	ὅτι ἀλλ' ἡ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος / τοῦ Ἀμορραίου,
	καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ / ὤμοσαν αὐτοῖς	e	וּבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל / נִשְׁבְּעוּ לָהֶם	καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ / ὤμοσαν αὐτοῖς

vs	M		m	B
	καὶ ἐζήτησεν Σαοὺλ πατάξαι αὐτοὺς	f	וַיְבַקֵּשׁ שָׁאוּל לְהַכֹּתָם	καὶ ἐζήτησεν Σαοὺλ πατάξαι αὐτοὺς
	ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι αὐτὸν	g	בְּקַנֹּאתוֹ	ἐν τῷ ζηλῶσαι αὐτὸν
	τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰούδα·	h	לִבְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל וִיהוּדָה	τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰούδα·
3	καὶ εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ προς τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας	a	וַיֹּאמֶר דָּוִד אֶל־הַגִּבְעֹנִים	καὶ εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ πρὸς τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας
	Τί ποιήσω ὑμῖν	b	מָה אֶעֱשֶׂה לָכֶם	Τί ποιήσω ὑμῖν
	καὶ ἐν τίνι ἐξιλάσομαι,	c	וּבַמָּה אֲכַפֵּר	καὶ ἐν τίνι ἐξιλάσωμαι,
	καὶ εὐλογήσατε	d	וּבָרְכוּ	καὶ εὐλογήσετε
	τὴν κληρονομίαν Κυρίου;	e	אֶת־נַחֲלַת יְהוָה	τὴν κληρονομίαν Κυρίου;
4	καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ οἱ Γαβαωνεῖται	a	וַיֹּאמְרוּ לוֹ הַגִּבְעֹנִים	καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ οἱ Γαβαωνεῖται
	Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον	b	אֵין־לִי כֶּסֶף וְזָהָב	Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον
	μετὰ Σαοὺλ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ,	c	עִם־שָׁאוּל וְעִם־בֵּיתוֹ	μετὰ Σαοὺλ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ,
	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ θανατῶσαι ἐκ παντὸς Ἰσραήλ.	d	וְאֵין־לָנוּ אִישׁ לְהָמִית בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ θανατῶσαι ἐν Ἰσραήλ.
	καὶ εἶπεν Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε	e	וַיֹּאמֶר מָה־אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים	καὶ εἶπεν Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε
	καὶ ποιήσω ὑμῖν;	f	אֶעֱשֶׂה לָכֶם	καὶ ποιήσω ὑμῖν;
5	καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα	a	וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־הַמֶּלֶךְ	καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα
	ὁ ἀνὴρ ὃς συνετέλεσεν ἡμᾶς	b	הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר כִּלָּנוּ	ὁ ἀνὴρ συνετέλεσεν ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς
	καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς,	c		καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς,
	καὶ ἐλογίσατο	d	וַאֲשֶׁר דִּמָּה־לָנוּ	ὃς παρελογίσατο
	ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς·	e		ἐξολεθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς·

