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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 (MT) 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, MT, 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.
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DEDICATION

To Amy
This study is a comparative analysis of three versions of 2 Samuel 21:1-14 as presented in manuscripts M, M, 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.
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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 MT. 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, who describes contemporary Jews questioning the veracity of the story about the origin of the Septuagint because the LXX had been preserved and transmitted primarily by Christians. 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.” Justin Martyr and other early church fathers argued that the Jews deliberately removed a number of passages which were favorable to


2I 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.


towards Christianity. 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 \textit{\textsc{Lxx}}.

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 \textit{\textsc{Lxx}} based on the received Hebrew Scripture. Three names are associated with these early improvements: Aquila, Theodotion, and Symmachus. Aquila, a Jewish proselyte from Pontus and student of Rabbi Akiba, completed a slavishly literal translation of the received Hebrew text in \textit{\textsc{Lxx}} in ca. A.D. 125. There were mixed reactions to Aquila's work by Jews and Christians. Jews, on the one hand, praised and trusted Aquila's translation even though it was forbidden for use in the Synagogue by the Code of Justinian (A.D. 555). Early Church Fathers Irenaeus and Epiphanius, on the other hand, reacted negatively to Aquila's anti-Christian bias. Symmachus, probably an Ebionite, provided a good Greek rendering of the received Hebrew text (\textit{\textsc{Lxx}}) probably in the latter part of the second century A.D. Theodotion, probably a proselyte to Judaism from Ephesus, completed a free revision of the Greek

\begin{itemize}
\item[5] Swete, \textit{Intro.}, 479.
\item[6] I will refer to the works of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion as \textit{\textsc{Lxx}}, \textit{\textsc{Lxx}'}, and \textit{\textsc{Lxx}'} respectively.
\item[7] Tov, \textquotedblleft The Septuagint,	extquotedblright 183-84; Swete, \textit{Intro.}, 31-32.
\item[10] Tov, \textquoteleft The Septuagint,\textquoteright 184.
\end{itemize}
Bible during the latter part of the second century A.D. Faithful to the standard Hebrew, Theodotion’s revision was better Greek style than Aquila.

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,” Origen created his Hexapla, six texts in parallel columns: Hebrew; a Greek transliteration; \( \alpha' \); \( \sigma' \); Origen’s revised Greek text; and \( \theta' \). Using \( \theta' \) as his primary text, he restored Hebrew word order and corrected supposed corruptions. Where \( \theta' \) had additions he marked them with an obelus. He supplied omissions from \( \alpha' \), \( \sigma' \), and \( \theta' \) 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.

---


12 Ibid.


Because of differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions, Jerome (ca. A.D. 345-420) was commissioned to revise the Old Latin version (تنظيم) since it had been translated from an old Greek version different from the received Hebrew text as early as the second century A.D.\textsuperscript{15} Jerome's revised Latin version, the Vulgate (.retry), was never able to completely replace the ퟏ;\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{17} Like the works of Origen and Jerome, the differences that emerged in the Polyglots were frequently solved by correction toward the ퟏ without explanation or interpretation of the Greek texts.\textsuperscript{18}

\textsuperscript{15}Swete. *Intro.*, 92.

\textsuperscript{16}Ibid., 102-103.


\textsuperscript{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, the differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Samuel were first emphasized by Otto Thenius. In his commentary on Samuel (A.D. 1842), he attempted to systematically revise the text based on the LXX. Since Thenius's conclusions were sometimes arbitrary and subjective, 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. 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). He argued that B is the best witness to the OG in 1Sam. 1:1-

---


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 II 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) which dates about one hundred B.C.28 The significance of that discovery can hardly be overstated. 4QSam preserved a Hebrew text-type distinctly different from II and closely related to the presumed Hebrew Vorlage of the

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


25 Ibid., 263.

26 Thackeray gave 10 characteristics of this “translator”: the use of οἱ ὀδρόι for ‘the great men (θέρετρα, ἀρχαί); κερατίνη for ἐνθρόνος; μονόζωνος for ἡμέρα; the unique use of ἀπάνωθεν; καὶ γε for ὁ; καὶ μάλα for ἡμέρα; the use of Ἡνίκα in only the βδ sections of Kingdoms; ἐγὼ ἐμί followed by a finite verb; absence of the historical perfect; Ibid., 267-274.

27 Ibid., 277-78.

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\textsuperscript{b}) from Qumran which antedated 4QSam\textsuperscript{a} by approximately two centuries.\textsuperscript{29} According to Cross, 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} was much closer to the LXX than to \textit{m}.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.\textsuperscript{31} The problem with the eclectic reconstructive approach is that the diversity of the versions works against it. Furthermore,

\textsuperscript{29}F. M. Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumrán," \textit{JBL} 74 (1955): 147-72, esp. 164.

\textsuperscript{30}4QSam\textsuperscript{b} agrees with LXX against \textit{m} thirteen times; 4QSam\textsuperscript{b} agrees with \textit{m} against LXX four times; Cross, "The Oldest Manuscripts," 172.

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. I as represented in א and ב.\(^{33}\) 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 א, 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 א. They opted for a reading said to be found in the LXX and 4QSam\(^{3}\). "Only, may Yahweh fulfill your word." The LXX and 4QSam\(^{3}\) actually read, "But may the Lord fulfill what has gone out of your mouth." While the proposed emendation reads better, neither the א 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.

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, n, 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, n, 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 n, represents a distinct version of the story with different emphases than either B or n.

In Chapter 5, I will compare M, n, 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

distinctly sympathetic towards proselytes and outsiders. B 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

Καὶ ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Δαυεὶδ τρία ἔτη ἐνιαυτὸς ἐχόμενος ἐνιαυτοῦ, καὶ ἐξήτησεν Δαυεὶδ τὸ πρόσωπον Κυρίου· καὶ εἶπεν Κύριος Ἐπὶ Σαουὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἡ ἁδικία περὶ οὗ ἠθανάτωσεν τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας. 2) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς Δαυεὶδ τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· καὶ οἱ Γαβαωνείται οὗθι υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ εἶσιν, ἄλλ’ ἡ ἐκ τοῦ αἴματος τοῦ Ἀμορραίου, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ ὠμοσαν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐξήτησεν Σαουὴ πατάξαυ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ξηλώσαι αὐτὸν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰούδα. 3) καὶ εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ πρὸς τοὺς Γαβαωνείτας Τί ποιήσω υμῖν καὶ ἐν τίνι ἐξιλάσομαι, καὶ εὐλογήσατε τὴν κληρονομίαν Κυρίου; 4) καὶ εἶπον ὁ οἱ Γαβαωνείται Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἄργυριον καὶ χρυσίον μετὰ Σαουὴ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ θανάτωσαι ἐκ παντὸς Ἰσραήλ. καὶ εἶπεν, Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε καὶ ποιήσω υμῖν; 5) καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα ὁ ἀνὴρ ὃς συνεκτέλεσεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ εἰδὼλευεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἔλογισεν ἐξοληθρεύασαι ἡμᾶς· ἀφανίσωμεν αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ ἐστάναι αὐτόν ἐν παντὶ ὄρῳ Ἰσραήλ. 6) Δότε ἡμῖν ἐπτὰ ἄνδρας ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξηλάσομεν αὐτοὺς τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν τῷ βοῶνῳ Σαουὴ ἐκλεκτοὺς Κυρίου, καὶ εἰπεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς Ἐγὼ δώσω. 7) καὶ

---

aSee Appendix A for a facsimile of Codex Coislinianus.

