

52. 4QSam^b

(PLATES XXIV-XXV)

Previous discussion: F. I. Andersen and D. N. Freedman, ‘Another Look at 4QSam^b’, *RevQ* 14 (1989) 7–29; D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l’Ancien Testament*, vol. 1: *Josué, Juges, Ruth, Samuel, Rois, Chroniques, Esdras, Néhémie, Esther* (OBO 50/1; Fribourg Suisse and Göttingen: Éditions universitaires and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982); E. M. Cook, ‘1 Samuel XX 26–XXI 5 According to 4QSam^b’, *VT* 44 (1994) 442–54; J. Cook, ‘Orthographical Peculiarities in the Dead Sea Scrolls’, *RevQ* 14 (1989) 293–305; F. M. Cross, ‘The Oldest Manuscripts from Qumran’, *JBL* 74 (1955) 147–72; ‘The Development of the Jewish Scripts’, *The Bible and the Ancient Near East: Essays in Honor of William Foxwell Albright*, ed. by G. E. Wright (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961) 133–202 (= *Epigrapher’s Notebook*, 3–43 [slightly revised]); ‘The Papyri and Their Historical Implications’, *Discoveries in the Wādī ed-Dāliyah*, ed. by P. W. Lapp and N. L. Lapp (AASOR 41; Cambridge, Mass.: ASOR, 1974) 17–29; ‘Palaeography and the Dead Sea Scrolls’, *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*, vol. 1, ed. by P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998) 379–402; ‘An Ostrakon in Literary Hebrew from Óorvat ‘Uza’, *The Archaeology of Jordan and Beyond: Essays in Honor of James A. Sauer*, ed. by L. E. Stager, J. A. Greene, and M. D. Coogan (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2000) 111–13 (= *Epigrapher’s Notebook*, 135–7); ‘Some Problems in Old Hebrew Orthography with Special Attention to the Third Person Masculine Singular Suffix on Plural Nouns [–âw]’, *ErIsr* 27 [Hayim and Miriam Tadmor Volume], ed. by I. Eph’al, A. Ben-Tor, and P. Machinist (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2003) 18*–24* (= *Epigrapher’s Notebook*, 351–6); F. M. Cross and D. N. Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography: A Study of the Epigraphic Evidence* (AOS 36; New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society, 1952); ‘Some Observations on Early Hebrew’, *Bib* 53 (1972) 413–20; F. M. Cross and D. W. Parry, ‘A Preliminary Edition of a Fragment of 4QSam^b (4Q52)’, *BASOR* 306 (1997) 63–74; F. M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds.), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1975); D. N. Freedman, ‘The Massoretic Text and the Qumran Scrolls: A Study in Orthography’, *Textus* 2 (1962) 87–102; P. K. McCarter, Jr., *I Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes & Commentary* (AB 8; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980); E. Tov, ‘The Orthography and Language of the Hebrew Scrolls Found at Qumran and the Origin of These Scrolls’, *Textus* 13 (1986) 31–57; ‘Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism’, *JJS* 39 (1988) 5–37.

TWENTY-THREE identifiable fragments survive from the old manuscript of Samuel from Qumran cave 4, that we signify by the *sigla* 4QSam^b and 4Q52. In 1955, Cross published seven fragments, all that he had acquired at that time (Cross, ‘Oldest Manuscripts’). These are now renumbered as frgs. 4–5, 7–8, 13, 17, and 19; see TABLE 1 below.

TABLE 1: *Contents of 4QSam^b*

Frg(s).	1 Samuel
1	12:3, 5-6
2	14:41-42
3	15:16-18
4	16:1-11
5	19:10-13, 15-17
6–7	20:26–21:3, 5-7
8	21:8-10
9	22:8-9
10–23	23:8-23

Physical Description

The leather of the fragments varies from beige (no doubt the original colour of the leather) to tan, with some darker places caused by decay or staining. In the better-preserved portions, the leather is soft, well-prepared, but unpolished.

Frg. 6, containing 1 Sam 20:26–21:3, 5–6, is the largest of the fragments extant, and was acquired by the Palestine Archaeological Museum among the last purchases of cave 4 remains. It measures approximately 15.9 cm and 10.4 cm at its greatest length and breadth. Portions of nineteen lines of text survive. The original column width was nearly twice the width of the preserved portion. Reconstructed, the lines average between 95 and 100 letters and spaces. However, vertical alignment of letters and words with those on lines above or below is more important than line length in reconstruction. The freedom of the scribe to stop short of the left dry line marking the left margin, or to run over several letters or spaces, makes line length somewhat flexible. The extreme width of the column is a most unusual feature of this manuscript. The columns of 4QSam^a, for example, usually are approximately half as wide. The right margin of the column is preserved revealing the stitching which joined it to the preceding column. The width of the right margin from the stitching to the dry line (marked by the scribe from which to begin penning his lines) averages 1 cm in frg. 6 and 0.7 cm in frg. 4. The bottom margin of the column on frg. 7 measures 1.5 cm from the dry line drawn to mark the final line to the bottom of the scroll. The scribe in this period was guided by a ceiling line, not by a baseline. The horizontal ceiling lines are faintly visible in this text.

Palaeography

The hand of the scribe is formal, small, and exquisite. In 1961, Cross wrote concerning the date of this manuscript: '[It] can be safely attributed to the last half of the third century . . . ' (Cross, 'Development', esp. 166). At that time, a date about 225 BCE was preferred. With the discovery of the dated Wadi Daliyeh papyri of the late fourth century (Cross, 'Papyri', 25–9 and *DJD XXVIII* [2001] 4) and, as well, the great mass of Edomite ostraca from the vicinity of Maresha dated to the late fourth and early third centuries (Cross, 'Palaeography', 383–4), the earlier end of the bracket, c.250 BCE, is preferred.

Two words have been erased (1 Sam 20:28; 23:9), both involving שׂאול. In 21:5, a word was added above the line. These three corrections were made by the original scribe of the manuscript. One correction by a later hand is found in 21:5 (supralinear ׀[א]). No other corrections are found.

Orthography

4QSam^b is written in a surprisingly archaic orthography (see Cross, 'Oldest Manuscripts', esp. 165; Freedman, 'Massoretic'; Cross and Freedman, 'Some Observations'; Andersen and Freedman, 'Another Look'. See also, generally, Tov, 'Orthography'; 'Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts'; Cook, 'Peculiarities'; Cross, 'Ostrakon'; 'Some Problems'). Only once (׀[א] 20:36) is it written in a fuller orthography than ׀, which itself in 1 Samuel tends to be on the 'defective', i.e. archaic, side. (The

orthography of ם is unusual here, leaving \bar{u} unmarked). At least in six instances, 4QSam^b exhibits a less *plene* reading. Most noteworthy is the usual practice of the scribe *not* to mark \bar{o} (< \bar{a}) with a *mater lectionis* (see TABLE 2, בבאם, קמתו, החלן, תכן, אלמנ[י], and אפד). Exceptions occur with the feminine plural of nouns, for example, נערוה (1 Sam 20:30); see also the reconstructed form מאוה (1 Sam 23:13). Participles and *Qal* infinitives absolute are always written ‘defectively’. (At 23:10, we find partially reconstructed שמע ש[מ]ע; ם also has the ‘defective’ orthography). On the other hand, the vowel \bar{o} derived from the contraction of the diphthong *aw* is regularly written with *waw* surviving as a *mater lectionis*.¹ The same is true of the vowel \bar{u} : רוץ (20:36), המוסר (21:7), etc. The variants העירה (4QSam^b) and העיר (ם) in 21:1 must be reckoned as morphological variants, not orthographic. The so-called *he directive* arises actually in the morpheme *-ha* as is now clear from Ugaritic. It is not a case ending.

Perhaps the most interesting example of archaic orthography is the survival of *he* as the *mater lectionis* for \bar{o} derived from u^2 in עלמה, ‘his lad’ (20:38). This is the regular orthography in pre-Exilic Hebrew, surviving very rarely in Biblical Hebrew.