vs	M		m	B
	ἀφανίσωμεν αὐτὸν	f	נִשְׁמָרֶנּוּ	ἀφανίσωμεν αὐτὸν
	τοῦ μὴ ἐστάναι αὐτὸν ἐν παντὶ ὁρίῳ Ἰσραήλ.	g	מֵהִתְיַצֵּב בְּכָל־גְּבֻל יִשְׂרָאֵל	τοῦ μη ἐστάναι αὐτὸν ἐν παντὶ ὁρίῳ Ἰσραήλ.
6	Δότε ἡμῖν ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ,	a	יֻתַּן־לָנוּ שִׁבְעָה אֲנָשִׁים מִבָּנָיו	Δότω ἡμῖν ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ,
	καὶ ἐξηλάσομεν αὐτοῖς τῷ κυρίῳ	b	וְהוֹקַעֲנוּם לַיהוָה	καὶ ἐξηλιάσωμεν αὐτοὺς τῷ κυρίῳ
	ἐν τῷ βούνῳ Σαοὺλ	c	בְּגִבְעַת שָׁאוּל	ἐν Γαβαὼν Σαοὺλ
	ἐκλεκτοὺς Κυρίου.	d	בְּחִיר יְהוָה	ἐκλεκτοὺς Κυρίου.
	καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Βασιλεύς Ἐγὼ δώσω.	e	וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲנִי אֶתֵּן	καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Βασιλεύς Ἐγὼ δώσω.
7	Καὶ ἐφείσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ Μεμφιβόσθε	a	וַיַּחְמֹל הַמֶּלֶךְ עַל־מְפִיבֹשֶׁת	Καὶ ἐφείσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ Μεμφιβόσθε
	υἱὸν Ἰωναθὰν υἱοῦ Σαοὺλ	b	בֶּן־יְהוֹנָתָן בֶּן־שָׁאוּל	υἱὸν Ἰωναθὰν υἱοῦ Σαοὺλ
	διὰ τὸν ὅρκον Κυρίου	c	עַל־שְׁבֻעַת יְהוָה	διὰ τὸν ὅρκον Κυρίου
	τὸν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν	d	אֲשֶׁר בֵּינֹתָם	τὸν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν
	καὶ ἀνα μέσον Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθὰν υἱοῦ Σαούλ.	e	בֵּין דָּוִד וּבֵין יְהוֹנָתָן בֶּן־שָׁאוּל	καὶ ἀνα μέσον Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθὰν υἱοῦ Σαούλ.
8	καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ῥεσφὰς θυγατρὸς Αἰὰ	a	וַיִּקַּח הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־שְׁנֵי בְּנֵי רִצְפָּה בַת־אַיָּה	καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ῥεσφὰ θυγατρὸς Αἰὰ
	παλλακῆς Σαοὺλ	b		
	οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σαούλ,	c	אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה לְשָׁאוּל	οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σαούλ,
	τὸν Ἐρμόνθι καὶ τὸν Μεμφιβόσθε,	d	אֶת־אַרְמֹנִי וְאֶת־מְפִבֹשֶׁת	τὸν Ἐρμωνοεὶ καὶ τὸν Μεμφιβόσθε,

vs	M		m	B
	καὶ τοὺς πέντε υἱοὺς τῆς Μερὸμ θυγατρὸς Σαοὺλ	e	וְאֶת־חֲמֵשֶׁת בְּנֵי מִיכַל בַּת־שָׁאוּל	καὶ τοὺς πέντε υἱοὺς Μιχὸλ θυγατρὸς Σαοὺλ
	οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Ἐσδρὶηλ υἱῷ Βερζελλὶ τῷ Μοουλαθὶ,	f	אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה לְעַדְרִיאֵל בֶּן־בַּרְזִלַּי הַמְּחֹלָתִי	οὓς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σερεὶ υἱῷ Βερζελλεὶ τῷ Μωουλαθεὶ,
9	καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβαωνειτῶν,	a	וַיִּתְּנֵם בְּיַד הַגִּבְעֹנִים	καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβαωνειτῶν,
	καὶ ἐξηλίασαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἔναντιον Κυρίου,	b	וַיֹּקִיעֻם בָּהָר לִפְנֵי יְהוָה	καὶ ἐξηλίασαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἔναντι Κυρίου,
	καὶ ἔπεσον ἐκεῖ οἱ ἑπτὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτό·	c	וַיִּפְּלוּ שְׁבַעְתָּים יָחַד	καὶ ἔπεσαν οἱ ἑπτὰ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό
	αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθανατώθησαν	d	וְהֵמָּה הֻמְתוּ	καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθανατώθησαν
	ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις,	e	בִּימֵי קָצִיר בָּרִאשֹׁנִים	ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις,
	ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν.	f	תְּחִלַּת קְצִיר שְׂעֹרִים	ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν.
10	καὶ ἔλαβεν Ῥεσφὰ θυγάτηρ Αἰὰ τὸν σάκκον	a	וַתִּקַּח רִצְפָּה בַת־אַיָּה אֶת־הַשַּׂק	καὶ ἔλαβεν Ῥεσφὰ θυγάτηρ Αἰὰ τὸν σάκκον
	καὶ διέστρωσεν αὐτὸν αὐτῇ	b	וַתַּטֵּהוּ לָהּ	καὶ ἔπηξεν αὐτῇ
	ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν	c	אֶל־הַצּוּר	πρὸς τὴν πέτραν
	ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν	d	מִתְּחִלַּת קָצִיר	ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν
	[ἕως] ἔσταξαν ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς ὕδατα θεοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ,	e	עַד נִתַּךְ־מַיִם עֲלֵיהֶם מִן־הַשָּׁמָיִם	ἕως ἔσταξεν ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς ὕδωρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
	καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ	f	וְלֹא־נָתְנָה עוֹף הַשָּׁמַיִם	καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
	καταπαῦσαι ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς ἡμέρας	g	לָנוּחַ עֲלֵיהֶם יוֹמָם	καταπαῦσαι ἐπ᾿ αὐτοὺς ἡμέρας