bIn 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.
ἐφείσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ Μεμψίβόσθε υἱῶν Ἰωναθᾶν υἱοῦ Σαοῦλ διὰ τὸν ὅρκον Κυρίου τὸν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Δαυείδ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθᾶν υἱοῦ Σαοῦλ. 8) καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ἐρεσφᾶς θυγατρὸς Αἰα παλλακῆς Σαοῦλ οὗς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σαοῦλ, τὸν Ἐρμόνθι καὶ τὸν Μεμψιβόσθε, καὶ τοὺς πέντε υἱοὺς τῆς Μερὸμ θυγατρὸς Σαοῦλ οὗς ἔτεκεν τῷ Ἐσδρίηλ υἱῷ Βερξελλί τῷ Μουσαλάθι. 9) καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβραωνίτων, καὶ ἐξηλίσασαν αὐτούς ἐν τῷ ὅρει ἐναντίον Κυρίου, καὶ ἔπεσον ἐκεῖ οἱ ἐπτὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ· αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐθανατώθησαν ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις, ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν. 10) καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἐρεσφᾶ θυγάτηρ Αἰα τὸν σάκκον καὶ διέστρωσεν αὐτὸν αὐτῇ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν ἐν ἀρχῇ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν. 11) καὶ ἀπηγγέλθη τῷ Δαυείδ πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν Ἐρεσφᾶ θυγάτηρ Αἰα παλλακῆ Σαοῦλ. 12) καὶ ἐπορεύθη Δαυείδ καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰ ὅστα Σαοῦλ καὶ τὰ ὅστα Ἰωναθᾶν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῶν ἄνδρῶν Ἰαβείς Γαλαάδ οἱ ἐκλεφταὶ αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ τείχους Βαβδᾶν, κρεμασάτων αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ τῶν ἀλλόφυλῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἤ ἐπάταξαν οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι τὸν Σαοῦλ ἐν Γελβοῦ. 13) καὶ ἀνήγευκεν ἐκεῖθεν τὰ ὅστα Σαοῦλ καὶ τὰ ὅστα Ἰωναθᾶν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήγαγεν τὰ ὅστα τῶν ἐξηλίσαμένων. 14) καὶ ἔθαψαν τὰ ὅστα Σαοῦλ καὶ τὰ ὅστα Ἰωναθᾶν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ὅστα τῶν ἡλιασθέντων ἐν γῇ Βενισαμίν ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ τοῦ τάφου Κεῖς τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐποίησαν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλατο ὁ Βασιλεὺς· καὶ ἐπήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ γῇ μετὰ ταῦτα.

<In verse 10, most MSS except MnS have ἔως here. Parablepsis probably caused ἔως to drop out in the uncial period due to the similarity of EWS ECTAZAN and ECTAZAN.>
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 γῆ (εςες) and ἐπὶ τῆ γῆν (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 בֵּיתוֹ בֵּיתוֹ. 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 \(\text{MR}\). 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 \(\text{MR}\). The first part of verse 1 is a good example of what is found throughout; M has καὶ ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἐν τοῖς ἡμέρας Αἰωνίων following \(\text{MR}\)'s ἔτες ἡμερῶν ὠραίας. I will highlight only the places where M is different from \(\text{MR}\).

\(^c\) In classical Greek, ἀδικία has the meanings "wrongdoing, unrighteousness" and "punishment of wrongdoing."\(^2\) M seems to have a Hebrew different from \(\text{MR}\) here since ἀδικία is commonly opposite ἁμαρτία in the Hebrew Bible, especially in Samuel,\(^3\) but never opposite ἁμαρτία as the \(\text{MR}\) has here. Twice in Samuel, ἀδικία is a calque for ἁμαρτία (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 ἁμαρτία: 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 the Gibeonites are not Israelites but 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 Normally καί is not disjunctive but here it reflects the disjunctive Hebrew construction waw + a non-verb.

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

   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 the inheritance of the Lord?”

   a εὐλογήσατε is the aorist imperative, “bless ye! (Israel’s inheritance).” The Greek imperative corresponds exactly to נָה’s piel imperative with waw, “to express with greater energy the intention signified by the preceding verb.”

---

4 LSJ 38b

5 McCarter, II Samuel, 437.
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4) 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 from all Israel.” And he said, “What are you saying, that I might do it for you?”

a μετά // בֵּן 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 R’s נָחָ֔ת אֶֽמְרִים אֶֽמְרֵי נָחָ֔ת with one slight variation: M and most LXX MSS have καὶ before ποιήσω and R has the minor disjunctive accent (tipha) on בֵּן instead of a waw on בֵּן. 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 καὶ 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 zmg has θέλετε instead of λέγετε, “What do you want. . .”

5) And they said to the king, “The man who struck us and persecuted us and planned to utterly destroy us—let us wipe him out from him having standing in all the territory of Israel.

a συνετέλεσεν ἡμᾶς certainly reflects M’s ΚΑΛΛΗ. When ἠλατος is followed by an accusative of person it usually means, “to destroy, kill, wipe out.” This seems too strong for the context, unless it means, “He killed [some of] us.” How can the Gibeonites speak...


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 // ἠλέλεῖ does not imply death.

b καὶ εὐθωκεῖν ἡμῶν would normally be opposite ἔπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτόν 10 but π does not have it. διώκειν means, "to pursue, chase," 11 similar to ἔπεσεν except ἔπεσεν often includes the sense of hostile intent and can also be translated "persecute." 12

c λογίζειν // ἂτάνα is a standard locution to express intention and purpose; λογίζειν occurs 84 times in the LXX, usually opposite ἄτανα (72 times), but never ἦμεν which is π'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 ἔσται αὐτῷ is the articular infinitive with the negative and is an acceptable way to translate ἄτανα, π's infinitive construct with ἦν. 13 The masculine accusative singular personal pronoun αὐτοῦ points to a 3d singular suffix which π 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 atonementa by means of them to the Lord on the hillb of Saul, [men] chosenc of the Lord." And the king said, "I will give."

a For the verb ἐζηλώσομεν, Brooke-McLean list ten additional variants, for a total of eleven. I understood them to be variant forms of two verbs, ἐζηλώζειν and ἐζηλώσκεσθαι, in various spelling deviations, most of which involve the interchange of η and τ or of indicative and subjunctive moods. Six of these, having the syllable -λός- and a primary ending, are forms of ἐζηλώζειν: ἐζηλώσωμεν B; ἐζηλώσομεν (ἐπ'w):

10 διώκειν stands opposite ἦμεν 58 of 75 times in the OT.

11 LSI 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.
εξιλιάσομεν (m[mg]); εξηλιώσομεν (44); εξολιάσομεν (a); εξηλιάσομαι (ε). Two others, having the syllable -λα- and a secondary ending, are clearly forms of εξιλάσκεσθαι: εξιλασόμεθα (M[mg]b c2e2); εξιλασόμεθα (b'0). This leaves three forms having the syllable -λα- which I take to be forms of εξιλάσκεσθαι but with primary endings, something that happens in Hellenistic Greek: εξιλάσομεν (gsyvay3); εξιλάσομεν (fl'uid)m-txt.qt); εξηλάσομεν (M [txt]). The texts with forms of εξηλιάζειν, “to hang in the sun,” (BA ael7m[mg]wx44 ) follow a Hebrew text like מ which has a form of יִּקְרָב (see also 2Sam. 21:9, 13). M and other MSS14 which have forms of εξιλάσκεσθαι and the מ seem to follow a Hebrew text with רָדָב, “to atone”; εξηλιάζειν stands opposite רָדָב 78 of 88 times and never opposite יִּקְרָב. 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 βούνῳ reflects the Hebrew יִּקְרָב,15 the same consonants but different vowel pointing as מ 's יִּקְרָב, “in Gibeah.”

c M and all Greek MSS except Αχ have the accusative plural adjective εκλεκτοῦς, indicating that “chosen” refers to the Seven. מ has the singular bound form יִּקְרָב, 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-txtqstvya2

15 ἐν τῷ βούνῳ occurs 8 times in the LXX, 7 of which are opposite forms of יִּקְרָב (1Sam. 7:1; 22:6; 23:19; 26:1.3; 2Sam. 6:3; Hos. 10:9) and once יִּקְרָב (1Sam. 13:3).
8) The king took the two sons of Respha daughter of Aia, Saul’s concubine, whom she bore to Saul,\(^a\) Eronthi 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 manuscript g oddly write Μέρομ instead of Μέροβ; the interchange of \(\mu\) and \(\beta\) is a common cursive error, but not expected in the uncial hand. Many Greek MSS (Νύστρελ 246) have forms of Merab as the mother of the five sons, while a number have forms of Michal (Ἀβνακεμαματυμ) in apparent internal conflict with the larger narrative. I discuss this issue below in the interpretation of \(\text{m}\).

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 ἐξηλιακείν appears to mean “to make/put (-\(\zeta\)-) out(side) (ἐκ-) in the sun (ἡλιος).” 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, ἀνακρεμάσσωμεν “to hang up.” Aquila gives ἀναπήξωμεν “impale.” Verse 14 refers to the slain men as τῶν ἠλιοθέντων, 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.

---


\(^{17}\) LSJ 768
b o'i ἐπτὰ reflect ῶτ’s qere’ ἀναλυτικά. ῶτ’s 3d plural suffix is implied. B has the
more literal rendering of the qere’ with o'i ἐπτὰ αὐτοί.

c κατὰ τὸ αὐτό stands opposite ῶττα in 1Sam. 11:11.

d M and some other MSS (ABN reti) have the ἐν ἡμέρας θερισμοῦ ἐν πρωτοῖς, a
literal rendering of ῶτ’s ἀναλυτικά. M(mg) and L have ἐν ἡμέρας ζευν. Brog argued persuasively that ζευν represents a transliteration of the old Canaanite
month of Ziv. 18 Ziv coincided with the second month of the later Jewish calendar, late
April or early May, the time of the barley harvest. If Brog is correct, ῶτ’s margin probably
reflects an old Hebrew text with τττ τοιοῦτον.