TABLE 2: *Orthographic Variants*

Frg(s). and Line	4QSam ^b	ם	1 Samuel
4 5	בבאם	בבואם	16:6
4 6	קמתו	קומתו	16:7
5 3	החלן	החלון	19:12
6–7 4	המרדת	המרדות	20:30
6–7 5	תכן	תכון	20:31
6–7 8	רוץ	רץ	20:36
6–7 10	עלמה	[הנער]	20:38
6–7 16	אלמנ[י]	אלמוני	21:3
8 3	אפד	האפוד	21:10

Textual Character

The following table and accompanying explanations present statistics that assist us in describing the character of this old manuscript. On the citation of the versions in the text-critical discussions, see the section under that heading in the introduction to

¹ Thus יונתן from older *yaw-natan* reflected on archaic seals (spelled *yw-*) and transcriptions of Hebrew proper names in the Marashu Tablets, and מועד for Canaanite **maw'id* (from a root *w'd*). As Cross and Freedman have observed (*Early Hebrew Orthography*, 53; and Freedman, ‘Massoretic’, 97–8), there are problems with the orthography of יום (20:34) and מקום (20:27). In West Semitic, biforms *yām* and *yawm* are found; but in pre-Exilic Hebrew we have only *ym* for *yām*. In the case of מקום, only the base form *maqām* is extant in West Semitic, though as Freedman has suggested, we could posit a biform **maqawm*.

² On this etymology, see Cross, ‘Some Problems’.

4QSam^a.

TABLE 3: *Relations of 4QSam^b to the Old Greek Translation and to the Masoretic Text*
(Reconstructed Readings in Square Brackets)

	Superior Readings	Inferior Readings	Unclassified Readings	Total Readings
<i>4QSam^b = Old Greek</i>				
(1) 4QSam ^b = $\text{Ⲅ}^B/\text{Ⲅ}^{BL} \neq \text{ⲙ}$	21 [35]	3 [4]	0 [0]	24 [39]
(2) 4QSam ^b $\text{Ⲅ}^L \neq \text{Ⲅ}^B \text{ⲙ}$	0 [2]	0 [0]	1 [0]	1 [2]
(3) 4QSam ^b $\text{Ⲅ}^L \neq \text{Ⲅ}^B \neq \text{ⲙ}$	0 [4]	1 [2]	0 [1]	1 [7]
(4) 4QSam ^b $\text{Ⲅ}^B \neq \text{Ⲅ}^L \text{ⲙ}$	1 [1]	0 [0]	0 [0]	1 [1]
Subtotal	22 [42]	4 [6]	1 [1]	27 [49]
<i>4QSam^b = Masoretic Text</i>				
(5) 4QSam ^b $\text{ⲙ} \text{Ⲅ}^L \neq \text{Ⲅ}^B$	2 [6]	0 [4]	2 [2]	4 [12]
(6) 4QSam ^b $\text{ⲙ} \text{Ⲅ}^B \neq \text{Ⲅ}^L$	7 [11]	0 [0]	2 [1]	9 [12]
(7) 4QSam ^b $\text{ⲙ} \neq \text{Ⲅ}^B/\text{Ⲅ}^L / \text{Ⲅ}^{BL}$	14 [23]	1 [1]	1 [1]	16 [25]
Subtotal	23 [40]	1 [5]	5 [4]	29 [49]
<i>4QSam^b = Unique Reading</i>				
(8) 4QSam ^b $\neq \text{ⲙ} \neq$ $\text{Ⲅ}^B/\text{Ⲅ}^L / \text{Ⲅ}^{BL}$	6 [9]	0 [0]	3 [2]	9 [11]
<i>Total: All Categories</i>	51 [91]	5 [11]	9 [7]	65 [109]

(1) *Readings of 4QSam^b in agreement with either Ⲅ^B or Ⲅ^{BL} against ⲙ (4QSam^b = $\text{Ⲅ}^B/\text{Ⲅ}^{BL} \neq \text{ⲙ}$):* Sixty-three readings fall into this category, thirty-nine of them in reconstructed contexts. We have argued that fifty-six are superior to ⲙ and seven inferior to ⲙ . The inferior readings are for the most part explicating pluses. The agreement with Ⲅ in seven secondary or inferior readings against ⲙ is strong evidence for a close genetic relationship between 4QSam^b and the Old Greek. Agreement in corrupt or inferior readings—a text’s bad genes—best characterizes a textual family. However, the remarkably large number of superior readings in which 4QSam^b agrees with the Old Greek is not irrelevant to the question of the affiliation of the two texts.

(2) *Readings of 4QSam^b in agreement with Ⲅ^L against Ⲅ^B and ⲙ (4QSam^b $\text{Ⲅ}^L \neq \text{Ⲅ}^B \text{ⲙ}$):* Three readings fall into this category where Ⲅ^B and ⲙ agree with each other against 4QSam^b Ⲅ^L . One of these is unclassified; the other two are both superior and reconstructed.

(3) *Readings of 4QSam^b in agreement with Ⲅ^L against Ⲅ^B and against ⲙ (4QSam^b $\text{Ⲅ}^L \neq \text{Ⲅ}^B \neq \text{ⲙ}$; that is, there is a three-way split in the tradition, a different reading each in 4QSam^b Ⲅ^L , Ⲅ^B , and ⲙ):* Eight readings (seven reconstructed, one reading unclassified) fall into this category, of which four are superior to both the reading of Ⲅ^B and the

reading of \aleph . In three instances, $4Q\text{Sam}^b \text{ } \textcircled{L}$ is inferior. Readings in category (3) qualify as Proto-Lucianic readings.

(4) *Readings of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ in agreement with \textcircled{B} against \textcircled{L} and \aleph ($4Q\text{Sam}^b \text{ } \textcircled{B} \neq \textcircled{L} \aleph$):* Two readings fall into this category, one of them reconstructed. Both of these readings are superior.

(5) *Readings of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ in agreement with \aleph and \textcircled{L} against \textcircled{B} ($4Q\text{Sam}^b \aleph \textcircled{L} \neq \textcircled{B}$):* There are sixteen readings in this category. The $4Q\text{Sam}^b \aleph \textcircled{L}$ readings appear to be superior in eight cases, in four cases inferior. Four readings are unclassified. \textcircled{L} here appears to reflect the Old Greek, with \textcircled{B} often defective either owing to *parablepsis*, or expansion with the addition of an explicating plus.

(6) *Readings of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ in agreement with \aleph and \textcircled{B} against \textcircled{L} ($4Q\text{Sam}^b \aleph \textcircled{B} \neq \textcircled{L}$):* There are twenty-one instances in this category. Eighteen readings are reckoned superior, of which eleven are reconstructed. None is inferior.

(7) *Readings of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ in agreement with \aleph against \textcircled{B} and/or \textcircled{L} ($4Q\text{Sam}^b \aleph \neq \textcircled{B}/\textcircled{L} / \textcircled{BL}$):* Forty-one readings fall into this category. We have analyzed thirty-seven as superior, twenty-three of these reconstructed. Only two we have labelled inferior (one reconstructed), and two (one reconstructed) remain unclassified. There are only two readings of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ in agreement with \aleph against the Old Greek in which \aleph is judged to be in error. This is a stunning statistic.

(8) *Unique readings in $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ ($4Q\text{Sam}^b \neq \aleph \neq \textcircled{B}/\textcircled{L} / \textcircled{BL}$):* There are twenty readings of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ against \aleph and the Old Greek, eleven reconstructed. Of these we reckon fifteen (nine reconstructed) to be superior, none inferior. Five (two reconstructed) readings are unclassified.

In summary, $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ exhibits 142 superior readings, of which ninety are in agreement with the Old Greek represented either by \textcircled{B} or \textcircled{L} or both. $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ is in agreement with \aleph seventy-eight times, of which sixty-three readings are superior (or original), nine unclassified, and six considered inferior.

In short, in an overwhelmingly large number of cases, the readings of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ agree with the Old Greek when it is superior, but agree with the Masoretic tradition when it is superior. We must add in some fifteen unique readings that are superior to both the Old Greek and \aleph . These are marks of a remarkably pristine textual witness. It is a tragedy that $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ is so poorly preserved.

We should note too that $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ has some ten inferior readings in agreement with the Old Greek against the Masoretic Text—the bad genes of the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek. Such readings are as crucial, perhaps even more crucial than the large number of agreements of $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ with the Old Greek in superior readings. Similarly, when $4Q\text{Sam}^b$ is in disagreement with both the Greek witnesses ($\textcircled{B}/\textcircled{L} / \textcircled{BL}$), but in agreement with \aleph , in some thirty-seven instances \aleph is superior; only in two cases (one reconstructed) are the readings reckoned inferior—bad genes. These data strongly support the view that the Old Greek was translated, presumably in Alexandria, from a Hebrew manuscript that was closely affiliated with the Old Palestinian text, such as that

preserved in this old Samuel manuscript.

Such statistics do not indicate really the full value of this archaic text. Its affinity with the tradition to which the *Vorlage* of the Old Greek belongs is most important, and cannot be neglected in developing new methods and evaluations in future critical studies of the text of Samuel. Nevertheless, the most extraordinary characteristic of the text of 4QSam^b is the high proportion of original readings which it preserves, whether it be in agreement with the Old Greek, or in agreement with מ , or against both in its several unique readings.