vs	M		m	B
11	καὶ τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ νυκτός,	h		καὶ τὰ θηρία τοῦ ἀγροῦ νυκτός,
	καὶ ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Δαυειδ	a	וַיֻּגַּד לְדָוִד אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עָשְׂתָה	καὶ ἀπηγγέλη τῷ Δαυειδ
	πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν Ῥεσφὰ θυγάτηρ Αἰὰ παλλακὴ Σαούλ.	b	רִצְפָּה בַת־אַיָּה פִּלֶגֶשׁ שָׁאוּל	ὅσα ἐποίησεν Αἰὰ θυγάτηρ Αἰὰ παλλακὴ Σαούλ·
		c		καὶ ἐξελύθησαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Δὰν υἱὸς Ἰωὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων.
12	καὶ ἐπορεύθη Δαυειδ	a		καὶ ἐπορεύθη Δαυειδ
	καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαούλ	b	וַיֵּלֶךְ דָּוִד וַיִּקַּח אֶת־עַצְמוֹת שָׁאוּל	καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαούλ
	Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ	c	אֶת־עַצְמוֹת יְהוֹנָתָן בְּנוֹ	Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ
	παρὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν Ἰαβεὶς Γαλαάδ	d	מֵאֵת בַּעֲלֵי יָבֵישׁ גִּלְעָד	παρὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν υἱῶν Ἰαβεὶς Γαλαάδ
	οἳ ἔκλεψαν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους Βαιθσάν,	e	אֲשֶׁר גָּנְבוּ אֹתָם מֵרְחֹב בֵּית־שָׁן	οἳ ἔκλεψαν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς πλατείας Βαιθσάν]
	κρεμασάντων αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων	f	אֲשֶׁר תְּלוּם שָׁם הַפְּלִשְׁתִּים	ὅτι ἔστησαν αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι
	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐπάταξαν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι τὸν Σαούλ ἐν Γελβουε.	g	בְּיוֹם הַכּוֹת פְּלִשְׁתִּים אֶת־שָׁאוּל בַּגִּלְבֹּעַ	ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐπάταξαν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι τὸν Σαούλ ἐν Γελβουε.
13	καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν ἐκεῖθεν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαούλ	a	וַיַּעַל מִשָּׁם אֶת־עַצְמוֹת שָׁאוּל	καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν ἐκεῖθεν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαούλ
	Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,	b	וְאֶת־עַצְמוֹת יְהוֹנָתָן בְּנוֹ	Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ,

vs	M		m	B
	καὶ συνήγαγεν τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἐξηλιασμένων.	c	ויאספו את־עצמות המופעים	καὶ συνήγαγεν τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἐξηλιασμένων.
14	καὶ ἔθαψαν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαούλ.	a	ויקברו את־עצמות־שאול	καὶ ἔθαψαν τὰ ὀστᾶ Σαούλ.
	Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ	b	ויהונתן בנו	Ἰωναθὰν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ
	καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ τῶν ἠλιασθέντων ἐν γῇ Βενιαμεὶν	c	בארץ בנימן בצלע	καὶ τῶν ἠλιασθέντων ἐν γῇ Βενιαμεὶν καὶ
	ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ τοῦ τάφου Κεὶς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,	d	בקבר קיש אביו	ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Κεὶς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,
	καὶ ἐποίησαν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεύς·	e	ויעשו כל אשר־צוה המלך	καὶ ἐποίησαν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο ὁ βασιλεύς·
	καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ γῇ μετὰ ταῦτα.	f	ויעתר אלהים לארץ אחרי־כן	καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ γῇ μετὰ ταῦτα.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackroyd, Peter. The Second Book of Samuel. Cambridge Bible Commentary. London: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

_____. "The Theology of the Chronicler," LTQ 8 (1973): 101-116.

Aejmelaeus, Anneli. "What Can We Know About the Hebrew Vorlage of the Septuagint?." ZAW 99 (1987): 58-89.