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

a ῶτ’s διέστρωσεν means “to spread (a bed)” 19 but ῶτ’s margin has ἐπηξεν “fixed,
stretched (i.e. a tent)”20 agreeing with ῶτ’s ἐπετύχει, 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 ἐπαύ (Ex. 9:33) and twice opposite ἐπάνω (Jdg. 5:4; Ps. 67:9). In
each case, rain, or lack thereof, is the result of divine intervention. Thus, ῶτ’s ἐσταζεῖν
was probably opposite ῶτ’s ἐπαύ and the rain that came is understood to be an act of God.

18 S. P. Brog. “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.
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 ἤ which occurs in all Greek MSS except L after ἐν ἡμέρα is stylistic; The relative pronoun occurs elsewhere in the LXX where it is absent in the Hebrew.  

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 τά does not have a text opposite M's phrase κοί τὰ ὀστα τῶν ἠλιασθέντων. All LXX MSS except L have the rare verb ἠλιαζώ, "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.” L uses the aforementioned verb, ἐξηλιότζω, “hang in the sun” 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 Ἰ놉α, “in Zela” as ἐν τῷ πλευρᾶ (ἐν θέλαι), “in the side.” This probably occurred because the LXX translator was unaware of the uncommon place name Ἰ놉α, mentioned only in Josh. 18:28, and because πλευρᾶ stands opposite Ἰ.mvp elsewhere.

c M probably improved the Greek style here by using the genitive case τοῦ τάφου, instead of the dative case which is expected by ἐν ῥῷ τάφῳ.

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

23LSJ 768

24LSJ 593

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

26Gen. 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. 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

---

27In L, David seeks a prophetic word; καὶ ὁ θυμὸς ἐξήτει Δαυίδ παρὰ Κυρίον, "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 יבּוּכָּהָ֥ה דֵּרֶ֥ד or it was an intentional change for emphasis.

28All 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 ζηλωσαί αὐτόν 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 מ' followed by the piel infinitive construct נַעֲשֶׂה. ἐν τῷ ζηλωσαί 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 priests29 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 ἐξιλόσκομα // רָדָד 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 ἐξιλόσκομα // רָדָד 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 RDB 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 // δεσμή δινή 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. 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 them; elsewhere in Samuel, only enemies are “pursued.” 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), its location in the final four


322Sam. 18:16; 20:7, 10, 13; 22:38; 24:13

33The 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, 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 (מִמְּנֵי הָעֵדֶּן) 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 דָּוִדָהָן נַעֲשֶׂה וּדָוִדֶהָן, "Let them be given"; the qere' (דָּוִדֶהָן נַעֲשֶׂה) and ketiv of (דָּוִדֶהָן נַעֲשֶׂה) are 3d singular passives, "Let there be given." בָּהָי have the indefinite 3d singular active imperative דָּוִדֶהָן נַעֲשֶׂה, "Let him (someone) give." I will comment on this below. Nonetheless, in M the Gibeonites do command David and the Israelites.


34Jdg. 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 βοῦνῳ Σαοῦλ, “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 βοῦνῳ, which 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: Eronthi 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). 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" / "Gibeath 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

---

35M 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 III 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: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1984], 78-86) and therefore less original (Wellhausen, Die Text der Bücher Samuelis, 104ff; McCarver, I Samuel, 308-309; NAB, NRSV) or it might be more original (Thenius, Die Bücher, 68; Driver, Notes, 150; RSV; NEB; III). 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. M's text states that Rizpah "spread" sackcloth (as a bed) for herself upon the rock. M's margin agrees with B and III which describe Rizpah as "stretching" sackcloth (as a tent) to the rock. Lying on sackcloth, although unusual, is an extravagant act of mourning.

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. 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

---

36Sackcloth 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).

37LSJ 413d

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

39Dt. 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

40Walters, “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 3

1. נִיְּחָתֵּנִ֣י יְרוּשָׁלַ֣יִם שָׁנַ֑יהָ שָׁמַ֩יִם הָאָֽחָרִים שְׁגֵגֶתָ֤ה נִשְׁגַּ֨גֶת רָֽחֲצֵת יְוָ֤ה
2. נַעֲרָךְ יֵדְעֵה וְאֶל-שָׁאָ֣ו הָ֔לָּמָם עָלָ֖יה הָרְאֵ֥ית הָאָֽחָרִים הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים: (2) נְכַנְלָ֣ה לְבָנֵ֗י נַעֲרֶךְ מִשְׁגַּ֣גֶת רָֽחֲצֵת יְוָ֤ה
3. נַעֲרָךְ יֵדְעֵה וְאֶל-שָׁאָ֣ו הָ֔לָּמָם עָלָ֖יה הָרְאֵ֥ית הָאָֽחָרִים הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים: (ב) נְכַנְלָ֣ה לְבָנֵ֗י נַעֲרֶךְ מִשְׁגַּ֣גֶת רָֽחֲצֵת יְוָ֤ה
4. נַעֲרָךְ יֵדְעֵה וְאֶל-שָׁאָ֣ו הָ֔לָּמָם עָלָ֖יה הָרְאֵ֥ית הָאָֽחָרִים הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים: (ג) נְכַנְלָ֣ה לְבָנֵ֗י נַעֲרֶךְ מִשְׁגַּ֣גֶת רָֽחֲצֵת יְוָ֤ה
5. נַעֲרָךְ יֵדְעֵה וְאֶל-שָׁאָ֣ו הָ֔לָּמָם עָלָ֖יה הָרְאֵ֥ית הָאָֽחָרִים הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים: (ד) נְכַנְלָ֣ה לְבָנֵ֗י נַעֲרֶךְ מִשְׁגַּ֣גֶת רָֽחֲצֵת יְוָ֤ה
6. יִנְחַ֥ה עֲנָתָ֖תוּן קֹ֖שֶׁים עָלָ֣יִם לָ֑נוּ אַחֲרֵ֥י הָמָ֖ר יִנְחַ֥ה עֲנָתָ֖תוּן קֹ֖שֶׁים עָלָ֣יִם לָ֑נוּ אַחֲרֵ֥י הָמָ֖ר
7. נִתיֹ֥ם הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים אַחֲרֵי הָמָ֖ר נִתיֹ֥ם הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים אַחֲרֵ֥י הָמָ֖ר
8. נִתיֹ֥ם הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים אַחֲרֵי הָמָ֖ר נִתיֹ֥ם הָֽאָרְמֹתֶ֖ים אַחֲרֵ֥י הָמָ֖ר

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

b The ketiv (יִּקְטִיב) allows the statement to be made by one man, where the qere’ (יִקְּרֶה) requires it to be made on behalf of all of them. Böström writes, “Qere’” has the plur. to correspond with the latter part of the verse, where we read הָאָֽחָרִים. 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 הָאָֽחָרִים in both places, and others הָאָֽחָרִים. In order to preserve both these readings one הָאָֽחָרִים and הָאָֽחָרִים were kept in the text;” Otto Böström, Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel (Rock Island, Ill: Augustana, 1918), 56.

c The qere’ יִקְּרֶה shows that יִשַׁגְּגַּה is a mixture of two forms of יִשַּגְּגַּה: the niphal imperfect 3d masculine singular יִשַּגְּגַּה and the qal passive 3d masculine singular יִשַּגְּגַּה. Both the ketiv and qere’ are translated virtually the same, “Let there be given.” 4QSamA has the plural יִשַּגְּגַּה, “You shall give.”
The qere’ פָּגַם "seven of them" was probably an explanatory gloss for the ketiv פָּגַם פָּגַם "seven times," to make better sense in the context.

The initial consonant is absent in the ketiv פָּגַם whereas the qere’ פָּגַם has the initial consonant פ. Loss of פ is probably the result of a transmissional error, although H. P. Smith argues that חָלָה 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.)

The qere’ פָּגַם פָּגַם. "And these died" preserves a different division of the same letters and hence an alternative reading for the ketiv פָּגַם פָּגַם. "And they were put to death."

The qere’ פָּגַם פָּגַם preserves a different division of the same letters but the meaning is the same.
Translation and Notes of מ

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 הָרֹאעִים does not occur elsewhere, similar expressions do: בֵּית הָרֹאעִים\(^1\) and בֵּית הָרֹמְשִׁים\(^2\). 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 בֵּית הָרֹאעִים, normally followed by direct discourse, is interrupted by two disjunctive clauses providing parenthetical information about the Gibeonites.

\(^b\) יָבֹשֶׂם 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.

---

\(^1\)Sam. 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 נִפְּלָה followed by ל plus a person, without a specific referent to what one is swearing, means “to swear allegiance to.”

e כִּסִ' 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\textsuperscript{a} the inheritance\textsuperscript{b} of the Lord?”