Frg. 1 1 Sam 12:3, 5-6 (Pl. XXIV)

4] ∞[3]	1
	[
] עד יהוה בכם [5]	2
	[
] ∞ ∞[6]	3
	[

Mus. Inv. 206

PAM 42.277, 43.072*

NOTES ON READINGS

- L. 1 (12:3) The traces of two letters may be discerned, but they cannot be identified.
 L. 2 (12:5) בכם. The bottoms of *kap* and final *mem* are clear, and the reading is not in doubt.
 L. 3 (12:6) The very tops of four letters are visible, but their identity cannot be made out.

Frg. 2 1 Sam 14:41-42 (Pl. XXIV)

את עבדך היום אם יש בי] או ב[יונתן בני העון יהוה אלהי ישראל	1
[⁴¹ למה לא ענית	
הבה ארים ואם ישנו בעמך ישראל]	
יונתן ושאול והעם יצ[⁴² ויאמר] שאול הפילו ביני ובין יונתן בני	2
[הבה תמים וילכד	
[

bottom margin

Mus. Inv. 206
PAM 42.277, 43.072*

The Masoretic text has suffered a long haplography in v 41 caused by *homoioteleuton*, triggered by the repetition of ישראל; the text of 4Q52 has been reconstructed in v 41 basically from σ and ϵ . The vertical alignment of או ב'יונתן in line 1 and ויאמר [יצ] in line 2 certifies the identification of the fragment as well as the existence in 4QSam^b of the longer text. On the reconstruction, see Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 93–5, and McCarter, *I Samuel*, 247–8. The longer text is original.

The bottom margin of this column is considerably longer than the bottom margin in frg. 7.

NOTES ON READINGS

L. 1 (14:41) או ב'יונתן . The reading או is certain; the *bet* is damaged by the tear on the left side, but is reasonably secure.

L. 2 (14:41-42) [יצ] ויאמר . The ticked shaft near the edge of the leather conforms to *waw*; before it are two dots of ink which can be the ends of the two legs of an *alep*. The following ויאמר is fairly clear. There is a trace of ink following the *mem*, no doubt a trace of *res*.

VARIANTS

- 14:41 (1) או ב'יונתן] $\sigma \epsilon$] > מטטט . See the manuscript note above. The longer text reflected in σ and ϵ is original.
- 14:41 (2) ויצאו העם] $\sigma \epsilon$] מ [והעם יצא] מטטט ; cf. ϵ] ויצאו העם] מטטט

RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS

- 14:41 (1) $\text{[למה לא ענית את עבדך היום אם יש בי]}$] מטטט ; cf. σ^O] מטטט
- 14:41 (1) [בני העון הזה]] מטטט ; > מטטט
- 14:41 (1) $\text{[יהוה אלהי ישראל הבה ארים ואם]}$] מטטט ; cf. ϵ] מטטט
- 14:41 (1) [ישנו]] ; cf. ϵ] ταδε ειπθη] מטטט ; cf. σ^{LO} . Compare ישנו in v 39 which the Greek translator renders as αποκριθη , apparently again at a loss as to the meaning of the expression.
- 14:41 (1) [בעמד]] מטטט pr מטטט ; cf. $\sigma^{(O)}$] מטטט
- 14:41 (1) [ישראל]] מטטט ; cf. ϵ] מטטט ; cf. ϵ . The long omission presumes the reading ישראל .
- 14:41 (2) [הבה]] מטטט] + מטטט

Frg. 3 1 Sam 15:16-18 (Pl. XXIV)

שמואל אל שאול הר] ואנידה לך את אשר דבר יהוה אלי הלילה
ויאמר] 1

[*vacat* דבר לו דיאמר]

אל שאול הלוא אם קט] אתה [בעיניך ראש שבטי ישראל אתה וימשחך
 17] ויאמר שמואל 2

יהוה למלך על ישראל 18 וישלחך יהוה בדרך]

[ויאמר לך והחרמתה את החטאים] אֵת [עמ]ל[ק ונלחמת 3

[

Mus. Inv. 206

PAM 42.277, 43.072*

NOTES ON READINGS

L. 1 (15:16) [הרף]. There is the tail of a long letter, no doubt the final *pe* of הרף of v 16.

L. 1 At the end of line 1, it is necessary to reconstruct a long spacing to indicate paragraphing. It conforms to the paragraphing in מ marked with ס.

L. 2 (15:17) [קט]. On the right edge of the fragment before the clear אהה is a long stroke, somewhat distorted by the wrinkling of the leather. It conforms best with final *nun*.

L. 3 (15:18) אֵת [עמ]ל[ק]. The top of a *taw* can be discerned, and before it evidently the high left arm of an *alep*. Following after some space is a trace of ink, evidently the distorted top of a *lamed*.

RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS

15:17 (2) [אל שאול] מ ^{pc mss} ט ט ט > מ ט ט. Space requirements dictate the inclusion of this phrase in 4QSam^b. It echoes the same phrase at the beginning of v 16. The phrase probably was lost owing to a haplography by *homoioteleuton* (שמאל אל שאל in older orthography). It is less likely that we are dealing with an explicating plus.

15:17 (2) [ראש שבט שבט ישראל] מ ; cf. ט ט] ^{BA} ט ; cf. ^{L(O)} ט. ^{BA} ט contain a simple dittography. The Greek readings of ^L ט, ^(O) ט and ε are expansive, presumably to make sense of the curious reading ש ב ט שבט, probably on the basis of 1 Sam 9:21, itself corrupt in ט.

15:17 (2) [אהה] מ ; cf. ט ט] > ט ט

15:17 (2) [על] מ ^{BO} ט ט ט + כל ^L ט

15:18 (3) [לך] מ ט ט ט + לך ט. The Greek reading is dittographic or the Masoretic Text is haplographic. לך and לך לך or לך לכה interchange frequently.

15:18 (3) [והחרמתה] מ ט ט ט] החרמתה ט

15:18 (3) [החטאים] מ ט ; cf. ט ט] + לי ט. The לי is erroneous and probably secondary.

Frg. 4 1 Sam 16:1-11 (Pl. XXIV)

ישי בית לחם כי ראיתי בבניו לי מלך 2 ויאמר שמואל איך אלק ושמע
 1] אשלה]ך [אל

שאול והרגני ויאמר יהוה עגלת]

ואמרת לזבח ליהוה באתי³ וקראת לישי לזבח ואנכי אודיעך את אשר
 בקר קח בידך 2
 תעשה ומשחת לי את אשר]
 [ויעש שמואל את אשר דבר יהוה ויבא בית לחם ויחרדו זקני העיר
 אמר אליך 3
 לקראתו ויאמרו השלם בואך]
 לזבח ליהוה באתי התקדשו ושמחו אתי היום ויקדש את ישי ואת
 הראה⁵ ויאמר [שלם 4
 בניו ויקרא להם לזבח]
 את א]ליאב ויאמר אך נגד יהוה משיחו⁷ ויאמר יהוה אל שמואל אל
 תבט אל מראהו ואל גבה]
 כ]י לא כאשר יראה האדם כן יראה אלהים כי האדם יראה לעינים
 קמתו כי מאסתיו 6
 ויהוה יראה ללבב⁸ ויקרא]
 [ויעבר לפני שמואל ויאמר גם בזה לא בחר אלהים⁹ ויעבר ישי
 ישי אל אבינדב 7
 שמעא ויאמר גם בזה לא בחר]
 י]שי שבעת בניו לפני שמואל ויאמר שמואל לא בחר יהוה באלה
 יהוה¹⁰ ויעבר 8
 ויאמר שמואל אל]
 vacat¹¹
 ישי ה'ת]מו הנערים 9
 [

Mus. Inv. 206

PAM 42.277, 43.072*

The right margin is preserved on the leather fragment.

NOTES ON READINGS

L. 1 (16:1) [אשלה]ך . Calculation of space makes this reading probable, and the long tail of *kap* preserved on the leather certifies the reconstruction. No other letter with a long tail is near enough to fit the count.

L. 8 It is necessary to reconstruct a paragraph spacing between vv 10 and 11. It is not found in *BHS*, ed. de Boer; it is found, marked with σ , in *BH²*, ed. Rudolph.

VARIANTS

16:2 (2) [ח]ק ם s] תקח ן ן ן ן

- 16:4 (4) הראה σ (σ $\beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\omega\upsilon$)] > מטטט
 16:7 (6) מאסתיו] מאסתיהו מ . See the same phenomenon, the syncope of intervocalic *he*, in v 1 מ (מאסתיו). It is not infrequent elsewhere in Biblical and epigraphic Hebrew (Cross and Freedman, *Early Hebrew Orthography*, 50 and n. 27).

RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS

- 16:1 (1) [בית לחם] σ] מטטט בית הלחמי מ ; cf. טט . σ uses $\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) before the place name. However, the Hebrew idiom does not require a preposition here.
- 16:1 (1) [בבניו] מ σ BO טטט ; cf. ט] מטטט בני ישי σ^L
- 16:3 (2) [לישי] מ σ^{BA} טטט] + ולבניו $\sigma^{L(O)}$
- 16:3 (2) [לזבח] טטט] מ בזבח מ ; cf. ט . After the verb קרא, the preposition -ל is desiderated. The reading in מ evidently is influenced by the corrupt reading בזבח in v 5. For the idiom, see the reading at the end of v 5 ויקרא להם לזבח מ .
- 16:3 (2) [ואנכי] מ טטטט] > σ . Presumably the ואנכי has been lost in σ owing to the repetition of several letters in אודיעך ואנכי as a *casus pendens* is a familiar literary device in early Hebrew.
- 16:3 (2) [לי] מ σ^L טט ; cf. ט] > σ^{BO} טט
- 16:4 (3) [את] מטטט ; cf. ט] + כל σ
- 16:4 (3) [דבר] מ σ^L טט] + לו σ^{BA} ; cf. $\sigma^{(O)}$ טט . We take לו as an explicating plus.
- 16:4 (3) [ויחרדו] מ σ טט] יחרדה ויצאו טט . The reading of יחרדה in טט may have arisen from graphic confusion with ויחרדו.
- 16:4 (3) [ויאמרו] טטטט] מ ויאמר מ . מ is in error; context requires a plural verb.
- 16:4 (3) [השלם] σ^B] מטטט שלם σ^{LO} טטטט . The reading of σ^B makes better sense in the context we have reconstructed.
- 16:5 (4) [ושמחו אתי היום] σ^{BO} ; cf. טט] מטטט ובאתם אתי בזבח מ ; cf. טטטט . The reading found in the Greek and Old Latin is clearly superior to the Masoretic reading as first demonstrated by Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 101.
- 16:7 (6) [כאשר] טטטט] מטטט אשר מ
- 16:7 (6) [אלהים] σ^L ; cf. σ^{BO}] > מטטט . The reading of מ is impossible as it stands, as is generally recognized. The fuller text of σ^L must be read in 4QSam^b to fill out the line. The phrase כן יראה האלהים appears to have fallen out of מ by haplography owing to *homoiarkton*.
- 16:8 (7) [ויעברו] σ טט] מטטט ויעברו מטטט . The reading of מ (and its faithful congeners) is influenced by the *Hip'il* readings in vv 9 and 10.
- 16:8 (7) [אלהים] $\sigma^{B(O)}$] מטטט יהוה מ σ^{LA} טטטט ; cf. ט . The variant in $\sigma^{B(O)}$ arises perhaps as a reminiscence of אלהים in v 7. We cannot be absolutely certain of this reading in 4QSam^b; however, it helps to fill out a short line.
- 16:9 (7) [שמעא] $\sigma^{L(O)}$ ($\sigma\alpha\mu\alpha$) טט] מטטט שמע מ σ^A טטט ; cf. σ^B ($\sigma\alpha\mu\alpha$) טט . See שמעא 1 Chr 2:13; 20:7; 2 Sam 21:21 מ^a ; and שמעה 2 Sam 13:3, 32. In 4QSam^a at 2 Sam 13:3, the same name is written שמעיה, the full or non-hypocoristic, form of the name. The common element of personal names שמע plus the hypocoristic suffix א-, is the most likely choice here.
- 16:10 (8) [ויאמר] σ^B] + אל ישי מ σ^{LO} טטטט . The words אל ישי are an example of the type of explicating plus usually absent from 4QSam^b. However, owing to the paragraph break, we cannot be certain of the reconstruction here.

Frg. 5 1 Sam 19:10-13, 15-17 (Pl. XXIV)

10] 1

[מפני

בקיר ודוד נס וימלט ויהי בלילה ההוא¹¹ וישלח שאול מלאכים
 2 [שואל ויך את החנית

אל בית דוד לשמרו ל]המיתו

לדוד מיכל אשתו לאמר אם אינך ממלט את נפשך הלילה מחר תומת
 3 [בבקר ותגד

12 ותורד מיכל את ד]וד בעד החלן

וימלט¹³ ותקח מיכל את התרפים ותשם על המטה ואת כביר העזים שמה
 4 [וילך ויברח

מראשתיו ות]כֹּס בבגד

מלאכים לקחת את דוד ויאמרו חלה הוא¹⁵ וישלח שאול את המלאכים
 5 [4] וישלח שאול

לראת את ד]וד לאמר העלו

אלי להמתו *vacat* ויבאו המלאכים והנה התרפים על המטה
 6 [אתו במטה

וכביר העזים מראש]תיו¹⁷ ויאמר

Mus. Inv. 206

PAM 42.277, 43.072*

The left margin of the column is visible on the leather fragment, and as well, stitching with linen thread where the sheet of leather on which this column is inscribed was sewn to the next piece of leather.

NOTES ON READINGS

L. 4 (19:13) כֹּס [ות]. Before בבגד, the leather is badly split and distorted by shrinkage. Some traces of letters, presumably *kap* and *samek*, are preserved on the border twisted down from the split.

L. 6 We must posit a paragraph spacing at the end of v 15. ׀ has a paragraph break at the end of v 13 and v 14.

VARIANTS

19:12 (3) החלן] החלן ׀ . This is a noteworthy orthographic variant in which the vowel $\bar{o} < \bar{a}$ is written without the *matres lectionis waw*.

19:16 (6) [מראש]תיו ׀ ׀ ׀ + לשאול] ׀ ׀ ׀ ^{BO} . In view of the intriguing agreement of the Luci-anic Greek and the Syriac, it may be that we are dealing with a Proto-

Lucianic plus. In any case, the reading is to explicate an elliptical text.

RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS

- 19:10 (2) [ויהי] > טסס. There is ample room for the introduction of ויהי in the line before
 טסס בלילה ההו with ט, clearly the original reading (so, Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 112).
- 19:10 (2) [ההוא] טס. The letter *he* has been lost by haplography.
- 19:11 (2) [להמיתו] טס; cf. ט. The initial *waw* stems from dittography (cf. McCarter, *I Samuel*, 325).
- 19:11 (3) [הלילה] טס + טססהו; > ט
- 19:11 (3) [תומת] ט^{BO}; cf. ט^L. The variant is between the finite verb and the participle with pronoun; the requirements of space favour the shorter reading.
- 19:13 (4) [על] טס; cf. טס. As we have seen, this confusion of על and טל, the two falling together in popular pronunciation, is not infrequent in the text of Samuel. See the fuller discussion at 20:27 (2), VARIANTS, below.
- 19:14 (5) [ויאמרו] ט^{BO}; cf. ט. The *lectio difficilior* ט^L fits the space well. Moreover, Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 113 is justified in arguing that Michal says nothing, later showing the messengers the faked body of David, while it is said that David is ill. Here Jerome may be reflecting a correct Old Latin understanding (*et responsum est*). On the indefinite use of the third masculine plural, see Waltke and O'Connor, *Hebrew Syntax* §4.4.2, 70–71.
- 19:15 (5) [שאול] ט^L טס; cf. ט^(O). The shorter reading of ט^{BA} is to be preferred. ט and its allies here are influenced by the beginning of v 14.
- 19:15 (5) [את המלאכים לראת] ט^L טס; cf. ט^O. The omission by ט^B is a transparent haplography by *homoiarkton* (את . . . את) in the *Vorlage* of ט^B. Calculation of the spatial requirements in line 5 makes certain that 4QSam^b follows the full (and superior) reading.
- 19:16 (6) [על] טס. See the RECONSTRUCTED VARIANT at 19:13.