Albright, W. F. "New Light on Early Recensions of the Hebrew Bible." BASOR 140 (1955): 27-33.

Altar, Robert. The Art of Biblical Narrative. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1981.

Anderson, A. A. II Samuel. WBC 11. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989.

Barthélemy, Dominique. "A Reexamination of the Textual Problems in 2 Sam. 11:2-I Kings 2:11 in Light of the Certain Criticisms of Les Devanciers d'Aquila." Trans. Kathleen McCarthy. 1972 Proceedings IOSCS, Number Two. ed. R.A. Kraft. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972, 16-89.

_____. "La Qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel." The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Preceedings IOSCS - Vienna. ed. Emanuel Tov, 1-44. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

_____. Les Devanciers d'Aquila. VT Supp. 10. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963.

_____. "Redécouverte d'un chaîon manquant de l'histoire de la Septuante." RB 60 (1953): 18-29.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Did Saul Make Gibeon His Capital." VT 24 (1974): 1-7.

_____. Gibeon and Israel. Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series. Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

Böstrom, Otto. Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel. Rock Island: Ill.: Augustana, 1918.

Brenner, Athalya., ed. A Feminist Companion to Samuel and Kings. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Brock, S.P. "An Unrecognized Occurence of the Month Name ZIW (2 Sam. XXI 9)." VT 23 (1973): 100-03.

_____. "Lucian *redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's Les Devanciers d'Aquila." Studia Evangelica 5. Berlin (1968): 176-181.

_____. "Origen's Aims as a Textual Critic of the Old Testament." Studia Patristica 10 (1970): 215-218.

_____. The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of 1 Samuel. Torino: Silvio Zamorani Editore, 1996.

Brueggeman, Walter. First and Second Samuel. Interpretation. Louisville: John Knox, 1990.

_____. "2 Samuel 21-24: An Appendix of Deconstruction." CBQ 50 (1988): 383-397.

Budde, Karl. Die Bücher Samuel erklärt. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament VIII. Tubingen and Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr [Siebeck], 1902.

Carlson, R. A. David the Chosen King: A Traditio-Historical Approach to the Second Book of Samuel. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksell, 1964.

Caspari, D. Wilhelm. Die Samuelbücher. Kommentar zum Alten Testament VII. Leipzig: Deichertsche Vertlagsbuchhandlung [Scholl], 1926.

Cazelles, Henri. "David's Monarchy and the Gibeonite Claim [II Sam. 21:1-14]." PEQ 87 (1955): 165-175.

Childs, Brevard S. Introduction to the Old Testament as Scripture. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979, 263-280.

Clines, D. and T. Eskenazi, eds. In Telling Queen Michal's Story: An Experiment in Comparative Interpretation. JSOT Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Conybeare, F. C. & St. George Stock. Selections from the Septuagint. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1905; repr. as A Grammar of Septuagint Greek. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1980.

Cross, F. M. and S. Talmon, eds. Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Cross, F. M. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint." BASOR 132 (1953): 15-26.

_____. "The Ammonite Oppression of the Tribes of Gad and Reuben: Mission verses from I Samuel 11 Found in 4QSamuel[a]." The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Preceedings IOSCS - Vienna, ed. Emanuel Tov. 105-119. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

_____. The Ancient Library of Qumran. 3d ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1995.

_____. "The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text." IEJ XVI (1966): 81-95.

_____. "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts." In Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text. eds. Cross, F. M., and Talmon S., 108-26. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press,1975.

_____. "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert." HTR 57 (1964): 281-299.

_____. "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran." JBL 74 (1955): 147-172.

Demsky, Aaron. "Geba, Gibeah, and Givean: An Historico-Geographic Riddle." BASOR 212 (1973): 26-31.

Dhorme, Paul. Les Livres de Samuel. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: Librairie Victor Le Coffre, J. Gabalda & Co., 1910.

Dieterle C. and V. Monsarrat. "Famine, guerre et peste en 2 Samuel 21-24." In Lectio Difficilior Probabilior? comme expérience de décloisonnement. Mélanges offerts à Françoise Symth-Florentin. ed. Thomas Römer, 207-230. Dielheimer Blätter aum Alten Testament und seiner Rezeption in der Alten Kirche Beiheft 11. Heidelberg: Wiss. theol. Seminar, 1991.

Driver, S.R. A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew. 3d ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1982.

_____. Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Ehrlich, H. "The Matrite Family and the Gibeonites." Beth Mikra 17 (1981/82): 266-69.