\textsuperscript{a} The piel imperative with a waw preformative is unusual in a narrative sequence to express result. The only other place the specific form נַפְּלָה 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” (יִפְלֶה). The converted perfect נַפְּלֶה (Ex. 12:32) or the imperfect נַפְלֶה (Num. 6:23) would be smoother; thus, ב’s מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל הָסַיְּרָה. GK §110 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 נַפְּלֶה occurs, “God”, “the Lord” or “His name” is the object.\textsuperscript{7} I will return to this in the interpretation.

\textsuperscript{b} Elsewhere when נִפְּלָה “inheritance” occurs as a bound form with “Lord” or synonyms for “the Lord”, it refers either to the people of Israel\textsuperscript{8} or to the land of promise.\textsuperscript{9} As already mentioned, the phrase, “inheritance of the Lord” refers to the entire way of life

\textsuperscript{6}Josh. 9:15, 18, 19, 20; 2Kgs. 25:24; Is. 19:18; Jer. 40:9; Ezek. 16:8; 2Chr. 15:14

\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{8}1Sam. 10:1; 2Sam. 14:16; 1Kgs. 8:51, 53; 2Kgs. 21:14; Jer. 10:16; 28:19

\textsuperscript{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]\textsuperscript{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.”

\textsuperscript{a} מָלַךְ followed by מִלְךְ probably expresses obligation.

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

\textsuperscript{a} As already mentioned, the basic meaning of לֶחַל is “to complete, finish.”\textsuperscript{10} This 
sense, however, is too strong for the context. McCarter has called it “impossible and 
obviously defective.”\textsuperscript{11} Anderson translates it, “who (nearly) annihilated us.”\textsuperscript{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: לֶחַל אָסָף אָסָף לְךָ הַיָּמִים הָיוּ הָאָמָה הַגָּדְהָת 
“You have struck them, but they sensed no pain; You have consumed them, but 
they would accept no discipline.”

\textsuperscript{b} All LXX MSS have forms of κοι ἐδιώκειν ημῶς reflecting a Hebrew לֶחַל but יְּֽלַּכְּשׁ does not have it. Although haplography due to either homoioteleuton or 
homoioarchton might explain the loss since לֶחַל is after כָּלָה and before לֶחַל, the 
cumulative affect of this minus with other differences between the יְּֽלַּכְּשׁ and the LXX versions, 
points to ideological and theological interests rather than transmissional error.

\textsuperscript{10}See page 15.

\textsuperscript{11}McCarter. \textit{II Samuel}, 438.

\textsuperscript{12}Anderson, \textit{2 Samuel}, 246-247.
The piel form of מָלַל means "to liken, compare" or "to think, intend." The translation takes up the latter meaning, although מָלַל followed by ל plus the substantive does not occur elsewhere. Judges 20:5 is not a parallel, as argued by Driver and Budde, since ל introduces an infinitive, not a pronoun or a noun. The atnach on לְ and the apodosis of the sentence seem to expect an infinitive like לְשֹׁמֵר. Wellhausen proposed stages in the texts decay -- לְשֹׁמֵר became לְשֹׁמֵר, which later became לְשֹׁמֵר -- but he does not explain how scribal lapses can account for the changes. As is, לְשֹׁמֵר is awkward but readable. It should be translated something like, "the one who devised against us."

The vocalization of the consonants לְשֹׁמֵר, as a nif'al perfect 1st common plural לְשֹׁמֵר, required a translation "we were wiped out." According to מ, 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 מ were instead vocalized as the hif'il imperfect 1st common plural with a 3d plural suffix לְשֹׁמֵר, 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 לְ, "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 ὀφείλομενου. Thus, מ provides an awkward and different way of reading the story than the LXX. We will pick this up below in the interpretation.

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

---


14 Wellhausen, Die Text der Bücher Samuelis, 209.
6) Let seven men\textsuperscript{a} from his sons be given to us and we will hang them\textsuperscript{b} to the Lord\textsuperscript{c} in Gibeah\textsuperscript{d} of Saul, chosen\textsuperscript{e} of the Lord. And the king said, “I will give.”

\textsuperscript{a} בֵּיתוֹ, “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” (לְיָדָיו) who believed the deceptive tale of the Gibeonites who seemed to have a quasi-legal status.

\textsuperscript{b} The meaning of לְיָדָיו is uncertain. The hif’il of לְיָדָיו occurs only in Num. 25:4 where it refers to a type of execution which involves exposure in the sun (יהת מַפְסֹד).\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{c} Although the NRSV translates לְיָדָיו “before the Lord” echoing v. 9 where the hangings are reported לְיָדָיו, a locative sense of יָדָיו would be unusual and not well attested. לְיָדָיו and יָדָיו probably imply a verb of offering or bringing “to/for the Lord.”\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{17}

\textsuperscript{e} בֵּיתוֹ “chosen” is a singular bound form modifying “Saul.” Although it is syntactically possible that בֵּיתוֹ refers to the singular place name, “Gibeah,” בֵּיתוֹ in the Hebrew Scripture always refers to people and never a place.\textsuperscript{18} Thus, in it, Saul is “chosen of the Lord” and not the Seven as in the LXX.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{16}BDB 510d

\textsuperscript{17}1Sam. 11:4; 15:34; Is. 10:29

\textsuperscript{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 spareda 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 המִלְחָם means “to have compassion on” and “to spare.” A passage like Dt. 13:6-10 adds support to a specific association of המִלְחָם 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-folda together. Theyb were killed in the first days of the harvest, at the beginning of the barley harvest.

   a The ketiv שְׁבֵנְתָּהוֹד, “seven-fold” is different from the LXX texts which reflect מ’s qere, שְׁבֵנְתָּהוֹן, “seven of them.” שְׁבֵנְתָּהוֹד makes more sense in the context but resonates with Lev. 26 which describes God’s judgment upon covenant breakers, as I will take up below.

   b רְפֵאָה of the מ’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 ita for herself tob the rock from the beginningc of the harvest until water poured forth upon them from the

19BDB 988
heavens. She did not let the birds of the heavens settle upon them by day and the beasts of the field by night.

a הָאָרֶץ normally means "to stretch out, extend," often in reference to pitching a tent, but never to the spreading out of a cloth. The hiphil of בָּשָׁמַיִם is the normal verb used for "spreading out" sackcloth and בָּשָׁמַיִם for spreading out garments.

b Although יָשָׁמַיִם is sometimes used where יָשָׁמַיִם is expected in Samuel, a notation in the margin of מ alerts the reader to two other occurrences of יָשָׁמַיִם. Is. 30:29 and 51:1, the significance of which I will explore in מ’s interpretation.

c יָשָׁמַיִם does not occur elsewhere with the preposition מ. מ here emphasizes the beginning of the time in which Rizpah began to shoo away the birds and the beasts.

d The time when the famine ended is ambiguous. The phrase יָשָׁמַיִם וַתָּרֹא "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 and divine punishment.

---

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

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

22 Dt. 22:17; Jdg. 8:25; 2Sam. 17:19; Is. 19:8


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 יֶזֶל, “Zela” occurs elsewhere only in Josh. 18:28.

\(^b\) בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל, “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.
Interpretation of II

The story opens just as does M by reporting the prolonged famine and David's "seeking the Lord's face." The δ 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. 2 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 חֲלֹה, “bless,” is unusual in a narrative sequence. The converted perfect הֵלֵל (Ex. 12:32) or the imperfect הֵלֵל (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 חֲלֹה always has the “Lord”, “God” or “His name” as its object, 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” (אֲשֶׁר יִנֹּא יְהֹוָה). Similarly, worship is evoked in Neh. 9:5, “Stand up and bless the Lord” (אֲשֶׁר יִנֹּא יְהֹוָה). 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 shows evidence of having been revised from an alternative Hebrew version. See the critical and explanatory notes for details. It 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. Therefore, the Gibeonite accusation in does not tell. Thus, the Gibeonite accusation in focuses primarily on Saul's plans and intent rather than his actions.

's בְּּ' , "we were wiped out," is syntactically awkward and differs from all Greek forms of the text which have, "let us wipe him out." '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 '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, 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 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" כַּלְכָּלָה "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 '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 כָּלְכָּלָה, "Gibeah" here, although some MSS have forms of כָּלְכָּלָה, "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 כָּלְכָּלָה might have been an abbreviation כָּלְכָּלָה 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 יָבוּן. 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 its 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 יָבוּן, “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. \(^{11}\) 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,\textsuperscript{35} the fact remains that \textsuperscript{33} and \textsuperscript{35} 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.\textsuperscript{36}

The Gibeonites execute the Seven “before the Lord” (לְלֵדֵי הַנִּבְיָה), 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.