Frgs. 6–7 1 Sam 20:26–21:3, 5–7 (Pl. XXIV)

מִמְחֶרֶת הַחֹדֶשׁ הַשְּׁנִי וַיִּפְקֵד מִקּוֹם [דוד ויאמר שאול אל יונתן בנו
 לא טהר^{2 7} ויהי⁶ 1 f.6

מדוע לא בא בן ישי גם תמל]

השלחן²⁸ ויען {שאול את} יונתן את שאול ויאמר נשאל מעמדי עד בית
 גם היום על 2

לחם עירו²⁹ ויאמר שלחני נא כי זבח]

לנו בעיר ואני צוו לי אחי ועתה אם נא מצאתי [חן בעיניך אמלטה נא
 למשפחה 3

ואראה את אחי על כן לא בא על שלחן]

אף שאול ביונתן מאד ויאמר לו בן נערות המרדת [הלא ידעתי כי חבר
המלך³⁰ ויחר

4

אתה לבן ישי לבשתך ולבשת ערות אמך]

אשר בן ישי חי על האדמה לא תכן את ממלכתך ועתה [שלח וקח
כי³¹ כל הימים

5

את הבחר כי בן מות הוא³² ויען יונתן את]

יומת מה עשה³³ ויטל שאול את החנית עליו להכתו וידע יונתן כי
אביו ויאמר למה

6

כלתה הרעה מעם אביו להמית את דוד]

מעל השלחן בחרי אף ולא אכל ביום החדש השני לחם [כי נעצב על
ויפחו יונתן

7

דוד כי כלה עליו אביו³⁵ ויהי בבקר ויצא]

למועד דוד ונער קטן עמו³⁶ ויאמר לנער רוץ קח את החץ אשר אנכי
יונתן השדה

8

מורה והנער רץ והוא ירה החץ להעבירו]

הנער עד מקום החץ אשר ירה יונתן וי[קרא אחר העלם ויאמר הנה
העירה³⁷ ויבא

9

החץ ממך והלאה³⁸ ויקרא יונתן]

חושה אל תעמד וילקט נער יונתן א[ת החץ ויבא אל אדניו³⁹ והנער
אחר עלמה מהרה

10

לא ידע מאומה אך יונתן ודוד ידעו]

יונתן את כליו על הנער אשר לו וי[אמר לו לכה בא העירה⁴¹ הנער
את הדבר⁴⁰ ויתן

11

בא ודוד קם מאצל הארגב ויפל לאפיו]

שלש פעמים וישקו איש את [רעהו ויבכו איש את רעהו עד הבדל
ארצה וישתחו

12

² ויאמר יונתן לך לשלם אשר נשבענו אנחנו]

יהוה לאמר יהוה יהיה ביני ובינך [ובין זרעי ובין זרעך עד עולם
שנינו בשם

13

[*vacat*]

דוד וילך ויונתן בא העירה² ויבא דוד נבה אל [אבימלך הכהן ויחרד
ויקם^{21:1}

14

אבימלך לקראתו ויאמר לו מדוע אתה לבדך]

3 ויאמר דוד לכהן המלך צוני דבר ויאמר אלי איש אל ידע מאומה את
 ואיש אין עמך 15 f.7

הדבר אשר אנכי שלחך [ואשר צויתך]

יעדתי אל מקום פלני אלמנני⁴ ועתה אם יש תחת ירך חמשה לחם תנה
 ואת הנערים 16

בידי את הנמצא⁵ וי[ען] הכהן את [דוד]

אין לחם חל תחת ידיו כי אם לחם קדש יש *vacat* אם נשמרו
 ויאמר 17

הנערים [מאשה ו^א] כלתם ממנו [ויען דוד]

ויאמר לו כי אם אשה עצרה לנו מאתמל שלשם בצאתי בדרך [היו כל
 את הכהן 18

הנערים קדש והוא דרך חל ואף]

בכלי⁷ ויתן לו הכהן קדש כי לא היה שם לחם כי אם לחם הפנים
 כי יקדש היום 19

המוסר מלפני יהוה לשום לחם]

bottom margin

Mus. Inv. 206 (frg. 6 could not be located in the museum)

PAM 42.277, 43.072* (frgs. 6–7)

NOTES ON READINGS

L. 1 (20:26) טהר. While the top of *tet* in טהר is damaged, the reading is certain.

L. 1 (20:27) ויהי ממחרת החדש. The tear along the top of the line has badly damaged a series of letters, but the traces of letters make the reading more or less secure. A trace of the bottom of the second *yod* in ויהי is preserved. The two *mems* of ממחרת are not in doubt; *het* is virtually completely preserved, and *taw* has left traces that cannot be confused with any other letter. *Res* is preserved (if at all) only in a trace of ink. The lower parts of the downstrokes of the *he* in החדש are visible.

L. 2 (20:28) { שאול את } ויען. Following ויען is an erasure. Infrared photography reveals clearly the reading שאול את, an error caught by the scribe himself, who after erasing, went on to undamaged leather to write correctly יונתן את.

L. 2 (20:28) ויאמר. At the end of the preserved portion of the line there is a clear *waw*, and the lower remnant of a letter, no doubt *yod*.

L. 3 (20:29) The reading of the line is certain; a split in the leather has separated parts of letters toward the end of the line, but in no case is a letter doubtful.

L. 4 (20:30) נערו המרדת. The reading נערו המרדת is problematic in 4QSam^b. The *waw* of נערו has a defective head, and without context could be read as *zayin*. However, parallel forms of *waw* do appear sporadically in this script. The top of the head of *res* in המרדת has been rubbed bare, but the *res* is not in doubt. The *dalet* may also be read as *res*; indeed, *dalet*, *res*, and *waw* are on occasion indistinguishable in this scribe's hand, though when he is careful, the distinction between them is clear.

L. 15 (21:3) [שלחך]. The tail of a letter seen on the top of frg. 7 belongs to *kap*.

L. 16 (21:3) אַלמנ׳. The top of the *nun* is visible.

L. 17 The line is very short. We must posit a paragraph break or an addition without witness.

L. 17 (21:5) ך[א] . Most of a final *kap*, written in above the ceiling line, is visible, and we must reconstruct ך[א] .

L. 19 (21:6) כִּי . The final letters on the large fragment (frg. 6) against the right margin are כִּי . Earlier we had misread them as *he*, but under magnification they prove to be a *kap* followed by the head of a *yod*.

VARIANTS

- 20:26 (1) ט ם ; cf. ט ם] טהור . The Greek rendering presumes טהור, a *Pu^{sal}*, and as Driver, *Notes*, 169 has remarked, ‘relieves the tautology of MT’. The preceding טהור may have influenced ט (reminiscence), and, of course, the original text read טהור, capable of more than one vocalization. The assumption of Talmon, ‘Double Readings’, 173–4 that ט paraphrases ט is without warrant; evidently the translator had a text like that of 4QSam^b.
- 20:27 (1) ם ממחרת החדש ביום השני] ם א ט ; cf. ם א ט (τη επαυριον του μηνος τη ημερα τη δευτερα); cf. ם^(O) ט Josephus, *Ant.* 6.235. Probably we have the remnant of a double reading here: ממחרת החדש and ביום החדש השני. Cf. 20:34 ביום החדש השני.
- 20:27 (2) ם על הלחם] ם על הלחם (επι τη τραπεζαν) . In 1 Sam 20:24, ט^k reads ם על הלחם (επι τη τραπεζαν); in 1 Sam 20:29 ט has ם ל שלחן (επι [= על] τη τραπεζαν) and in 1 Sam 20:34 ט has ם על הלחם. We are inclined to follow 4QSam^b and ם throughout. The graphic similarity of ם על הלחם and ם על הלחם is obvious, especially in the Old Hebrew script, where *mem* and *nun* are easily confused (especially in the seventh-century cursive script). Confusion between ם and ם is frequent in ט (and 4QSam^a) of Samuel; it is a late confusion originating in auditory error when ‘ayin was being lost and the vowel shifted. Transcriptions in Greek frequently show the shift *ha* > *e*.
- 20:28 (2) ם יונהן] ם יונהן . The pre-Exilic *yhwntn* / *yahû-natan* was replaced by *ywntn* / *yawnatan* > *yônātān*, and by secondary archaizing *yhwntn* / *yêhônātān*. 4QSam^b regularly has יונהן.
- 20:28 (2) ם ו׳[אמר] ; cf. ם] > ם ט . For further discussion, see below under RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS.
- 20:29 (3) ם למשפחה] ם למשפחה . See 1 Sam 20:6 ם לכל המשפחה which may have influenced the 4QSam^b reading.
- 20:29 (3) ם לי אחי] ם לי אחי (και ενετειλαντο προς με οι αδελφοι μου) ; cf. ם^{BL} . The text of 4QSam^b with ם לי אחי as a *casus pendens* is original, clearly, and is a text providing a basis for later variant, corrupt readings. ם לי אחי and ם לי אחי (in older orthography) are easily confused (assuming metathesis); *nun-yod* in the Archaic Jewish character is often ligatured and resembles *he* closely. Grammatical revision to make sense of the reading ensued as often in corrupt passages of Samuel. ם^{BL} may have had ם לי אחי or simply ם לי אחי, but probably the former.
- 20:29 (3) ם א ם] ם א ם ט
- 20:30 (4) ם מ ם] > ם ט . The reading of 4QSam^b ם מ ם is expanded with ם מ, an intensifying adverb which is not infrequently added in transmission. Compare 1 Sam 18:8 where ט is expanded similarly.
- 20:30 (4) ם נערה] ם נערה ; cf. ם . The reading of ט arises from the

frequent confusion of *waw* and *reš* especially in the third century BCE, e.g. in the script of 4QSam^b. The original reading was evidently נַעֲרָה. The orthography of 4QSam^b is surprising given the prevailing practice of this manuscript to leave the vowel \bar{o} (< \bar{a}) unmarked by a *mater lectionis*. See the following variant.