Erdmann, David. The Books of Samuel. Trans. C.H. Toy and John A. Broadus. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1876.

Eybers, I.H. "Notes on the Texts of Samuel Found in Cave 4." In Studies on the Books of Samuel, Papers Read at 3rd Meeting at Stellenbosch, January 26-28, 1960. Ou Testamentiese Wergemeenskap in Suid-Afrika. Pretoria, South Africa, 1960, 1-17.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. "Literary and Editional Features of the Antiochian Text in Kings." VI Congress of the IOSCS, Jerusalem 1986. ed. Claude E. Cox, 287-304. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Books of Kings. New York: E.J. Brill, 1994.

Fokkelman, J.P. Narrative Art and Poetry in the Books of Samuel. Vol. III, Throne and City; 11 Samuel 2-8 & 21-24. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum 20, 1990.

Freedman, D. N. "The Chronicler's Purpose," CBQ 23 (1961): 436-442.

Fuss, W. "II Samuel 24." ZAW 74 (1962): 145-64.

Ginzberg, Louis. Legends of the Jews. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1942.

Glück, J.J. "Merab or Michal [II Samuel 21:1-14]." ZAW 77 (1965): 72-81.

Goldman, S. Samuel. London: The Soncino Press, 1951.

Gooding, D.W. "Appeal For a Stricter Terminology In the Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." JSS 21 (1976): 15-25.

Gordon, R.P. I & II Samuel. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1988.

Goshen-Gottstein, Moshe H. "Editions of the Hebrew Bible-Past and Future." In Sha'arei Talmon, eds. Michael Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields, 221-242. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

_____. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts." Bib XLVIII (1967): 249-77.

Gottwald, N.K. "Samuel, Book of." Encyclopedia Judaica 14 (1971): 788-97.

Green, A.R.W. The Role of Human Sacrifice in the Ancient Near East. American Schools of Oriental Research Dissertation. 1. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.

Gressman, Hugo, at al. Narrative and Novella in Samuel. JSOT Supplement Series 116. Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991.

Grindel, J.A. "Another Characteristic of the kaige Recension: nsh/nikos." CBQ 31 (1969): 499-513.

Groningen, Gerard van. "Joshua-II Kings: Deuteronomistic? Priestly? or prophetic writing?." JETS 12 (1969): 3-26.

Gunn, David M. The Story of King David: Genre and Interpretation. JSOT Supp. 6. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1978.

Harrington, Daniel J., S.J. Saldarini, and Anthony J. Saldarini. Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets. Director Martin McNamara, M.S.C. The Aramaic Bible, the Targums. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.

Hentschel, Georg. "Die Hinrichtung der Nachkommen Sauls (2 Sam. 21,1-14)." In Nachdenken über Israel, Bible und Theologie, eds. H. Michael Niemann, Matthias Augustin and Werner H. Schmidt. New York: Peter Lang, 1994, 93-116.

Hertzberg, H. W. I and II Samuel. OTL. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1964.

Hossfeld, Frank-Lothar. "Versöhnung und Sünde." BK 41 (1986): 54-60.

Howard, George. "Frank Cross and Recensional Criticism." VT 21 (1971): 440-450.

_____. "The Septuagint: A Review of Recent Studies." RQ 13 (1970): 154-164.

Jellicoe, Sidney. "Some Reflections on the KAIGE Recension." VT 23 (1973): 15-24.

_____. Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations. New York: KTAV Publishing House, 1974.

_____. The Septuagint and Modern Study. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.

Jerome [Pseudo]. Quaestiones on the Book of Samuel. ed. Avrom Saltman. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.

Johnson, B. Die Hexaplarische Rezension des 1 Samuelbuches der Septuaginta. Studiea Theologica Lundensia 22. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1963.

Kahle, P. The Cairo Geniza. The Schweich Lectures. London: G. Cumberlege: Basil Blackwell, 1947.

_____. "The Greek Bible and the Fragments from the Judaean Desert." Studia Evangelica 1. Berlin (1959): 613-21.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. "King and Fertility: A Discussion of II Sam. 21:1-14", Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, Oslo, 1955, 113-122; in God and His Friends in the Old Testament. ed. Arvid S. Mowinckel, 41-50. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1979.

Keil, C.F. & F. Delitzsch. The Books of Samuel. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1876.

Kirkpatrick, A.F. The Second Book of Samuel. Cambridge: University Press, 1890.