\textsuperscript{33} alone states “they fell seven-fold together” (םֵכַבְשַׁנָּם נַפְרַת). What does it mean that the sons fell “seven-fold”? Although the \textit{qere’} reads מֵכַבְשַׁנָּם, “the seven of them”, the written text with “seven-fold” resonates with Lev. 26 where the Lord warns the Israelis that he will punish them “seven-fold” if they break his covenant and are disobedient.\textsuperscript{37}

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

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{36}Walters, “Childless Michal”, 294.

\textsuperscript{37}Lev. 26:18, 21, 24, 28. Although the exact word מֵכַבְשַׁנָּם is not used in Lev. 26, the meaning is similar. 26:18 reads, “And I will continue to punish you sevenfold for your sins” (וַיְהִי לָכֶם נַפְרַת אֶל הַנִּבְיָה). 26:21 reads, “I will continue to plague you sevenfold for your sins” (וַיִּקְשֹׁם הַנִּבְיָה אֶל הַנִּבְיָה לְכֶם). 26:24 reads, “I myself will strike you sevenfold for your sins” (וַיִּקְשֹׁם הַנִּבְיָה אֶל הַנִּבְיָה לְכֶם). 26:28 reads, “I in turn will punish you myself sevenfold for your sins” (וַיִּקְשֹׁם הַנִּבְיָה אֶל הַנִּבְיָה לְכֶם).
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 מ. 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. מ’s verb דמש, agrees with ב and מ’s margin which have ἔπησεν
here, and describes Rizpah "stretching" the sackcloth, that is, "pitching a tent." מ’s
reading is different from מ’s text which describes Rizpah "spreading a bed" (διέστρωσεν)
with the sackcloth. Considered literally, מ’s "sackcloth tent" reading provides shelter for
Rizpah from the summer sun and anticipates perhaps a long waiting period.

The מ narrative describes Rizpah pitching a tent "to the rock" (ךֵּלָה),
undoubtedly a reference to God. Elsewhere in Samuel, all references to "rock" (ךֵּלָה) 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 (ךֵּלָה), my
fortress, and my deliverer, my God, my rock (ךֵּלָה). . .” 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.

38In 1Sam. 24:2, the plural form ofךֵּלָה is part of a place name.
Furthermore, the use of the preposition יָּעַל before לָבָּן is not expected; יָּעַל "upon" would be more usual (see the critical note on יָּעַל לָבָּן). מ has glossed the words יָּעַל לָבָּן 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 יָּעַל לָבָּן 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. Rizpah prevents this curse from being carried out on Saul’s descendants. In this way, the story gently prompts its readers to entertain positive 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; the and some LXX MSS (BA) describe the men of Jabesh stealing the bones "from the public square" (םלוע) 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" (’appo) 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 the story does not report their actual burial. Perhaps '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.
The Text of B

Καὶ ἐγένετο λίμος ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Δαυείδ τρία ἔτη, ἐνιαυτὸς ἔχομενος ἐνιαυτοῦ, καὶ εξῆτησεν Δαυείδ τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ Κυρίου· καὶ ἔπειν Κύριος Ἐπὶ Σαοῦλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἅδικὰ διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θανάτῳ[σαι θανάτῳ]b αἷμάτων, περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν τοὺς Γαβαθωνεῖτας. 2) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν οἱ Βασιλεῖς Δαυείδ τοὺς Γαβαθωνεῖτας καὶ ἔπειν πρὸς αὐτοὺς· καὶ οἱ Γαβαθωνεῖται οὐκ ὑπὸ Ἰσραὴλ εἴσιν, ὅτι ἀλλ' ἦ ἐκ τοῦ αἷματος τοῦ Ἁμορραίου, καὶ οὐκ ὑπὸ Ἰσραὴλ ἀμοσαν αὐτοῖς· καὶ εξῆτησεν Σαοῦλ πατάξας αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ἄραμα αὐτῶν τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰουδα. 3) καὶ ἔπειν Δαυείδ πρὸς τοὺς Γαβαθωνεῖτας Τί ποιήσω υμῖν καὶ ἐν τίνι ἐξιλάσωμαι, καὶ εὐλογήσετε τὴν κληρονομίαν Κυρίου; 4) καὶ ἔπαν αὐτῷ οἱ Γαβαθωνεῖται Οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἄγρυποι καὶ χρυσίν μετὰ Σαοῦλ καὶ μετὰ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ θανατώσαι ἐν Ἰσραήλ. καὶ ἔπειν Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε καὶ ποιήσω υμῖν; 5) καὶ ἔπαν πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα ο ἀνὴρ συνετέλεσεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς, ὡς παρελογίσατο ἐξολεθρεύσαι ἡμᾶς· ἀφανίσθησεν αὐτὸν τῷ μὴ ἑστάναι αὐτὸν ἐν παντὶ ὅριῳ Ἰσραήλ. 6) Δότω ἡμῖν ἐπτὰ ἄνδρας ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξηλιάσωμεν αὐτοὺς τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν Γαβαθων Σαοῦλ ἐκλεκτοὺς

---

a See Appendix C for a facsimile of Codex Vaticanus.

b We may postulate a haplography of the underlined letters: διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θανάτῳ[σαι θανάτῳ] αἷμάτων περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν.
Κυρίου. καὶ ἐπεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς Ἑγὼ δῶσω. 7) Καὶ ἐφείσατο οἱ Βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ Μεμφιδόσθε υἱὸν Ἰωναθάν υἱοῦ Σαοῦλ διὰ τὸν ὅρκον Κυρίου τὸν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Δαυείδ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθάν υἱοῦ Σαοῦλ. 8) καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ἀσσαφά θυγατρὸς Αἰα ὦς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σαοῦλ, τὸν Ἐρμωνοεὶ καὶ τὸν Μεμφιδόσθε, καὶ τοὺς πέντε υἱοὺς Μιχᾶλ θυγατρῶς Σαοῦλ ὦς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σερεὶ υἱῷ Βερζελλεὶ τῷ Μουσαλαθεί, 9) καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοὺς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβαωνειτῶν, καὶ ἔξελίσασαν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὅρει ἑναντι Κυρίου, καὶ ἔπεσαν οἱ ἐπὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ· καὶ αὐτοὶ δὲ ἔθανατοθησαν ἐν ἡμέραις θερισμοῦ ἐν πρώτοις, ἐν ἄρχῃ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν. 10) καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἀσσαφά θυγάτηρ Αἰα τὸν σάκκον καὶ ἔπηξεν αὐτῇ πρὸς τὴν πέτραν ἐν ἄρχῃ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν ἐς ἐστατεῖν ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς ὑδρῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταπαύσας ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς ἡμέρας καὶ τὰ θερία τοῦ ἄγρου νυκτός. 11) καὶ ἀπηγέλη τῷ Δαυείδ ὁ σα ἐποίησεν Ἀσσαφά θυγάτηρ Αἰα παλλακῆ Σαοῦλ· καὶ ἐξελύθησαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Δᾶν υἱὸς Ἰωάν ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γιγάντων. 12) καὶ ἔπορεύθη Δαυείδ καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰ ὅστα Σαοῦλ καὶ τὰ ὅστα Ἰωναθάν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ παρὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν υἱῶν Ἰαβείς Γαλαάδ, οἱ ἐκλεισαν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τῆς πλατείας Βαΐθ[σαν], εἴ ἐστησαν αὐτοὺς εκεῖ οἱ ἁλλόφυλοι ἐν ἡμέρα ἡ ἐπάταξαν οἱ ἁλλόφυλοι τὸν Σαοῦλ ἐν Γελβοῦε. 13) καὶ ἀνήνεγκεν ἐκεῖθεν τὰ ὅστα Σαοῦλ καὶ τὰ ὅστα Ἰωναθάν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνήγαγεν τὰ ὅστα τῶν ἐξηλιασμένων. 14) καὶ ἔθαψαν τὰ ὅστα Σαοῦλ καὶ τὰ ὅστα Ἰωναθάν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἡλιασθέντων τῶν ἐν γῇ

---

<sup>c</sup> Only B reads Βαΐθ while the rest of the LXX MSS have forms of Βαΐθσαν following ΙΙΙ's ἔτεκεν. 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 Βαΐθσαν which is reflected in M rell.

<sup>d</sup> τῶν after ἡλιασθέντων which occurs only in B is probably the result of dittography.
Βενιαμείν ἐν τῇ πλευρῇ ἐν τῷ τάφῳ Κῆς 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.\textsuperscript{a} The Lord said, "Guilt [rests] upon Saul and upon his house because he [killed with bloody violence],\textsuperscript{b} because he killed the Gibeonites."