- 20:30 (4) הַמְרֵדָה] המרדות ט; cf. σ ; αυτομολουτων σ^{BO} ; αυτομολουσων γυναικοτραφη σ^L ; cf. ϵ Josephus, *Ant.* 6.237 (αυτομολων). The reading of σ is presumably translating מורדות, מרדות, or מרדה as a plural participle of מרד. However, the *Vorlage* of σ may have had מר(ו)ת, *mōrōt* from מרה. The reading נַעֲוֹת הַמְרֵדוֹת, as Driver, *Notes*, 170 has observed, excites suspicion; it is redundant: ‘the perverse (woman) of rebelliousness’. Generally, since Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 119, the original reading has been assumed to be נַעֲרָה הַמְרֵדוֹת. The article, however, is not expected and apparently was not in the *Vorlage* of σ . We are inclined to think the difficulty arose with the defective (i.e. old) orthography, and that the original reading was *nʿrt mrdt*, ‘a rebelling (slave) girl’. The σ^L doublet of γυναικοτραφη (‘brought up by a woman’) may hint at yet another Hebrew *Vorlage* in antiquity, i.e. בֶּן נַעֲרָה מְרַבּוֹת, ‘son of rearing women’, the מְרַבּוֹת being understood as a *Piʿel* feminine plural participle from רבָּה (compare the Aramaic cognate nouns מְרַבִּיתָא, ‘foster-mother’, מְרַבִּיתָא, ‘training’, etc.).
- 20:31 (5) מִמְלַכְתָּךְ] תִּכְוֶן אֶתְּ מִמְלַכְתָּךְ σ^{BO} ט; cf. σ ; σ^L ט; σ ט; σ ט. The 4QSam^b text is superior; a misreading of ט as *ʿattā* rather than *ʿet* with passive (as suggested by Cook, ‘According to 4QSam^b’, 445–6; cf. *GK* § 121a–b) gave rise to σ in the process of modernizing the orthography, and the subsequent revision of *mmlkth* to *wmlkth* and finally *wmlkwtk*. The text of 4QSam^b is also capable of being read *tākīn* for which, however, *tkyn* is expected. The writing תִּכְוֶן for *tikkōn*, however, is expected, for the introduction of *waw* for \bar{o} (< \bar{a}) is late, as we have remarked above, and not used normally in 4QSam^b. Note, on the other hand, the marginal reading $\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\rho\theta\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ in σ^b (= *tkyn*). See McCarter, *I Samuel*, 339.
- 20:32 (6) וַיֵּאמֶר] אֵלָיו σ^L ; cf. σ ; σ^O ט; σ σ^B . The short reading of σ^B is probably original. 4QSam^b with noteworthy agreement with σ^L is a first explicating expansion; the אֵלָיו in σ^O ט is a second.
- 20:33 (6) וַיִּנְתֵּן] אֵלָיו (επιλωναθαν) ϵ ; σ σ^B . The Greek and Old Latin reading of וַיִּנְתֵּן is an explicating plus.
- 20:33 (6)] אֵלָיו (επιλωναθαν) ϵ ; σ σ^B . The Greek and Old Latin reading of וַיִּנְתֵּן is an explicating plus.
- 20:34 (7) וַיִּפְחוּ] אֵלָיו (και ανεπηδησευ/απεπηδησευ) σ σ^B ; cf. σ . The reading of 4QSam^b is original and is a textbook example of *lectio difficilior*: ‘and Jonathan sprang up excitedly from the table’. The text of σ has for וַיִּפְחוּ a bland וַיִּקָּם, ‘and he rose up’. σ has been modernized, with the difficult, rare word replaced by the innocuous וַיִּקָּם. Modernization is, perhaps, too neutral a term to apply; in late Hebrew, middle Hebrew, and Aramaic, the root פָּחוּ developed the primary meaning ‘to be concupiscent, lewd, lascivious’.³ The early meaning, ‘to be excited’, ‘act in excitement’, was forgotten or obsolescent. Hence the older reading was more than obscure; it was grotesque, and suppressed. The reading of σ ‘and he started up’, reflects וַיִּפְחוּ. Elsewhere, the Greek verb is used to translate the corrupt וַיִּנְתֵּן of σ , a transparent graphic confusion of

³ J. C. Greenfield, ‘The Meaning of פָּחוּ’, *Studies in Bible and the Ancient Near East: Presented to Samuel E. Loewenstamm on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. by Y. Avishur and J. Blau (Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein’s Publishing House, 1978) 35–40.

נער יונתן later in v 38.

- 20:38 (10) מהרה] pr לאמר ; cf. s . לאמר here is an obvious explicating plus.
- 20:38 (10) חושה] BO חושה] לך (?) L ($\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\upsilon$). The reading of L is puzzling. Did his *Vorlage* really have לך or was the translator not sure of the meaning of חושה and so used a 'blur word'? We are inclined to the latter view.
- 20:38 (10) ואל] A ואל ; cf. A ואל 4QSam^a;
- 20:39 (10-11)] $\text{L}^{(O)}$ ואל] > B ; [ידעו] 4QSam^a. Does B reflect a haplography וד ו ו י ד ע ו , or is the reading an explicating expansion? The omission of ואל in 4QSam^a is necessary to fulfill the requirements of vertical alignment and line length. We suspect that the reading of B is superior, and that the addition of ידעו is a first explicating expansion, and ואל a second explicating plus.
- 20:40 (11) על] $\text{L}^{(O)}$ על] A על ; cf. A על
- 20:41 (12) ארצה] L ארצה ; cf. B ארצה] > B
- 20:41 (12) וישתחו] A וישתחו] + לו . This is plainly an explicating plus in B .
- 20:42 (13) יהיה] A יהיה] + עד
- 21:1 (14) דוד] A דוד] > A . We take the reading of A to be original.
- 21:1 (14) העיר] A העיר]
- 21:2 (15) עמך] A עמך]
- 21:3 (15)] B] להכהן] A להכהן] A ; cf. L . A represents an explicating plus.
- 21:3 (15) דבר] A דבר] + היום] BLO ; cf. A . The shorter reading is to be preferred.
- 21:3 (16) יעדתי] A יעדתי] ; cf. A ; A יעדתי ($\delta\iota\alpha\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\eta\mu\alpha\iota$). The reading of 4QSam^b is original. Already Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 121 had recognized that the original Hebrew text had some form of the root יעד. A reads $\delta\iota\alpha\mu\epsilon\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\rho\eta\mu\alpha\iota$, the verb regularly used to render the *Hip'il* of עוד in A . The reading of B , *condixi*, would appear to represent יעדתי (cf. Jer 47:7; Job 2:11). A has the anomalous יעדתי, a putative *Po'el* of יעד, which is clearly a corruption and may now be safely dropped.
- 21:5 (17) תחת] A תחת] A תחת] A is evidently a corruption of חל; A is conflate.
- 21:5 (17) מאשה] BLO מאשה] ; cf. A מאשה] A 4QSam^b corrector (B מאשה). Presumably, the supralinear addition of מאשה by a corrector is to be placed before מאשה with A . The expression מאשה may be a torso of the original reading ממנו ואכלתם found in 4QSam^b or the like. See the next entry.
- 21:5 (17) ממנו] ואכלתם] ; cf. A ; > A . The Greek witnesses are divided between $\kappa\alpha\iota \phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (BO), $\kappa\alpha\iota \phi\alpha\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ (L), and $\kappa\alpha\iota \phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ (Syro-Hexapla *apud* Barhebraeus, Eusebius). Without the phrase, the conditional sentence stands awkwardly without an apodosis; the protasis cannot be construed gracefully with the preceding phrase. Evidently a *parablepsis*, ממנו . . . מאשה, accounts for the corrupt text with the Greek text partially revised and corrupted; or A may be interpretive, having been added to make sense. In any case, 4QSam^b is preferred.
- 21:6 (18) היו] A היו] ; cf. A .
- 21:6 (18) כל] BO כל] ; cf. L . 4QSam^b presents the preferable reading as 'all of the young men'. The reading of כל, 'vessels', perhaps arising secondarily in anticipation of בכל at the end of the verse, presents many difficulties, as noted by Driver, *Notes*, 174–5 and Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 99; see also Freedman's remarks on this variant (Andersen and Freedman, 'Another Look', 15–16).
- 21:6 (18)] BO] A] L וכי A . Presumably the reading of L is ultimately a