Klein, R. W. 1 Samuel. Word Biblical Commentary. Waco: 1983.

_____. "New Evidence for an Old Recension of Reigns." HTR 60 (1967): 93-105.

_____. Textual Criticism of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.

Klostermann, August. Die Bücher Samuelis und der Könige. Kurzgefasster Kommentar zu den heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments. Nördlingen: C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1887.

Kraft, R.A. "Septuagint, Earliest Greek Versions." IDB Supp. Nashville, Abingdon, 1976, 811-815.

_____. "The Methodology of Textual Criticism in Jewish Greek Scriptures, with Special Attentions to the Problems in Samuel-Kings." In LXX: 1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Number two. ed. R.A. Kraft, 1-126. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Martin, John A. "Studies in 1 and 2 Samuel, pt. 3: The Text of Samuel." BS 141 (1984): 209-222.

Marx, Alfred. "Sacrifice de Réparation et Rites of Leveé de Sanction." ZAW 100 (1988): 183-198.

Mayes, A.D.H. "Deuteronomistic Ideology and the Theology of the Old Testament." JSOT 82, 1999.

_____. "The Gibeonites as a Historical and Theological Problem in the Old Testament," Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association. Dublin: Dominican Publications, 1986, 13-24.

McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. Textual Criticism. Recovering the Text of the Hebrew Bible. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. ed. Gene M. Tucker. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

_____. I Samuel. AB 8. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1980.

_____. II Samuel. AB 9. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1984.

McKane, W. I and II Samuel: The Way to the Throne. Torch Bible Commentary. London: SCM, 1963.

Metzger, B.M. "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible." Chapters in the History of New Testament Criticism. Leiden, 1963, 1-41.

Mulder, M.J. "The Transmission of the Biblical Text." In Mikra. eds. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, 87-136. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

Müller, M. "The Septuagint as the Bible of the New Testament Church: Some Reflections." Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament 7 (1993): 194-207.

Muraoka, T. "The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations or Recensional Activity?", LXX: 1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Number two. ed. R.A. Kraft, 90-107. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

Myers, Jacob M. 1 Chronicles. AB 12. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973.

North, R. "Theology of the Chronicler," JBL 82 (1963): 369-381.

Noth, Martin. The Deuteronomistic History. Journal for the Study of Old Testament Supplement Series 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981; Trans. from Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I. Halle: Niemeyer, 1942.

Nysse, Richard W. "An Analysis of the Greek Witnesses to the Text of the Lament of David." In The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Preceedings IOSCS - Vienna. ed. by Emanuel Tov, 69-104. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

O'Connell, K.G. "Greek Versions, Minor." IDB Supp. Nashville: Abingdon, 1976, 377-381.

Orlinsky, Harry M. "Current Process and Problems in Septuagint Research." In The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow, ed. H. R. Willoughby. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1947; reprinted in Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations. ed. Harry M. Orlinsky. New York: KTAV, 1974.

Payne, David F. Samuel. Edinburgh: St. Andrew Press, 1982.

Pietersma, Albert. "Proto-Lucian and the Greek Psalter." VT 20 (1978): 66-72.

Pisano, Stephen. Additions Or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984.

Polzin, Robert. Samuel and the Deuteronomist. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers, 1989.

Poulssen, N. "An Hour with Rispah", In Von Kanaan bis Kerala. ed. W. Delsman and J. Nelis, trans. Bergh-Marshall M. van den: 132, Ploeg J. van der, 1982, 185-211.

Roberts, B. J. "Old Testament: Manuscripts, Text and Versions." In Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 2. ed. G. W. H. Lampe, 13-26. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.

Rost, Leonard. The Succession to the Throne of David. Trans. by Michael D. Rutter and David Gunn. Sheffield: The Almond Press, 1982; Trans. from Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids. Beitrage zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 3/6. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926.

Sanders, James A. "The Hebrew University Bible and Biblia Hebraica Quinta." JBL 118 (1999): 518-526.

Shenkel, James Donald. Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Sheppard, Gerald T. Wisdom as a Hermeneutical Construct. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.

Skehan, P.W. "The Earliest LXX and Subsequent Revisions." Jerome Biblical Commentary 2. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968, 570-572.

_____. "The Scrolls and the O.T. Text." In New Directions in Biblical Archaelogy. D.N. Freedman and J.C. Greenfield, eds., 99-112. New York: Doubleday, 1971.