\textsuperscript{a} B prefers the definite article before Κυρίου as it does elsewhere when it is opposite the anarthrous tetragrammaton Γ', in construct relationship.\textsuperscript{1}

\textsuperscript{b} B's text is garbled. If it is correct to assume the above mentioned haplography, then B's text reads διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θεανάτωσαι θεανάτῳ αἵματον περὶ οὗ έθεανάτωσεν. As such it was triply conflate. διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν θεανάτωσαι and περὶ οὗ έθεανάτωσεν are two different ways of expressing "because he killed." αἵματον surely derives from Βιβλίον. Although McCarter is probably correct to see behind θεανάτῳ αἵματον a misreading of Βιβλίον Ἰάβλη,\textsuperscript{2} B's text can still be translated. There are other parallels for αἵματον as a plural genitive. ἀνήρ αἵματων means something like "murderer" or "bloodthirsty"\textsuperscript{3} and πόλις αἵματον means something like "city of bloodshed" or "bloody city."\textsuperscript{4} It is reasonable, therefore, to translate θεανάτῳ αἵματον as "bloody death" or "bloody violence."

\textsuperscript{1} Sam. 6:11, 12, 15, 17; 13:12; 21:1; 22:17, 21

\textsuperscript{2} McCarter, \textit{II Samuel}, 437.

\textsuperscript{3} 2Sam. 16:7, 8; Ps. 5:7; 54:24; 58:3; 138:19; Prov. 29:10

\textsuperscript{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 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 ἀλλὰ ἦ is the normal way to translate the strong adversative,⁵ B's ὅτι ἀλλὰ ἦ is also opposite ἐὰν.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,⁵ so that you will bless 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 ἐξιλάσωμαι. Both forms are acceptable opposite ἀτ's ἐξιλάσωμαι.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.

---

⁵Gen. 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.

⁶1Sam. 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


⁸The future ἐξιλάσωμαι is opposite ἐπιθύμησιν in Gen. 32:20 and the subjunctive ἐξιλάσωμαι is opposite ἐπιθύμησιν in Ex. 32:30.
b If B's future indicative active 2d plural εὐλογήσετε implies a different Hebrew than ἡ's imperative ἔτρεξεν it was probably ἔτρεξε.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 usa and persecuted us--the one who deceivedb 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 ἐφέλε, it can also mean "to kill, destroy."10 Both meanings seem too strong here, and in the interpretation of both M and Ἡ I adopt the somewhat attenuated meaning "strike." The Hebrew ἐφέλε can also mean, "to decide, determine," as an intransitive11 and transitive.12 Now, only in B, the verb is construed with εὐτά, 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.

---

9McCarter, II Samuel. 438.

101Sam. 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

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

12Prov. 16:29-30

b παρελογίζωμαι usually stands opposite μάθησις 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 δώτω 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 ἔξηλισσωμεν αὐτούς 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 Μελχολ, imitating LXX's μελχολ, 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 reg. do. This shows that B follows closely the LXX or to the tradition that has informed LXX's distinctive telling of the story. 15

14 παρελογίζομαι occurs 10 times in the LXX, 6 times opposite μάθησις (Gen. 29:25; Josh. 9:22; 1Sam. 19:17; 28:12; 2Sam. 19:27; Lam. 1:19), once opposite μαθησις (Gen. 29:25), and three times opposite μαθησις 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.

\(^a\) αὐτοῖς is translated as the intensive pronoun and stands opposite the 3d plural suffix on מ's qere' מְנַשְׁבִּישׁ.

\(^b\) ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό is a standard locution for ἀποθεμένων.\(^16\)

\(^c\) The identical pronoun αὐτοῖς here reflects מ's qere' מְנַשְׁבִּישׁ 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.\(^a\)

\(^a\) At this point, B alone has a plus of thirteen words: καὶ ἔξελθον, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοὺς Δάν υἱὸς 'Ιωά ἐκ τῶν ἀπογόνων τῶν γίγαντων. 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 ἄνδρα, "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 ὀστά τῶν ἠλιασθέντων, “and the bones of those having been exposed to the sun,” and B has καὶ τῶν ἠλιασθέντων without τὰ ὀστά. B’s meaning is essentially the same as M’s although M is more explicit about the bones. As already mentioned, \(\text{MT}\) does not mention the burial of the Seven at all.

\(^b\) B’s ἐν τῇ πλευρῇ ἐν τῷ τάφῳ, “in the side, in the tomb” is a literal but awkward rendering of \(\text{MT}\)’s consonants בללי ביתבר. 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 M, I will comment here primarily on the places where it is different from one or both. The story opens identically to the stories in M 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 M. 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 εξιλασωμαι indicates that David was uncertain of his ability to atone. εξιλασωμαι 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 ευλογησετε, "[so that] you will bless" the inheritance of the Lord. ευλογησετε 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

18See 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” (ὀς 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?”; τι παρελογίσατε με / ἄνκα μας ὑπάτη (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?”; τι οὕτως παρελογίσασαι με / ἡμᾶς ὑπάτη (1Sam. 19:17). Like father, like daughter. Third, Saul himself deceived the necromancer at Endor; She cried out, “Why have you deceived me?”; τι παρελογίσασαι με / ἡμᾶς ὑπάτη (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 οἰωνίζω usually stands opposite ᾿ρώτημα. 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.”


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, \( \mathfrak{m} \), AND B VERSIONS OF 2 SAMUEL 21:1-14

Introduction

Having translated and interpreted M, \( \mathfrak{m} \), 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, \( \mathfrak{m} \), and B

MSS M, \( \mathfrak{m} \), and B agree throughout most of the story: M’s and B’s words agree with \( \mathfrak{m} \)’s words 93% and 94% respectively; M and B agree together with \( \mathfrak{m} \)’s words 88% of the time. Where M and B agree with \( \mathfrak{m} \)’s words, they always follow \( \mathfrak{m} \)’s word order except for a simple transposition in verse 10 in B.
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II. The Story Common to M, m, and B

The story common to M, m, 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, m, 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 θανάτω αἱμάτων reflects ימי רעימו, a possible misreading for m’s ימי נקחיים.

1g.-1h. Haplography has caused the underlined letters to drop out in B; δικτο αὐτον θανάτωσει θανάτως αἱμάτων περὶ οὗ ἐθανάτωσεν. If θανάτως αἵματων implies ימי רעימו, “death of bloods,” B is triply conflate.

1See Appendix D.
2d. Most LXX MSS misread AIMATOS for ΑΙΜΑΤΟΣ.

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 ετε’ αὐτοῦς ὃδε θεοῦ may reflect a conflation of two Hebrew texts: one with מִלַּחְיוֹן and the other with מְלַחְיוֹן.

10e. ἔτος has dropped out in M in the uncial period due to homoioarchton; ΕΩΣΕΣΤΑΞΑΝ became ΕΣΤΑΞΑΝ.

11c. B and the hexaplaric MSS have the large displacement καὶ εξελύθησαν, καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτοῦς Δαβιδ ὀνείδος Ἰωάς ἐκ τῶν ἰδιογονῶν τῶν γεγονόντων probably reflecting the Hebrew ינבר יישב обрат אל מלו מיריה רבחים.

12e. B alone reads Βασίθα while the rest of the LXX MSS have forms of Βασιθασαν following מ’s בֵּית. 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 ἡλπισθέντων in B.

B. Stylistic Differences and Improvements

1c. B’s definite article before Κυρίου is a stylistic preference of B when it is opposite Πνεύμα in construct relationship.

2a. LXX MSS except L have the plus Δαυείδ after ό Βασιλεὺς which ττ does not have, clarifying the subject of the sentence as David and not Saul.

2d. M’s ὄλλα’ ἦ and B’s ὅτι ὄλλα’ ἦ are both ways to translate ττ’s ὃι γιὸν.

3c. B has the formal and elegant aorist subjunctive ἔξιλασωμαι opposite ττ’s ἔλασσαν, whereas the rest of the LXX MSS have the future indicative ἔξιλασσαν.
3d. B's future indicative active 2d plural **εὐλογησετε** was probably an attempt to smooth out the awkwardness of the imperative forms **εὐλογησε** and **τελευταίοι** which occur in MN rell and ττ.

4e. M B and most LXX MSS have καί before **ποιήσω** and ττ 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 ὡς after ὁ ἀνήρ in B, where it occurs in MN rell and ττ, is probably stylistic.

5b. B's **συνετέλεσεν ἕφ᾽ ἡμᾶς** and M's **συνετέλεσεν ἡμᾶς** both seem to reflect ττ's **τίπτε.** B's ἕφ' 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 ττ's **τῇ.**

9d. M's **αὐτοῖ ὃ καὶ αὐτοῖ** are common Greek expressions opposite **περιήλθε** or **περιῆλθε.** B's καὶ αὐτοῖ ὃ could be a stylistic improvement or conflation.