- 20:38 (10) [ויבא] (*Hip'il*) $\text{ס}^{L(O)}$ (καὶ ἠνεγκε) ס (Yty'w) ט] ויבא (*Qal*) מט ; ס^A ויבא החצים ; (καὶ ἠνεγκεν τὰς σχιζὰς); > ס^{B*} . There is no room for the plus in 4QSam^b. We prefer the *Hip'il* interpretation of $\text{ס}^{LO\text{ט}}$.
- 20:40 (11) [לן] מ ס^L ט ט ט] ס לנערן ס^{BA} (τῷ παιδαριῷ αὐτοῦ); > $\text{ס}^{(O)}$. The ס^{BA} reading is an explicating plus.
- 20:40 (11) [בא] ס^B ; cf. ס^O] ס לכה בא ; cf. ט ; ס^L לכה . ס^L omits בא , perhaps a *parablepsis* in Greek: εἰσελθε εἰς . The reading of מ probably originates in a wrong division of words at an early time when medial and final *kap* were not distinguished and orthography was defective: בא לכה > לכ הבא > לך הביא .
- 20:40 (11) [העירה]] מ העיר . We prefer the older form with the so-called directional *he*.
- 20:41 (11) [בא] מ ט ט ; cf. ס^A] ס ויבא הנער $\text{ס}^{L(O)}$; καὶ ὡς εἰσηλθεν τὸ παιδαριον ס^B ; cf. ט . The readings of ס^B and ט may be interpretive, 'when the lad had gone in, then David rose up . . .'. We have hesitated to retrovert their Hebrew *Vorlagen*. The reading of the verb of מ indicates a disjunction which is appropriate here.
- 20:41 (11) [ודוד] מ ס^{BO} ט ט ט] מ העירה ס^L . See above on 20:40.
- 20:41 (11) [הארנב] $\text{ס}^{BL(O)}$ (αργαβ/αργοβ/εργαβ)] מ הנב . The name of the place is corrupt in מ in both 20:19 (האבן האזל) and here (הנב). ס and ט in 20:41 have conflate readings. In 20:19, $\text{ס}^{B(O)}$ have τὸ (τῷ) εργαβεκεينو (εκεινω), which reflects probably הארנב הלא , as generally recognized. The demonstrative is also reflected in ס .

provide plausible readings. We suspect that the text once read **העבדים אשר לשאול** **אביר אביר** is an animal name used of military nobility and cannot be easily construed with either shepherds (מ) or mules (ט). It may be that graphic confusion has altered **העבדים** to **הרעים**. In any case, we have not reconstructed this line in 4QSam^b. Cf. 1 Sam 22:9.

- 21:9 (2) [לאבמלך] ט^{B(O)}] ט^{LA}טטט. See above 21:2, RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS.
- 21:9 (2) [ראה אם יש] ט^{BAL}; cf. ט] ט ואין יש ; cf. ט; ט ראה ט^(O); ט אין (tyl). The reading of מ, the anomalous אין (^{an}), is probably an Aramaism replacing אם in Hebrew, the error of a sleepy scribe. In any case, ט ראה אם יש best fills out the space required in the line. On the *crux*, see Driver, *Notes*, 176.
- 21:9 (3) [נחוג] טטטטט] The term is a *hapax legomenon* and problematic. See the commentaries.
- 21:10 (3) [הכהן] טטטטט] + הנה ט
- 21:10 (3) [והיא] ט] ט והנה היא ; ט והנה ט

Frg. 9 1 Sam 22:8-9 (Pl. XXV)

8] 1

[הקים בני את עבדי עלי]

את ויען דאג האדמי הנצב על עבדי שאול ויאמר ראיתי את *vacat*

[לאיב כיום הזה 2

[בן ישי בא נבה אל] אבמלך]

Mus. Inv. 195
PAM 42.277, 43.076*

The placement of the fragment is uncertain, but judging from the position of frg. 8 above on the left-hand margin of the column, we expect the pattern of destruction to place frg. 9 similarly near the left edge.

NOTES ON READINGS

- L. 1 (22:8) הִקִּים. The *he* of הִקִּים consists only of a trace of ink from the left shoulder of the letter.
- L. 2 4QSam^b has a paragraph break between vv 8 and 9, corresponding to the ט of מ.

RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS

- 22:8 (2) [לאיב] ט^{BAL}] ט לארב ; cf. טטט ; ט לאיבי ט^(O). Here *yod* and *reš* evidently have been confused, a rare phenomenon both in Old Hebrew and in the Jewish scripts, early and late. While it has been argued that the Masoretic reading is the *lectio difficilior*, and therefore to be preferred, it is not felicitous. A corrupt reading too is often the *lectio difficilior*, at best a slippery rule of thumb, and not to be preferred.
- 22:9 (2) [האדמי] ט^L טטטטט] ט האדמי ט^{BO} (συρος) Josephus, *Ant.* 6.254. This is another

example of the confusion of *reš* and *dalet*.

22:9 (2) [הנצב] ט; cf. ט] נצב והוא ט ט ט . For a parallel construction, see Ruth 2:6.

22:9 (2) [עבדי] ט ט ט] ημολογους ט Josephus, *Ant.* 6.254. See above 21:8, RECONSTRUCTED VARIANTS.

22:9 (2) [אבימלך] ט^{B(O)} Josephus, *Ant.* 6.254; cf. ט^A] אחימלך ט ט^L ט ט . See above 21:2, RECON-STRUCTED VARIANTS.

Frgs. 10–23 1 Sam 23:8-23 (Pl. XXV)

top margin

ל מ ל ח מ ה ל ר ד ת ק ע י ל ה ל צ ו ר א ל ד ו ד ו א ל א נ ש י ו ⁹ ו י ד ע ד ו ד כ י ע ל י ו
אֵת כָּל הָעָם⁸ 1f.10,11,12

{שׁוֹטֵל} מַחְרִישׁ הָרָעָה וַיֹּאמֶר

ה כ ה ן ה ג י ש ה א פ ד ¹⁰ ו י א מ ר ד ו ד י ה ו ה א ל ה י שְׂר א ל ש מ ע ש מ ע ע ב ד ך
אֵל [א] בֵּיתָר²

כ י מ ב ק ש ש א ו ל [ל ב א]

לְעִיר בַּעבוּרֵי ¹¹ וְעַתָּה הִירַד שְׂאֹל כֹּאשֶׁר שָׁמַע עַבְדְּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי
אֵל קַעִילָה ל[שַׁחַת] 3 f.13,14

יִשְׂרָאֵל הַגִּידָה לַעֲבָדְךָ

יֵרֵד ¹² וַיֹּאמֶר דוּד הִיִּסְגִּירוּ בַעֲלֵי קַעִילָה אֶתִּי וְאֶת אַנְשֵׁי בֵּית שְׂאֹל
וַיֹּאמְרוּ יְהוָה 4 f.15

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יִסְגִּירוּ ¹³ וַיִּקָּם

מֵאוֹת אִישׁ וַיִּצְאוּ מִקַּעִילָה וַיִּתְהַלְכוּ בְּאֶשְׁרֵי יִתְהַלְכוּ וַיִּגְדּוּ לְשֹׂאֵל
דוּד וַאֲנָשָׁיו [כֹּאֲרַבַּע] 5 f.16,17

[כִּי נִמְלֵט דוּד] מִקַּעִילָה

¹⁴ וַיֵּשֶׁב דוּד בַּמְדָּבָר בַּמִּצְדָּת וַיִּשָּׁב בְּהַר בַּעֲרָב זִיָּף וַיִּבְקֶשְׁהוּ שְׂאֹל כָּל
וַיַּחְדְּלֵם [לְצַאֲת] 6

הַיָּמִים וְלֹא נָתַנוּ יְהוָה בִּידוֹ

שְׂאֹל לִב[קֶשׁ אֶת נַפְשׁוֹ וְדוּד] בַּמְדָּבָר זִיָּף בַּחֲרָשָׁה ¹⁶ וַיִּקָּם יוֹנָתָן בֶּן
[⁵ וַיִּרְאֵהוּ דוּד כִּי יֵצֵא] 7 f.18

שְׂאֹל וַיִּלְכְּ אֵל [דוּד]

אֶת יָדוֹ בִּיהוָה ¹⁷ וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלֵינוּ אֵל תִּירָא *vacat* [כִּי לֹא תִמְצָאֵךְ יָד שְׂאֹל
[חֲרָשָׁה וַיַּחֲזֹק] 8 f.19