Smith, H.P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel. ICC. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.

Smith, M. "Another Criterion of the kaige Recension." Bib XLVIII (1967): 443-445.

Stoebe, Hanz Joachim. Das erste Buch Samuelis. Kommentar zum Alten Testament VIII/1. Gütersloch: Gerd Mohn, 1973.

Swete, H.B. Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.

Talmon, Shemaryahu. "The Old Testament Text." In Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1. eds. P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans, 159-199. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Thackery, H. St. J. "The Greek Translations of the Four Books of Kings." JTS 8 (1907): 262-278.

_____. The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, a Study in Origins. The Schweich Lectures, 1920. London: Milford for the British Academy, 1921; 2d ed., 1923.

Thenius, Otto. Die Bücher Samuels. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Leipzig: Weidman'sche Buchhandlung, 1842.

Tov, Emanuel. "Determining the Relationship between the Qumran Scrolls and the LXX: Some Methodological Issues." In The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Preceedings IOSCS - Vienna. ed. by Emanuel Tov, 45-67. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

_____. "Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism." JJS 39 (1988): 5-37.

_____. "Interchanges of Consonants between the Masoretic Text and the Vorlage of the Septuagint." In Sha'arei Talmon. eds. Michael Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields, 255-66. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

_____. "Lucian and Proto-Lucian." RB 79 (1972): 101-13.

_____. "Some Sequence Differences Between the MT and LXX and Their Ramifications for the Literary Criticism of the Bible." JNSL 13 (1987): 151-160.

_____. Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research. Jerusalem: Simor Ltd., 1981.

_____. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

_____. "The Septuagint." In Mikra. eds. Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, 161-188. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

_____. "The State of the Question: Problems and Proposed Solutions." In LXX: 1972 Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Number two. ed. R.A. Kraft, 3-15. Missoula: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

_____. "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the O.T.--A Further Characterstic of the kaige-Th Revision?." Textus 8 (1973): 107-125.

Ulrich, Eugene C. "The Canonical Process, Textual Criticism, and Latter Stages in the Composition of the Bible." In Sha'arei Talmon. eds. Michael Fishbane, Emanuel Tov, and Weston W. Fields, 267-91. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

_____. "The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran." In The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel. 1980 Preceedings IOSCS - Vienna. ed. Emanuel Tov, 121-165. Jerusalem: Academon, 1980.

_____. The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus. Harvard Semitic Monograph 19. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978.

van Seters, John. In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origin of Biblical History. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

de Vaux, Roland. Les Livres de Samuel. 2d ed. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf., 1953.

Walters, Stanley D. "Childless Michal, Mother of Five." In The Tablet and Scroll: Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William W. Hallo. eds. Mark E. Cohen, Daniel C. Snell, and David B. Weisberg. Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 1993, 290-296.

_____. "Gibeon of Saul." JSOT 52 (1991): 61-76.

_____. "Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of I Samuel 1." JBL 107 (1988): 385-412.

_____. The Book of Reversals: An Essay on the Organization of Purpose of Samuel. Courtice, Ontario: Manthano Press: 1990.

_____. "The Light and the Dark." In Ascribe to the Lord. Essays in Memory of Peter C. Craigie. eds. J. Glen Taylor and Lyle Eslinger, 567-589. JSOT Supp. 67. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.

Waltke, Bruce K. "Aims of Old Testament Text Criticism." Westminister Theological Journal 51 (1989): 93-108.

Welch, A.C. The Work of the Chronicler, Its Purpose and Its Date. London: Oxford, 1939.

Wellhausen, Julius. Der Text der Bücher Samuelis untersucht. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag, 1871.

Wevers, J.W. "Proto-Septuagint Studies." In The Seed of Wisdom. Essays in Honour of T.J. Meek. Toronto: University Press, 1964, 58-77.

_____. "The Study in the Exegetical Principles Underlaying the Greek Text of II Sam. 11:2-I Kings 2:11." CBQ 15 (1953): 30-45.

Whybray, R.N. The Succession Narrative. Studies in Biblical Theology 9. Naperville, Ill.: Alec R. Allenson, Inc., 1968.

Williams, Ronald J. Hebrew Syntax: An Outline. 2d ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

Williamson, H. G. M. 1 and 2 Chronicles. NCBC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

Würthwein, Ernst. The Text of the Old Testament. Trans. Erroll F. Rhodes. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1979.