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

14b. ττ's minus of **ραβμόν τὰς Μαγδαληναί** before Jonathan is probably an attempt to avoid monotonous repetition.

14c. B does not have τὰ ὀστα.}

14d. As already mentioned, all LXX MSS misread the place name **εἰς ** in Zela’ as εν τῇ **πλευρᾷ (εἰς **).” This makes for an awkward rendering of ττ’s **εἰς **. B takes both as datives, εν τῇ **πλευρᾷ εν 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 ὁφανίσωμεν αὐτῶν reflecting מִשְׁפָּטָה, “let us wipe him out” rather than מ’s מִשְׁפָּתָה, “we were destroyed.”

6d. מ’s מִשְׁפָּטָה, “in Gibeah” reflects the same Hebrew consonants as מNJ refl which have ἐν τῷ βουνῷ (Μειζοναῖον), “on the mountain.”

9c. מ’s oi ἐπτά and ב’s oi ἐπτά αὐτοῖ reflect מ’s qere’ מַעְחַלְחַל, “the seven of them,”

but מ’s ketiv has מַעְחַלְחַל, “seven-fold.”

12g. LXX MSS have ἐν Γέλβοῦ, without the definite article reflecting מַעְחַלְחַל, whereas מ has מַעְחַלְחַל.

14d. LXX MSS have ἐν τῇ πλευρᾷ reflecting מַעְחַלְחַל, while מ has the place name מַעְחַלְחַל, “in Zela.”

D. Different Hebrew Consonants

1f. LXX MSS have ἁδικία, “wrongdoing” reflecting a Hebrew with מִשְׁפָּט, “iniquity, guilt”,

which מ does not have.

5c. All LXX MSS have forms of καὶ εἰδὼν ημᾶς reflecting a Hebrew מַעְחַלְחַל which מ does not have.

5d. מ has ἐλογίσατο, “planned,” reflecting מַעְחַלְחַל. ב has παρέλογισατο, “deceived,”

reflecting מַעְחַלְחַל and מ has מַעְחַלְחַל, “devised.”

5e. LXX MSS have ἔξολεθρεύσατο ημᾶς, “to utterly destroy us”, reflecting the Hebrew מַעְחַלְחַל or מַעְחַלְחַל and not מ’s verbless מַעְחַלְחַל.

5g. All LXX MSS, except Λ, have the personal pronoun αὐτῶν after the articular infinitive,

whereas, the מ does not have a pronoun.
6d. B and some LXX MSS have ἐν Γαβριαλ, reflecting יִכְּנְהָנָא, “in Gibeon,” instead of מ’ס יִכְּנְהָנָא, “in Gibeath.” M’s ἐν τῷ βούνῳ reflects מ’s consonants יכנה but different vowel pointing.

6e. All Greek MSS except the hexaplaric have ἐκλεκτοῦς Κυρίου, “(men) chosen of the Lord,” reflecting יֶלֶל בֶּן בֵּית קָדָשׁ whereas מ has יְלֵל בֶּן בֵּית קָדָשׁ, “(Saul) chosen of the Lord.”

10d. M N B A x rell have ἐν θαρσή, “in the beginning” and L TJ reflect מ’ס יִכְּנְהָנָא, “from the beginning.”

14b. All LXX MSS except L have καὶ τὰ ὀστά ἱωνοθέν reflecting יְלֵל בֶּן בֵּית קָדָשׁ, “and the bones of Jonathan.” L and TJ reflect מ’ס יְלֵל בֶּן בֵּית קָדָשׁ, “and Jonathan.”

14c. All LXX MSS describe the burial of the bones of the Seven but מ never does. M and most LXX MSS have καὶ τὰ ὀστά 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, מ, and ב

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.” מ by comparison, is less negative. מ never describes
Saul in terms of "guilt." Instead, M 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..." M'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 M 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 M 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, 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.

---

2Walters, "Gibeon of Saul," 61-76.
Saul is Chosen of the Lord in \textit{M}

In \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{M}, the Gibeonites command David and the Israelites (2d plural) to give seven sons of Saul, calling for his direct action. \textit{M} and \textit{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 \textit{M}’s story David is obedient and cooperative, whereas, in \textit{M} and \textit{B}, David takes initiative in the killings.

As part of their request, the Gibeonites ask to kill seven of Saul’s sons. In \textit{M} and \textit{B}, the Gibeonites describe the Seven as “chosen of the Lord”, whereas, \textit{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, \textit{M} describes Saul as “chosen of the Lord,” and thus infers that David chose the Seven. \textit{M} and \textit{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 \textit{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 Meholahite (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.

The LXX 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 Ἱ differ in the Lord’s description of Saul. In the LXX MSS, the Lord pronounces guilt upon Saul and upon his house, whereas in Ἱ, 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 Ἱ 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” (Tn), and “in Gibeon of Saul.” The phrase “chosen of the Lord” that follows refers to the Seven in the LXX, whereas, in the Tn 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 Tn the Lord chooses Saul. Thus, the Lord is involved in the killings in the LXX but in the Tn 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 Tn describe Rizpah stretching sackcloth for herself “to the rock.” As already mentioned, פליאש אל הר, "to the rock," is undoubtedly a reference to God. Tn 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, Tn 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 M 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 M 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. M describes them as ἐκ τῶν ἀμαμάθων τοῦ Ἀμώραν, “from the remains of the Amorites,” and M and B describe them ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Ἀμώραν, “from Amorite blood.”

What Do the Gibeonites Say About Saul?

Following the Gibeonite charge, the LXX and M differ in who was wiped out. In the LXX, the Gibeonites request to “wipe out Saul,” whereas, in the M 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 M. In the LXX, the Gibeonites desire to wipe out Saul from having standing in Israel and in the M 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 M 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, δῶτε, "Give." R has לְדֹּתֶה, a mixture of two forms of לֹדְת: the nifal imperfect 3d masculine singular לֹדְת and the qal passive 3d masculine singular לּוּדֵי. Both of these forms are translated virtually the same, "Let there be given." B has the 3d person singular imperative δῶτο, "Let someone give." In M, the social outsiders are powerful; they command a king to give and he gives. In R 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 R 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 R 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." R 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 †, Rizpah stretches something like a sackcloth tent for herself to the rock. As already mentioned, †’s words יִנְדְּעָהְו, "to the rock," are undoubtedly a reference to God. Thus, in † 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 † she stays until water dropped on them out of heaven. In M, Rizpah gets a response from God: God sends water from heaven. In † 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 †, 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 †’s qere’ agree “the Seven fell there together.” †’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 ἱ in 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 ἱ in 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 ἱ in 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 ἱ in 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. It portrays both Michal and David negatively since David chose Michal’s sons for the killings.

V. Theological and Political Interests of M, II, 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 \( m \)

God is Distant From the Executions

The theological emphasis of \( m \) 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, \( m \) does not describe Saul as guilty. Furthermore, the Gibeonites request that seven sons be given to them, but \( m \) 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, \( m \) 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 \( m \).
Saul is the Lord's Chosen and an Ideal King

By comparison with the LXX, ה is much more positive about Saul. Again, the view of Saul espoused by ה 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. ה'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 ה distinguishes between the bones of the Seven and those of Saul and Jonathan also reflects positively on Saul. ה'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 נו than in the LXX. Although David is described in some positive ways (he prays, wishes to atone), נו 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.

ֶו’s singular construct יִתְנָר, making Saul the antecedent of “chosen” in verse 6, also points to an emphasis in נו on David’s involvement in the killings. Since Saul is the “chosen,” נו 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 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 נו 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 complicit 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. It 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 It's story.

*Outsiders Do Not Atone*

The Gibeonites' stated purpose for the Seven in It 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 It.
Outsiders Are Not Aggressive Towards Kings Even When They Are Functioning as Instruments of Divine Judgment

In contrast to the LXX, the Gibeonites in II 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 II, 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 an 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

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 \( M \), 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 \( M \) 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, \( M \), 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 \( M \)’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.

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; it 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 the Lord's ideological context and that David's was depreciated.

**Violence Against Saul's Sons By the Gibeonites is Not Allowed**

The 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 tells a different story in this regard. '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 ; Saul struck them and devised against them but he did not wipe them out. Furthermore, 's awkward in verse 5 does not allow the Gibeonites to request to wipe out Saul. Also, 's singular bound form modifies Saul and not the Seven indicating the Lord's choosing Saul and not the Seven. Thus, in , 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 did not allow violence by non-Jews against Jews even for retribution.
Depreciation of the Role of Outsiders

After the Seven were killed, R describes Rizpah taking sackcloth and stretching it to the rock—to God. R 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, R reflects an ideological context in which social outsiders may influence Israelis to action but they cannot move God’s heart.