אֲבִי וְאֶתָּה תִּמְלֹךְ עָלַי

אֵהִי לְךָ לְמִשְׁנָה וְגַם שְׂאוּל אָבִי יָדַע כֵּן¹⁸ וַיִּכְרַתוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם בְּרִית לִפְנֵי
9 [יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאֲנֹכִי]

[יהוה] *va* *cat* [

דוֹד בַּחֲרָשָׁה וַיּוֹנְתָן הַלֵּךְ לְבֵיתוֹ¹⁹ וַיַּעֲלוּ זָפִים אֵל שְׂאוּל הַגִּבְעָתָה לְאָמֵר
10 f.20 [וַיֵּשֶׁב *vacat*]

דוֹד מִסְתַּתֵּר עִמָּנוּ]

בְּגִבְעָתָה הַחֲכִילָה אֲשֶׁר מִימִין הַיְשִׁימָן²⁰ וְעַתָּה לְכָל נַפְשׁ הַמֵּלֵךְ לָרְדָה
11 f.21 [בַּמַּצְדָּתָה בַּחֲרָשָׁה]

יֵרֵד עֲלֵינוּ הַסְגִירוֹ בִּיד]

בְּרוּכִים [אֲתָם] לִיהוָה כִּי חִמַּלְתֶּם עָלַי²² לְכוּ [נָא הִבִּינוּ עוֹד וְדַעוּ
12 f.22,23 [הַמֶּלֶךְ וַיֹּאמֶר²¹] שְׂאוּל]

[וּרְאוּ] אֲתָם [מִקְמוֹ אֲשֶׁר]

שֵׁם כִּי [אֲמַר] אֵלַי²³ [עֵרַם] וּרְאוּ מִכָּל הַמַּחְבֵּי אִים אֲשֶׁר יִתְחַבֵּא שֵׁם
13 [תְּהִיָּה רַגְלוֹ הַמְהֵרָה]

[

Mus. Inv. 195

PAM 42.277, 43.076* (frgs. 10–23)

In order to make clearer and easier the determination of the vertical alignment of letters and words in the lines of the text, we offer the following reconstruction. Vertical alignment is often obscured by the need to break up long lines following the format of the *DJD* edition, as well as by the added symbols, verse numbers, and brackets introduced into the text, thereby distorting it. Moreover, we have printed the lines in 12-point type, a size nearer to that of the actual script of 4QSam^b.

שְׂאוּל

לָרְדָתָה קַעִילָה לְצוֹר אֵל דוֹד וְאֵל אֲנָשָׁיו וַיָּדַע דוֹד כִּי עָלִיו {∞} מַחְרִישׁ הִרְעָה וַיֹּאמֶר
1 אֵת כָּל הָעָם לְמַלְחָמָה

הַגִּישָׁה הָאֶפֶד וַיֹּאמֶר דוֹד יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל שָׁמַע שָׁמַע עַבְדְּךָ כִּי מִבְּקֶשׁ שְׂאוּל לְבֹא
2 אֵל אֲבִיתֶךָ הַכְּהֵן

בְּעִבְרוֹי וְעַתָּה הִירֵד שְׂאוּל כְּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמַע עַבְדְּךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל הַגִּידָה לְעַבְדְּךָ
3 אֵל קַעִילָה לְשַׁחַת לְעִיר

דוֹד הִסְגִירוֹ בְּעָלִי קַעִילָה אֲתִי וְאֵת אֲנָשֵׁי בֵּית שְׂאוּל וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יִסְגִירוּ וַיִּקָּם
4 וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יֵרֵד *vacat* וַיֹּאמֶר

אִישׁ וַיִּצְאוּ מִקַּעִילָה וַיִּתְהַלְכוּ בְּאֲשֶׁר יִתְהַלְכוּ וַיִּגְדּוּ לְשְׂאוּל כִּי נִמְלַט דוֹד מִקַּעִילָה
5 דוֹד וְאֲנָשָׁיו כְּאַרְבַּע מְאוֹת

במצדת וישב בהר בערב זיף ויבקשהו שאול כל הימים ולא נתנו יהוה בידו ויחדל לצאת וישב דוד במדבר	6
שאול לבקש את נפשו ודוד במדבר זיף בחרשה ויקם יונתן בן שאול וילך אל דוד וירא דוד כי יצא	7
ביהוה ויאמר אליו אל תירא <i>vacat</i> כי לא תמצאך יד שאול אבי ואתה תמלך על חרשה ויחזק את ידו	8
אהיה לך למשנה וגם שאול אבי ידע כן ויכרתו שניהם ברית לפני יהוה <i>vacat</i> ישראל ואנכי	9
בחרשה ויונתן הלך לביתו ויעלו זפים אל שאול הגבעתה לאמר דוד מסתתר עמנו וישב דוד	<i>vacat</i> 10
החכילה אשר מימין השימן ועתה לכל נפש המלך לרדה ירד עלינו הסגירו ביד במצדת בחרשה בגבעת	11
ברוכים אתם ליהוה כי חמלתם עלי לכו נא הבינו עוד ודעו וראו את מקומו אשר המלך ויאמר שאול	12
תהיה רגלו המהרה שם כי אמר אלי יערם וראו מכל המחבאים אשר יתחבא שם	13

NOTES ON READINGS

L. 1 (23:8) Frg. 10 shows both the top and right margins allowing us to reconstruct its place on the complex pattern of fragments from this column. The fragment is badly wrinkled and worn but legible.

L. 1 (23:9) {^שאול}. ^שאול is written slightly above the ceiling line of the first line of frg. 12. It is a correction, above a word that has been erased. The erased word requires only the space of two letters and probably was אַל, a mistaken reading found in the Greek versions. See VARIANTS. The script of the correction is archaic, making use of the 'final *lamed*'. The *š*in is small, but breaks slightly through at the base, normally not a trait of the scribe of 4QSam^b. However, the correction is almost certainly made by the scribe of 4QSam^b.

L. 2 (23:9) אַל [א]בִּיתָ[ר]. The reading אַל [א]בִּיתָ[ר] at the beginning of line 2, along the lower edge of frg. 10, is very difficult to read. All the letters have been cut off at the bottom, and abraded, sometimes almost rubbed off (e.g. the *lamed* of אַל). However, the reading is not in doubt.

L. 2 4QSam^b has no paragraph spacing corresponding to the ס of מ between vv 9 and 10.

L. 3 (23:11) אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. On frg. 11, the third line of script is almost wholly torn off before the אֱלֹהֵי

אֱלֹהֵי of the large frg. 12. A few dots of ink are visible, but no clear letters.

- 23:22 (12) [הבינו] מ^{pc mss}] והכינו ט^{BAL} (καὶ ετοιμασατε); cf. ט^(O). הכינו does not make good sense in this context. However, we cannot be certain that 4QSam^b read הבינו rather than הכינו. The graphic confusion of *bet* and *kap* is easy in most periods of the Jewish Script. The text-critical integrity of ט is too uncertain to use it as support for הבינו (*pace* de Boer, *BHS*; and McCarter, *I Samuel*, 377).
- 23:22 (12) אָתּ] ודעו וראו] מ^{LO} ט ט ; cf. ט^B. The reading of ט^B probably arises from haplography. The reading of v 23 (ודעו וראו] מ^{mss} ט^O ט ; cf. ט) evidently arises from reminiscence of v 22 (ודעו וראו] מ^{LO} ט ט ט).
- 23:22 (13) [המרה] ; cf. ט (εὐταχεῖ)] מי ראהו . The Masoretic Text is corrupt, as generally recognized since Thenius, *Bücher Samuels*, 110 and Wellhausen, *Bücher Samuelis*, 129. Vertical alignment required by frg. 23 makes the slightly shorter reading highly likely in 4QSam^b. We are reading *ham-mēhîrāh*, an adjectival form written defectively, which in 4QSam^b is not surprising. A. B. Ehrlich, *Randglossen*, 249 proposed this reading already in 1910.
- 23:23 (13) [וראו]] ודעו וראו] מ^{BL} ט ט ; cf. ט. The requirements of vertical alignment impose on us a reconstruction in which either וראו or ודעו fills out the line before [מכל ה]מחב[אים]. We prefer וראו and translate the clause to read, 'Seek out from all the hiding places (the place) where he hides'. On the usage, compare 2 Kgs 10:3. The expansion of the text to וראו ודעו or וראו ודעו is owing to reminiscence of the expression in the preceding verse.
- 23:23 (13) [שם]] > ט^B ט ; cf. ט^L ט] מכל ה]מחב[אים אשר יתחבא שם]