The Importance of Congruity with the Torah

Compared to the LXX, R’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.” R’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 R reads, Saul’s sons do not die for Saul’s crime; they die for their own. Whether it can be proved that R’s Vorlage changed the text to comply with the law in Deuteronomy or not is inconsequential for our purposes. R’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 R’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 \( \mathfrak{m} \) 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 1:1-1 Kings 8:40.\(^9\) It was acquired in the East in the middle of the 17th century and still resides at Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris.

\( \mathfrak{m} \) is represented in the Leningrad Codex B 19A which was written in A.D. 1008, and is the oldest manuscript of the complete Hebrew Bible. Although \( \mathfrak{m} \)’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.


\(^7\) 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. L.t. i (1899), 72-79.

\(^8\) B. Montfaucon, Bibliotheca Coisliniana, from Swete, Intro., 140.

its consonantal framework reflects an ancient tradition that was in existence more than a thousand years earlier.\textsuperscript{10}

B. The Chronological Sequence of M, II, 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.

\textit{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 \textit{II}, 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.\textsuperscript{11} If Walters is correct, that the Chronicler links Saul to the ancient Canaanite city of Gibeon rather than to

\textsuperscript{10}Emanuel Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible} (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 23.

\textsuperscript{11}1Chr. 8:29-33 and 9:35-39
one of Jacob’s twelve sons, 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. 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.

III Appears to be a Developed Text

There are four minuses in the Hebrew which point to intentional development in III’s version. In 2Sam. 21:1 of III, God does not say that “guilt” rests upon Saul like all Greek versions. Furthermore, the Gibeonites do not say that Saul “pursued/persecuted”

---

12Walters, “Saul and Gibeon,” 61-76.

13Josh. 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. As such, B and M present the Gibeonites as less demanding of David.

In 2Sam. 21:10, B and M 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, M 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, M 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 M, where the differences cannot be explained as transmissional errors and where the differences are not hexaplaric. 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 Ax 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 A 36 times in 2Sam. 21:1-14. Of these, A agrees with B 23 times and the two times M agrees with A against B they are not hexaplaric. In 2.21:3, AxMN rell θεία have εξιλασομαι where only Bg have εξιλασομαι. In 2.21:6, AMN rell δότε where Btx have δότω. In the latter, the hexaplaric MSS are split. In the former, the other MSS associated with the non-hexaplaric in Samuel, yasEth, have εξιλασομαι. 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 Chronicler’s 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. 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. 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.

---


16 Myers, *1 Chronicles, LXXXVIII-LXXXIX.*
It is not surprising that \textsuperscript{21}Sam. 21:1-14 is reflected in rabbinic literature.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textsuperscript{21} 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-\textsuperscript{21} 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. \textsuperscript{21}'s similarities with rabbinic literature are summarized below.

\textit{Saul is Appreciated}

Like the \textsuperscript{21}, the rabbinic literature presents Saul in a less negative manner than the LXX. \textsuperscript{21}'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

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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).

\textsuperscript{18}Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 195.
Saul” means because Saul was not mourned for in a proper manner. 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. 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].’” 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.”

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].”
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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.\textsuperscript{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.’”\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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, \textit{And there was a famine in the days of David}.\textsuperscript{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.’”\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{24}Yebamoth 79a

\textsuperscript{25}Ginzburg, \textit{Legends}, vol. IV, 110.

\textsuperscript{26}ibid.

\textsuperscript{27}Erubin 63a

\textsuperscript{28}Ginzburg, \textit{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. 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.

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."

Miscellaneous Incongruities between Ḥ 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 M’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

32Sanhedrin 19b
33Yebamoth 79a
34Ibid.
35Ibid.
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, N, and B represent three specific versions of the story in 2 Samuel 21:1-14. Although there are many similarities among M, N, 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, N, 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. N’s context embraced a story that emphasized Saul’s connection with the prophetic movement and the importance of his burial in the land. N’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, N, 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, N, 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:
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 commentators² 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 בּוֹדֵר "chosen" deteriorated into מֵר "mountain" and that בַּכְנַת "in Gibeon" came to be understood as בַּכְנַתְיָהו "in Gibeah of Saul." ⁴ While it is orthographically possible to confuse מ for ב, no Hebrew or Greek manuscript attests בַּכְנַתְיָהו. 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 recensions⁵ 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 מ's "Gibeh," 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

¹McCarter, I Samuel, 8.

²Wellhausen, Der Text der Bücher Samuelis, 209; Driver, Notes, 351-352; McCarter, II Samuel, 438; Anderson, 2 Samuel, 247.

³Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 230.

⁴Wellhausen, Bücher Samuelis, 209.

⁵MSS 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. H 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 have adopted "Merab" as a better reading. In support of this emendation, M N relt 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. 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." 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:
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6 e.g., RSV, NEB, JB, TEV, NIV.

7 Thenius, Die Bücher Samuels, 230.

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


10Ibid., 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. Mr'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 Mr 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 Mr, his analysis is similar to the conclusions of this study. Because his approach presupposes coherency, however, he cannot resist replacing

\(^{11}\) Ibid., 11.

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 Ṣ’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 Ṣ, namely, the importance of Saul’s burial in the land and the positive affects this has on the image of Saul; Ṣ 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 MT 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 MT? 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 MT 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.

15A. 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 D

COMPARISON CHART OF MANUSCRIPTS M, \( \text{\textit{M}} \) AND B
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>157.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοι δι αναφορα</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δι άνθρωπον ι εκ τοι αναφορα</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>άνθρωπον ι εκ τοι αναφορα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>άνθρωπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καν ουλ ου λεγων</td>
<td>άνθρωπον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>καὶ ἐξήτησεν Σαουλ πατάξαι αὐτοῦς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ καὶ Ἰουδα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν Δαυεὶδ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πρὸς τοὺς Γαβραωνεῖτας</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Τί ποιήσω ὑμῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἐν τινὶ εξιλάσωμαι,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ εὐλογήσατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τὴν κληρονομίαν Κυρίου;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπον αὐτῷ οἱ Γαβραωνεῖται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡμῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἀργόριον καὶ χρυσόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>μετὰ Σαουλ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ μετὰ τοῦ οἶκου αὐτοῦ,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡμῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἀνήρ θανατώσει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκ παντὸς Ἰσραὴλ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ εἶπεν Τί ὑμεῖς λέγετε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ποιήσω ὑμῖν;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὁ ἀνήρ ὃς συνετέλεσεν ἡμᾶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἐδίωξεν ἡμᾶς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἐλογίσατο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἔξολοθρεύσαι ἡμᾶς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αφανίσωμεν αὐτὸν</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τοῦ μὴ ἔσταναι αὐτὸν</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν παντὶ ὅριῳ Ἰσραήλ.</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Δότε ἡμῖν ἐπτὰ ἀνδρὰς</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ,</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐξηλάσομεν αὐτοὺς</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ κυρίῳ</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν τῷ βούνῳ Σαοῦλ</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλεκτούς Κυρίου.</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐπεν ὁ Βασιλεὺς Ἑγὼ δόσω.</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Καὶ ἐφείσατο ὁ βασιλεὺς</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ Μεμφιβόσθε</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υἱὸν Ἰωναθᾶν υἱοῦ Σαοῦλ.</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διὰ τὸν ὅρκον Κυρίου</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸν ἀνὰ μέσον αὐτῶν</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Δαυεὶδ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Ἰωναθᾶν υἱοῦ Σαοῦλ.</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ βασιλεὺς τοὺς δύο</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υἱοὺς Ρεσφᾶς θυγατρὸς Αἰα</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παλλακῆς Σαοῦλ</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὗς ἔτεκεν τῷ Σαοῦλ,</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸν Ἔρμωνθ</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ τὸν Μεμφιβόσθε,</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vs</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐν χειρὶ τῶν Γαβραωνείτων,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἐξηλίσασαν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῷ ὅρει ἑναντίον Κυρίου,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ ἐπέσαν ἐκεῖ οἱ ἐπτὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>καὶ ἔλαβεν Ἄρσφα θυγάτηρ Ἀλὰ τὸν σάκκον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ διέστρωσεν αὐτὸν αὐτῇ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐν ἀρχῆ θερισμοῦ κριθῶν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ἕως] ἐστατέαν</td>
<td>ἐως ἐστατέαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐπὶ αὐτοὺς ὁδοτὰ θεοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἐκ οὐρανοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Κατά τόν υπόχορο, κατά τόν υπόχορο.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- The table contains entries in Greek, possibly discussing a specific topic or set of instructions.
- The entries are not clearly legible due to the quality of the image.
- The table structure suggests a comparison or listing of items or conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table contains placeholder text and does not provide a clear understanding of the content.
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